



SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Long Term Plan

2018 - 2028

SUBMISSION BOOKLET FIVE
Submissions 100403 - 100436



[100403] - Ms Helen Duckworth

Address: 621 Days Road RD 4 7674

Postal Address: Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: gloverduck@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I support rates going to community facilities, however I would want those local halls that are not managed by Council to be part of Council support. For example, the Springston South Soldiers Memorial Hall is managed by a local community Committee (is an incorporated society). It is a Heritage Building with full compliance. Historically, the committee has done everything - all maintenance, cleaning, bookings, compliance and regulation follow-ups, and our facility is enjoyed by a variety of community groups and individuals, both locally and further afield.

The only financial contribution from the Council has been insurance , and recently, SDC has proposed to reduce their contribution. Given that we will all be rated - this seems very unfair, and a threat to the sustainability of such a significant facility.

This hall was built by the community in remembrance of all the locals who never returned from the war - their names are on the walls and many of their families still live in the district. The committee honours this legacy by keeping this building in very good condition, and it is a treasure of a facility that anyone can use, and do use.

By all means, rate us, but PLEASE continue to support this hall, and the people who keep it running by covering the cost of hall insurance. This is the only financial cost to the district and it is a very small amount to pay for an outstanding building that continues to honour our history and provide a wonderful facility for all.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I think that the \$140,000 to be spread amongst youth development, community development, arts, environment and history and culture is an insult.

These areas need more funding and this is a trifling amount compared to millions being spent on sports facilities. Surely our youth, arts, environment, culture and vital to our people's wellbeing. The funding should reflect this.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I would like to see some strategic planning around the Selwyn District's natural environment. I am particularly concerned about the pollution that is increasing the nitrates in our ground water. Chlorination will not address this. I think there needs to be increased funding for biodiversity and regenerative land uses, increased monitoring and enforcement of environmental rules, and explore 'polluter pays' types of policies. We want to swim.

Don't leave it all to ECAn - SDC should be active in this

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council currently makes a contribution to the insurance for the Springston South Soldiers Memorial Hall. The premium is paid directly by the Committee. Our proposal is that Selwyn District Council from next year 2018/19 contribute an amount of premium paid by us for a similar valued building on our Schedule OR contribute 40% towards the insurance premium invoice paid by the Springston South Soldiers Memorial Hall Committee whichever is higher and we stay consistent with that for the following years on.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for Community Grant Scheme noted. Submission also advocated for significant increase in level of funding within proposed Community Grants Scheme.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Selwyn District Council notes your concerns ground water pollution especially regarding the prevalence of nitrates, and your desire to swim in clean water.

The Council will continue to support and work with Environment Canterbury, and respective stakeholders, in their efforts to improve water quality and quantity in the district. In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant stakeholders and agencies including the Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management and regenerative land uses, along with pollution reduction and mitigation in the district.

As part of the District Plan Review process the (native) vegetation clearance rules are being reviewed by a working group of stakeholders. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Topic: Enforcement Comments and Issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Selwyn District Council notes your concerns ground water pollution especially regarding the prevalence of nitrates, and your desire to swim in clean water.

The Council will continue to support and work with Environment Canterbury, and respective stakeholders, in their efforts to improve water quality and quantity in the district. In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant stakeholders and agencies including the Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management and regenerative land uses, along with pollution reduction and mitigation in the district.

As part of the District Plan Review process the (native) vegetation clearance rules are being reviewed by a working group of stakeholders. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

[100404] - Mr Michael Glover

Address: 621 Days Road RD 4 7674

Postal Address: Springston South

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: mikegloverart@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I don't have a problem with the district wide rate for community facilities, as long as you look after the community owned facilities as well. I live near the Springston South Soldiers Memorial Hall which is community owned, and has provided facilities for the community over many decades.

The SDC has provided no funding towards the hall except for covering the insurance. Recently it was proposed to reduce the amount of funding towards the insurance. I ask the Council to fully cover the insurance of this important community facility - a small price to pay given the amount of rates local people are being asked to pay for other community facilities.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

While 82% of Selwyn residents are on community supply, the other 18% are on private bores which are not treated. The levels of nitrates in shallow bores are increasing (ECan predicts there will be 50% increase in nitrates in our water over the coming years).

Can you please get together with ECan and the CDHB and a full risk assessment of the increasing nitrates in our groundwater.

The risk to our babies through 'blue baby' syndrome is real. (Dr Alistar Humphrey has been talking about this for years).

This is not only a 10 year plan - we have to be looking 20 and 30 years ahead if we are serious about protecting the health of our community.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I do not agree on this single contestable scheme. Mixing youth, community development, environment, arts, culture and heritage together in one small underfunded scheme seems disrespectful and silly to me.

Surely the environment needs a lot more money and its own scheme given the loss of biodiversity and threats to our environment.

The Arts and Culture also needs its own, better funded scheme. In comparison, with the proposed funding for sports facilities the proposed amount of \$140,000 for all these disparate initiatives is paltry.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I am concerned there is no mention of the natural environment in this long-term plan. The 'long-term' prediction by ECan, as mentioned before - is that nitrates in shallow bores will increase by 50% in the coming years. This will endanger public health and lead to increased loss of biodiversity in our environment.

The lower Selwyn River is in almost permanent algal bloom now, given the constantly high levels of nitrates in the water.

While the SDC has no legislative responsibility for the river, it surely has a huge interest in seeing that it becomes healthy again. I ask that you actively pressure ECan to apply stricter rules on nitrate polluters. ECan have limited nitrate losses on lowland around Te Waihora to 15kgs/hectare. We ask that you pressure ECan to apply this rule over the whole district.

It may have to be phased in over time, but the message should be clear - we can no longer keep on polluting our precious water in say a way.

Another way to send such a message would be to make polluters pay for polluting over a certain allowable level. As it is, the people of Selwyn are paying for this pollution through degraded environments, poisoned swimming holes, degraded drinking water and higher rates and taxes to pay for the costs of cleaning up said pollution. Thank you.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Maintenance and renewal budgets will be based on the Council's Activity Management Plan for the hall or community centre. These plans are based on an assessment of the condition and use of the building, and future maintenance and renewal needs. As the plan is needs based rather than a funding allocation it means that work that is required will get done rather than being determined by the availability of local funds. Local Committees will have an input into the budget setting process, although the final approval rests with the Council. The activity management plans are available on the Council website.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council is closely monitoring nitrates in ground water.

Below are comments from Council staff on chlorination.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes

the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hruddy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer

The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water

borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Submission supports separation of community funding particularly for Environmental issues and projects, and proposes greater level of investment in the different areas. It is intended to retain separate environmental Funding at this time.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	<p>Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules.</p> <p>Selwyn District Council notes your concerns ground water pollution - especially regarding nitrates, associated algal blooms and the need for effective rules. Also noted is your desire to see the polluters pay given that the people of Selwyn are</p>

suffering from pollution effects with degraded environments, rivers that are unsafe to swim in, degraded drinking water quality and the current need for rate/tax payers to fund clean up and solutions.

The Council will continue to support and work with Environment Canterbury, and respective stakeholders, with their efforts to improve water quality and quantity in the district. In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant stakeholders and agencies including the Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff.

Topic: Enforcement Comments and Issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules.

Selwyn District Council notes your concerns ground water pollution - especially regarding nitrates, associated algal blooms and the need for effective rules. Also noted is your desire to see the polluters pay given that the people of Selwyn are suffering from pollution effects with degraded environments, rivers that are unsafe to swim in, degraded drinking water quality and the current need for rate/tax payers to fund clean up and solutions.

The Council will continue to support and work with Environment Canterbury, and respective stakeholders, with their efforts to improve water quality and quantity in the district. In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant stakeholders and agencies including the Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff.

[100405] -Dunsandel Community Committee Mr Nigel Barnett

Address: 176 Hororata Dunsandel Road Dunsandel 7682

Postal Address: Dunsandel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: barnett.family@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

We are concerned about the impact this proposal will have on our voluntary work currently undertaken. Do all reserves have an equal level of service? What will happen to the Ellesmere Reserve Committee and the funding they currently provide?

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Ongoing funding for roving secretarial services. Future provision of public toilets in Dunsandel.

Re-surfacing and realignment of tennis courts.

Building a storage shed for reserve and community centre.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Council is keen to have as much voluntarily commitment to our reserves and community centres/halls as we currently have and would encourage you to continue. Council recognises and values the role of volunteers and intends to ensure systems, mechanisms and processes (such as health and safety) associated with roles such as caretakers and cleaners, are appropriately supported to safeguard the interests of the individual volunteer and the organisation of Council.

Council will develop an appropriate level of service based on the Asset Management Plans for each reserve.

There is currently no proposal to change the way the Ellesmere Reserve Committee operates.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Budgets either allow for or could be adjusted as follows:

- public toilet - budget allowed for 2021-2022 for additional capacity but staff have discussed with the community centre committee the possibility of building the additional capacity on the domain to meet issues that site has with no public toilets. the logic of the domain site is that there is carparking already provided.
- storage shed - not allowed for in the council budgets but the community centre committee have advised that they can fund from other sources, using the charitable trust to bring the funds into the council
- tennis court replacement budgets are allowed for in 2019/2020 but whether that is a realignment will depend on what is deemed as the best spend of funds at that time

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments

Dunsandel Committee requests increase in Discretionary Funding for this committee to pay for paid secretarial services

[100406] - Deborah Tsavousis

Address: 10 Wrights Road Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: deborah_tsavousis@hotmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Leave the halls for the people in the area to decide how best to use them. You don't know the requirements of each area.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Spend the money improving health by improving our drinking water. No chlorine.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

This is not a safe practice and unnecessary. According to the US Council of Environmental Quality - "the cancer risk to people who drink chlorinated water is 93% higher than those who don't." This negative side effects and associated studies showing this harm is pages long.

Current information is required not 30 year old studies on your website. Notice to boil water is fine. Chlorination is not.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

So much \$ for SO FEW. That money could have given all of Canterbury good water. Misuse of public funds - this should benefit us all, but it doesn't

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Leave it alone you control freaks. These people do good work without any inference. Why waste more time and money on something that works well already.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Do some work in your existing building.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Let's have the best water in NZ and keep it that way. Make it better not worse. Do more real research that is current and not paid for by vested interests.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support SAC development and proposes to spend money on drinking water

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that

some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with

chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The ‘Water race user – Annual charge revenue’ is rated on a per rating

unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes NOT to change any community grants

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100407] - Mr Panos Tsavousis

Address: 10 Wrights Road Sheffield S18 7JQ

Postal Address: Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: panosplan@hotmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

This does not allow for self-governance which is more democratic, and responsive to local communities' needs

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

This is the worst idea ever. From a health standpoint, it is disastrous and will make people buy bottled water which will be an added expense. Why not use that money to upgrade the system?

That 80% of NZ uses chlorination is a non-argument and very lazy thinking.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Again, lacks responsiveness to local needs - too many hoops to jump.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is

organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic.

<https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system

minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission suggests that Community Grants proposal does not respond to community needs and is high in compliance. Officers suggest introduction of Community Grants Scheme was due to lack of public awareness of what funding and to increase funding to communities. The Review is intended to make the funding process simple. However it is noted that some residents / groups may have previously received funding without due process and without accountability, so introduction of a process may present increased compliance for a few.

[100408] - Not provided Not provided

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

We are totally against this! One of the reasons we live here is for the water quality and no-one has been affected negatively here! Why?

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Sounds great.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments	No comments made.
-----------------------	-------------------

[100409] -Whitecliffs Township Committee Miss Jodie Thompson

Address: c/- 19 Hector Street RD 1 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day): 318 2643

Phone (mobile):

Email: liz_weir@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

We would to prefer to say as it is. Never would we use another townships Hall. It's not economical for us to travel the distance.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

We prefer they don't do the extension. Rolleston residents only have a short distance to travel to access city pools. If this does go ahead, Rolleston rate payers should pay.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

We prefer targeted rate paid by Rolleston rate payers. Whitecliffs residents will seldom use this. We question the need for this considering the proximity of Rolleston to Christchurch with its amenities.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

NA

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

We support the introduction of a new community grant scheme.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

When the Glentunnel Hall burnt down, a targeted rate for Malvern residents was set to pay for the shortfall. Target the communities who use the hall.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

It is unsustainable to build a new facility when there are existing offices in townships unused.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

- The Whitecliffs Township would like to explanation on the massive rate increase over the next two years What are we getting for this? - This is way more than inflation and people cannot afford this, especially pensioners and single income families.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support SAC development

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support of a Rolleston based funding model is acknowledged. Staff do not support the rationale of this submission which proposes that the Indoor courts are not needed due to the development of indoor Sports centres in Christchurch. The needs analysis conducted as part of the Indoor Court proposal clearly shows a need in Selwyn for this facility in addition to the proposed Christchurch facilities. This view has been supported by a regional study of the need for sports facilities across the region conducted by Sport Canterbury. This study placed the proposed Indoor facility at Foster Park as a high priority given the lack of Indoor capacity across the region. Staff have been conscious of the need to ensure that the Foster park facility is designed in way to compliment and not duplicate the Christchurch facilities particularly around ensuring the facility is community sport level focused (as opposed to high performance).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following

comment. “We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in

drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments

Support for Community Grant Funding is noted.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is incorrect about the funding for the Glentunnel Community Centre rebuilt after the fire. the funds came from a combination of insurance fund proceeds and Glentunnel/Coalgate/Whitecliffs funding either from grants or lump sum/loan contributions from ratepayers.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter considers that Whitecliffs to Glentunnel Cycleway should be undertaken before/instead of the Darfield to Kirwee Cycleway because it has more safety benefits. The submitter has a valid point however it is likely only a small number will benefit anyway. Shingle pathways do not provide the levels of service users expect and perceived savings are a false economy relating to increased regular maintenance. The Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan and transport funding forecasts includes a \$504,000 project in 2032/33 to construct a cycleway between Glentunnel and Whitecliffs. Currently it is seen as having a low priority/use demand. In places it will be technically difficult to construct which may mean the budget will need to be increased when this is better understood. There is surprise at the Submitters comments about wanting no side street footpaths as recent consultation with the Committee to develop the forward upgrade programme for the Walk Cycle Action Plan agreed there would be, however these are assigned a low to very low priority in the Action Plan so same difference perhaps.

Topic: Camping Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The council is developing a camping strategy which will include comments on the future of Whitecliffs Domain

Council reserves ranger staff will monitor Tarling Common and move any campers there to the domain.

No allowance is planned at this time for playground changes at the common.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter questions whether the community of Whitecliffs has a rate increase of 9% for the next few years. This is because of the introduction of District Wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves. The submitter also asks what Whitecliffs residents receive for this rate increase. The average increase for Whitecliffs residents is projected to be 9.2% for 2018/19 and 9.7% for 2019/20, with an average increase over the 10 years of 4.8% p.a. These increases are largely associated with the introduction of a district wide rating structure. The introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves reflects that Selwyn residents are increasingly using facilities right across the district - not just in their own neighbourhoods. Facilities like the Lincoln Event Centre and Southbridge Hall, and reserves at Weedons, Rhodes Park in Tai Tapu, and Whitecliffs are examples of local facilities that are frequently used by residents from other communities. Under the current system, however, these users are not necessarily funding the facilities.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter considers that Whitecliffs to Glentunnel Cycleway should be undertaken before/instead of the Darfield to Kirwee Cycleway because it has more safety benefits. The submitter has a valid point however it is likely only a small number will benefit anyway. Shingle pathways do not provide the levels of service users expect and perceived savings are a false economy relating to increased regular maintenance. The Council's 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan and transport funding forecasts includes a \$504,000 project in 2032/33 to construct a cycleway between Glentunnel and Whitecliffs. Currently it is seen as having a low priority/use demand. In places it will be technically difficult to construct which may mean the budget will need to be increased when this is better understood. There is surprise at the Submitters comments about wanting no side street footpaths as recent consultation with the Committee to develop the forward

upgrade programme for the Walk Cycle Action Plan agreed there would be, however these are assigned a low to very low priority in the Action Plan so same difference perhaps.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Whitecliffs Committee wishes to continue to receive secretarial services. Officers propose an increase to Discretionary Funds to this committee sufficient to cover the costs of paid secretarial services.

[100410] - Mr Evan Frew

Address: 13 Avoca Place Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Topic: Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	<p>Thank you for your support for the future work program on the potential Darfield wastewater network.</p> <p>Council will provide an opportunity over the coming year for targeted feedback on the development of a reticulated wastewater network for Darfield and Kirwee.</p>

[100411] - Lorraine Sheen

Address: 129 Hacketts Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: sheen.sandl@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I do not support PERMANENT chlorination of the Hartleys Road water scheme. I support the present excellent filtration and UV treatment, but think they would be better protected by bunding and fencing the well head.

I support the installation of chlorine treatment equipment for use in emergency situations only when testing reveals the presence of ecoli above certain levels. This would require frequent testing at different points in the system, but it would allow recognition of faults in the delivery system and enable their correction.

These faults might otherwise be concealed by permanent chlorination.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100412] -Malvern Community Hub Mrs Beverley Elder

Address: 24 Kimberley Road Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: beve1@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

It seems likely that some committees will need a dispensation, so a blanket rule will not fit. It should be possible to grant exemptions / adaptations within an overall plan.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

As a member of the Malvern district, I am unlikely to make any use of the Aquatic Centre, but would like to use an upgraded Darfield pool. User pays in Rolleston would be more fair.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

User pays is the only fair way to go. Every community wishes to maintain or improve local facilities first.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Do not do it. Those who want chlorinated water can use tablets. Those who do not want chlorinated water should not be forced to use it.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

If big voices get money and little voices are not heard, no.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Yes to Leeston and Prebbleton as they are communities. No to Hororata as it is not yet a cohesive community.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Congratulations to the Council for contracting a demographics to write a report and speak to it. Why does this research not lead you to act on the needs of the aging percentage in Malvern?

Why is housing conspicuous by its absence as a topic to talk about? I know Council wishes to not be involved in social housing, but that does not excuse it from supporting / partnering with groups who do. Once again, I request a genuine

decision-making local-plus-central group to enable affordable housing / affordable rental for elderly folk to be made available.

This would be a win-win for Council AND community, so we know it is a partnership and not a bureaucracy. Help us to do what we CAN do please.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council's proposal is to set a uniform rate on all properties across the District. The alternative approach is to design a rating system with Zones or exemptions. This would substantially complicate the rates system. The Council's aim has been to develop a simple system.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes user pay model for SAC development.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road

(Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural

organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submission supports only if this process will provide a voice / opportunity for small groups. With the increased transparency it is intended to provide opportunities for all community groups. With the process it is intended that the process will be fair

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Horrorata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: Additional Housing - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Community housing is not an activity that this council has ever seen as core to its activities. Affordable housing matters have to date been dealt via RMA approvals or as in the Abbeyfield housing at Leeston, by allocating the Rata Foundation funds that council was granted to that project. A number of other community organisations have provide affordbale/community housing within the District and are arguably best placed to continue to do so.

[100413] - Mrs Alison Syme

Address: 342 Boultons Road Darfield 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

The current system allows smaller communities to retain their local hall as a centre and preserve it historically for future generations. A district rate will disadvantage these areas and their population in the future.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

This is a valuable asset, now fully utilised and it should be expanded to meet future needs.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Unlike the aquatics centre, I see nothing suggested here that older rate payers or other groups - young children, disabled etc would use. It will be of most use to the younger sporting population of Rolleston.

A district-wide rate is unfair on those living further away, unable to travel to Foster Park or use the facility who support their own local facilities and sports groups. I support a Rolleston rate.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

I think that the rating system needs a review, but the new proposal seems to increase unfairness. A per hectare basis is fairer as some people have only a few hectares and it appears would pay the same annual charge as a large land owner.

It is unclear how it works if your farm is made up of multiple small titles and rate demands. Is it one annual charge per landowner, block etc?

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

With well written guidelines, this should work well and give more flexibility for funding use.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

I am unsure of the reason behind the Kirwee to Darfield proposal, but support more walking and cycling tracks for locals, and to encourage visitors. We need more in the surrounding Malvern and Tawera wards.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Maintenance and renewal budgets will be based on the Council's Activity Management Plan for the hall or community centre. These plans are based on an assessment of the condition and use of the building, and future maintenance and renewal needs. As the plan is needs based rather than a funding allocation it means that work that is required will get done rather than being determined by the availability of local funds. Local Committees will have an input into the budget setting process, although the final approval rests with the Council. The activity management plans are available on the Council website.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support of a Rolleston based funding model is acknowledged. It is clear that the facility will be used extensively by residents outside the Rolleston area. The multi functional nature of the proposed facility will allow many and varied uses and classes, meetings, markets supporting of older age groups are envisaged as integral to the facility.

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and

farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Seems to support the wider concept of cycleways in the area but questions the planned Darfield to Kirwee cycleway.

[100414] - Mr Kevin McGoverne

Address: 1195 Hoskyns Road Kirwee Kirwee

Postal Address: Kirwee

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kevinmcgoverne@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Hi Naomi,

Thank you in anticipation for our late submission regarding Selwyn District Council, FastForward28.

We currently live at 1195 Hoskyns Road. The "Kirwee end" of Hoskyns road is unsealed (from The West Coast road, up to Kirwee).

As you can imagine living on an shingle road comes with a lot of consequences and none of them are positive.

We would like the Council to put in a proposal for Hoskyns Road (North End) to be sealed.

Listed below are just some of the reasons we would like to council to know what we have to deal with living on an unsealed road.

1. Dust; Dust covers us entirely, our farm, our cars, our house, our grass, our animals, our washing and worst our children. Our horses all have swollen glands in their necks from inhaling dust and our sheep are constantly coughing, our children suffer from constant sneezing and dirt up their noses, I'm forever dusting inside my house and cleaning down the outside walls. We inhale the dust when we're walking, biking or horse riding along our roadside, our cars are covered in it, it is a constant and quite honestly horrible battle.

2. Speed/Danger. For some reason people who drive down our road, immediately think "great, a shingle road, I'll floor it"... these people put even more dust up, throw gravel all over us and our grass verges and have numerous accidents. Also there are the local weekend idiot hooligans pulling "donuts" all down our road. I often come out of my driveway and have to sit for quite some time to let the dust settle from someone else having just been past, before I can actually see if there are any other cars coming and I can safely turn out onto our road. We've had numerous single car crashes into our roadside fences or our neighbours fences from people once again driving far too fast on the shingle and losing control and crashing through our fences or shelter belts.

3. Damage to our cars, needless to say our windscreens have yearly cracks to repair and our tyres wear out twice as fast as anyone else's, and our cars are quite simply never clean. Our postie and other various locals etc drive on the grass verge to try and avoid the dust. For this we can't blame them, however when coming out of our driveways you're not really expecting to have someone driving on the grass verge and we could easily hit one of them, also subsequently it messes up our grass verges with constant tyre tracks on them.

5. Our kids are covered in dust. Their school bus has to come along our road, and unfortunately a long vehicle tends to collect even more dust, they're breathing this in and getting covered in it while on their way to and from school!

6. The grader your council sends once a month, makes NO DIFFERENCE whatsoever to our road. The pot holes are still there, as is the guttering. The shingle spreads back onto the briefly sealed area where there is a stop sign at the end of our road, making it hazardous to stop and a cloud of dust follows over us onto the main West Coast Road covering oncoming

cars etc. No matter how many times you send the grader, it makes no difference, the road is back to being dangerous and full of ridges and potholes.....again in a day.

As you can imagine all of these factors add up to feeling very frustrated at having to live on such a road. In this day and age we live in I struggle to understand why ANY roads are still unsealed in our country, let alone our district. There is massive growth in the Selwyn district over the past 15-20 years and you would think we would have had progression with our roading. Subsequently with growth in the Rolleston/Lincoln/West Melton/Prebbleton district there is also growth in Kirwee, with a new large subdivision going in out there, the traffic on our road has increased too. Hoskyns Road, is a direct thoroughfare from Kirwee to Rolleston and with it sealed would result in a large increase of use which would in turn give people a second option from the main West Coast Road.

Thanks again for reading and considering our submission.

Kinds regards,

Kevin McGoverne.

Kevin McGoverne Phone: 0274 363 530

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The request to seal Hoskyns Rd is not aligned with Council's programme to address specific strategic network "missing link" seal extensions on high volume main routes or connections to assist in the movement of people and freight. Hoskyns Road is a local road that doesn't fall into that category. The submitters request to seal all 1,000km of unsealed roads in the District to address dust issues is unaffordable. Equally the request to subsidise the application of network wide dust suppressant is the same.

[100415] - Heather and Stuart Cadenhead

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: heathercadenhead@hotmail.com

Submission

Submission

Thank you in anticipation for my late submission regarding Selwyn District Council, Fastforward28.

Our family and I have lived in the Selwyn District Council for 18 years. We love this area. I have looked over the planning and am very excited about your plans for the future, and find it interesting about the growth that is anticipated over the next years.

I would like the Council to put in a proposal for Hoskyns Road (north end) to be tar sealed. I feel now that Westmelton, Rolleston & Kirwee are expanding in growth that it would be safer for drivers to have this road sealed. Plus it would reduce the amount of traffic from Kirwee on the main Westcoast Road and give more options for travellers coming from the Old Westcoast Road going to Rolleston. Also because it has high use it is constantly being graded and within days has potholes again,

which as you can gather is bad for the cars.

We were also considering subdividing our property which is at present 25 acres, and would like to subdivide it to 10 acres. Our next door neighbour is a 10 acre block and properties 0.5km down Sharps Road are 10 acre blocks also. If you could also look at this in the fast forward 28 would be appreciated as we think this would benefit this area due to the growth and demand in this area.

Once again thank you for reading & considering our submission.

Regards Heather & Stuart Cadenhead

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The request to seal Hoskyns Rd is not aligned with Council's programme to address specific strategic network "missing link" seal extensions on high volume main routes or connections to assist in the movement of people and freight. Hoskyns Road is a local road that doesn't fall into that category.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff note your proposal to potentially subdivide your property from 25 acres to 10 acres and for the reasons outlined in your submission. This is a resource consenting matter to be considered under the current Selwyn District Plan and it is suggested that you speak with Council Planning staff about your proposal. Without further information in the submission it is difficult to provide any further response. It is noted that this is not a matter to be considered in the Long Term Plan. It is noted that the Selwyn District Plan Review will also be considering rural and residential zone densities as a matter in that review. The matter raised in your submission may also be a matter for consideration through the District Plan Review. If you wish to make a submission to have your current zone reduced in minimum lot size, making a submission on the District Plan Review is the appropriate channel. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others.

[100416] - Mrs Beverley Robb

Address: 35 Cridges Road Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: bevrobb@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

(a) depends on what the rate costs b) it is very wrong to destroy and take away buildings that communities have funded as happens frequently in the Selwyn district. Darfield has very little heritage left standing.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

This should be placed, not in Rolleston, but in another Malvern area - we are rated for it, but never use it. Too far to travel.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Yes, many!! Taste and smell; risk of the chlorination, the nature of this product chlorine continually for household use and drinking is not the answer.

When I was at school, I was taught that chlorine gas is dangerous and will destroy lung tissue. My thoughts are, if the water is indeed likely to be harmful and needs chlorination, why aren't the Council chlorinating the water supply at the source and then filtering the chlorine out before the consumer receives supply?

Why should public have to filter the chlorine out? If Council say that is costly, why don't they reduce costs spent on visits to Sister Cities, many social functions, costs for entertaining,. Council are elected to manage infrastructure etc, roads and to manage the funds ratepayers pay more responsibly.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

We do not need more money spent at Rolleston. use this money to upgrade and repair the roads in the Selwyn area, particularly in Malvern area.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

Fix the roads and intersections first.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support SAC development

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is

perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is

generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments	No comments made.
-----------------------	-------------------

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments	Roads are also being fixed as well.
-----------------------	-------------------------------------

[100417] - Mr Alan Cammock

Address: 221 Auchenflower Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: menthcat@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Prefer the current system as a district wide rate favours the larger population bases, which are looking for more facilities.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

As long as this is fair to all, as I have a 2.2ha, but 1/2 is the house-block, and I don't draw out of the race at all.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

[100418] - Mrs Elza Stuart

Address: 12 Stanwood Grove Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I am against district-wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves. As a pensioner the rating, especially in 2028 is well out of my budget.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

You can do what you like as long as it does not affect our rates as I will not be using it, and it is not in my area.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Prefer option 3

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Prefer option 1

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Needs to stay as it is as it is working well. What is not broken does not need fixing.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

If facilities are needed, go ahead and develop them.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I do not support the proposal. Money could be better spent on the terrible roads that we have in our district.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

For the future there should be provision for developing a walkway and cycleway all the way to Springfield.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Council needs to be aware that there are a lot of pensioners living in the Selwyn district and constant rate rises are not affordable for pensioners.

What do pensioners do if they cannot afford to pay the rates? Going without other things is not an option that pensioners should have to worry about or deal with.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supports User pay

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission is silent re support or otherwise re the Indoor Court project at Foster Park. The submission does not support a district rating structure for this facility which is acknowledged.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports

the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and

concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support changing Community Grants Funding Scheme

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes connecting Kirwee to Springfield in successive stages. The first project Darfield to Kirwee is in 2022/23.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100419] - Mrs Georgina Eaves

Address: 13 Bleakhouse Road Racecourse Hill 7571

Postal Address: RD 1 Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Make it 50m

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Sheffield / Waddington water supply - no to chlorination. Was e.coli the only reason we had to boil water a few months ago? How many times in the last 20 years has our water supply been contaminated?

I'm paying well over \$500 per year for good water; if its contaminated with toxins, will it be cheaper?

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Is it necessary? Get all our water supplies fixed first.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Sport Canterbury have confirmed their advice that Selwyn would benefit from a 25 metre pool. Hon Megan Woods recently confirmed 50 metre pool was back on track with CCC

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. The Sheffield / Waddington water supply has had many 'reticulation' coli detections. This is the main driver for chlorinating this scheme.

Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes

the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hruddy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer

The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water

borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100420] - Mrs Lynette Anderson

Address: 70 Homebush Road RD 1 7673

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: regandlyn1944@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I consider what you are contemplating a good idea.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I consider it would be an advantage for the whole of the Selwyn district

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

This would mainly benefit Rolleston. The main growth area.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I would like scientific proof that it would not harm anyone or being, as it is a highly toxic product. Answers please!

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

This should only be a farming issue. It should not effect township rates

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

It is unworkable at this time.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

I believe they are a benefit to the community so they need them.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

Good idea.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No definitive position on the Indoor court proposal is provided although by inference the submitter would support a Rolleston based funding formula.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington

water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a

manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261],

Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments It is understood that the Submission supports the Community Grants Scheme

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

[100421] - Mr Dean Syme

Address: 363 Boulton Road Darfield 7511

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

The present system works well for Kimberley which would lose its community centre and opportunities for future development as the housing in the area increases.

Our local hall is significant historically to the resident families of the area and our central point. With Darfield expanding towards us, it is short-sighted to change the current system.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

They are needed.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

The proposal as we understand it places a greater cost on smaller units. The per hectare charge was fairer as it allows for more users to pay for use. It is unclear if a rate payer would pay the proposed annual charge per title, rate demand, block, i.e. it does not seem to be even per hectare or KM, or race available, etc.

With current changes races provide less and less economic value to farmers.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I support extra funding for the Roving Secretary for Kimberley Reserve.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supports SAC development

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments

Kimberley Reserve Committee requests additional discretionary funds to cover costs of paid secretarial services

[100422] - Mrs Elizabeth May

Address: 14 Stanwood Gove Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: ellymay@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I am against district-wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves. As a pensioner, the increase is way out of my budget.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

They can do as they like as long as it doesn't affect my rates, as its not in my area, and as a pensioner, don't need that extra cost.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I prefer no. 3

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Option 1

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Doesn't concern me.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Why can't it stay the way it is. It is working well. So doesn't need changing as it is not broken.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

If they are needed, yes go ahead and build them.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

No I don't support this as I think other things are more important such as roading and especially footpaths in Darfield are a mess. And I think you have to many people working there in the first place.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I think for the future there should be a cycleway from Kirwee to Darfield, and Darfield to Springfield.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Council need to realize that there are a lot of pensioners in Darfield, and they cannot afford all of these extra costs on their rates. Going without to pay the rates is not an option.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes User Pay / Targeted rate should fund the SAC on basis that Rolleston users only, use SAC .Officers note that users of the facility come from places outside of Rolleston. In a four week survey in late 2017 Learn to Swim participants: Selwyn Central - 49%, Springs Ward 19%, Ellesmere 10%, Malvern 8% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn. SAC casual admissions: Selwyn Central - 27.5%, Springs Ward - 19%, Ellesmere - 14.5%, Malvern 10.5% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission is silent re support or otherwise re the Indoor Court project at Foster Park. The submission does not support a district rating structure for this facility which is acknowledged.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to

all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural

organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support changing the Community Grants Scheme

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes connecting Kirwee to Springfield in successive stages. The first project Darfield to Kirwee is in 2022/23

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100423] -Kimberley Reserve Committee Julie Cameron

Address: 322 Auchenflower Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

As a member of a small committee of busy, largely self-employed people, we have difficulty providing a secretary from within our ranks.

We understand funding for our roving secretary will end in June. We would therefore respectfully request extra funds to cover outside secretarial costs.

We believe our Reserve has long-term value to our, and the wider community.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Submitter requests additional funding to cover the cost of paid secretarial services for the associated Reserve Committee . Specific name of Committee not included in information to Council

[100424] -Darfield Recreation and Community Centre Mr Stuart Gillanders

Address: 905 Greendale Road Darfield 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: stu.gillanders@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	<p>Darfield Recreation and Community Centre Projects: The committee have sought budgets for a range of additional projects and initiatives for inclusion in the 10 year plan. Staff note that this committee has had difficulty in delivering some projects with on-going carryforwards required. Comments on specific projects are set out below:</p> <p>Power cable - Assume this is a contribution to this project with some benefit to the reserve. Would need to be funded from rates (targeted or district).</p> <p>Reserve Irrigation - Assume this is an operating cost for irrigation. Would need to be funded from rates (targeted or district). Note that there is a budget to install an automated system for the fields in 2021/22 so may not be required after that.</p> <p>Womens Toilet Refurbishment - Mens is being done in 2017/18 and staff agree the womens also needs upgrading. It is suggested to use other opex project budgets to offset this e.g. internal painting (\$23,000).</p> <p>Tree removal - Provision has been made to carry the 2017/18 budget forward (\$10,000). If an extra \$10,000 is required (as requested) this would need to be funded from rates (targeted or district).</p> <p>Mower/Tractor replacements - A total of \$70,000 is sought as additional budget over two years (2020/21 nd 2021/22). This has previously been covered by the Darfield Domain Fund which has a current balance of \$48,372. It is suggested that this fund is used in the first instance for these projects (any shortfall would need to be met from rates). Staff also note that, at a cost of \$70,000 for capital investment and coupled with the wages costs for mowing, this may not be the most efficient way of providing this service.</p> <p>Entrance Upgrade - An increase from \$50,000 to \$80,000 is sought for this work by the committee. It is unclear whether the scope of works has changed from the initial project submitted by the committee. Staff would recommend that the full scope of works is developed and priced before accepting this increase. If additional funds are required these can be considered as part of the Annual Plan process.</p> <p>Machinery Maintenance - A budget of \$5,000 has been requested. Staff assume these costs have been met previously under existing budgets. As the Darfield Recreation and Community Centre operating budget has been under for the last few years (by about \$14,500 in 2015/16 and 2016/17 and is heading that way for 2017/18) staff would recommend the new budget is achieved from reallocating existing budgets.</p>

[100425] - Mr Reg Anderson

Address: 70 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

In the long run, we do a much better job collectively. This means individual townships like, say Glentunnel, would now not have to cover the debt alone. So having the chance to have perhaps a better building than perhaps they would have.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I consider it a good idea to go with the 50m pool. I don't use the pool, but am happy to see it extended.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

This is of not great benefit to our area, so a targeted rate paid by Rolleston Ratepayers. This along with West Melton is where the growth areas are.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Water races are a farm facility only and so the townships should not be affected per township rates.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

This would be a good idea if all Township committees combined. I cant see that happening in the near future.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

They had them before they so they still need them. They should push for them because unlike Glentunnel who had to pay for their own hall, now the whole Selwyn district will have to pay if the district plan is implemented.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I hear you have employed a hatchet man or woman - so if this person is trimming, what will be the need.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I'm happy with this as long as it includes the smaller townships as well.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

The Council's reply to phone calls is often non-existent. You want our committees to be the eyes and ears of the Council. We cost you nothing. We are enthusiastic about our township, so please...

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted and Submission proposes a 50 metre pool . Officers advise that Hon Megan Woods in Press Release 27 April, confirms the CCC Metro Sports facility is back on track and includes a 50 metre pool complex. Sport Canterbury reconfirms its support for a 25 metre pool as being sufficient for future needs in Selwyn.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for a local Rolleston funding formula for indoor courts is acknowledged. The needs analysis conducted around this facility demonstrates that high levels of use will be made of these facilities from areas outside Rolleston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Modern chlorination is unlikely to impact stock drinking the water. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all

supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-

products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for

livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supporting Community Grants Scheme funding is noted. The submitter further proposes Township funds be merged.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100426] - Liz Weir

Address: 19 Hector Street Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: liz_weir@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I would prefer the current system of a targeted rate. When Glentunnel hall burned down, Malvern residents paid for the short fall cost with a targeted rate; no other communities contributed. The Council is now building huge, expensive facilities near Rolleston, Lincoln and Tai Tapu that smaller, rural communities will never use. It is unfair and inequitable to ask smaller communities to subsidize these amenities.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

As above. These facilities are used mainly by ratepayers in Rolleston, Lincoln and environs. It is a huge amount of money to spend on facilities which already exist in nearby CHCH. If the Council choose to extend the facility, make it a targeted rate. Rural communities have already contributed to the aquatic centre, but get no benefit from it.

If the centre is widely used as indicated within the LTP, make the users fund it, not the people who can't use it.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

My argument for sections 1 & 2 applies here also. There is a huge amount of money being spent in suburbs close to CHCH, for amenities which already exist in CHCH. A recreational facility is a 'nice to have' but not a necessity such as safe drinking water, safe roads, reliable and affordable rubbish collection and other core services.

I opt for choice 3 - targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I don't believe the risk assessment is valid. In the Malvern Hills Hartleys Road system, the water is good - there is a problem with the reticulation system. Our rates will be increasing by 19% over the next two years, but.... what are we getting for this?

Give rural communities a fair go and actually do something positive for us - don't unnecessarily chlorinate our water because it is the cheapest, easiest option, fix the system.

if there is lots of money to build recreational facilities, there should be enough money to give Malvern Hills residents a secure water supply.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I support this proposal as long as there is an equitable distribution of funds between communities, regardless of size or location.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

These should be funded by a targeted rate to the communities benefitting.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I don't support and extension. Building onto an already large building is not only unsustainable, but unnecessary. There are older, but perfectly good Council rooms in Darfield and Leeston and I am sure that the large , lavish rooms in the current building could be reconfigured to accommodate growth.

Parking lots are a poor use of land. Perhaps if there was better, more reliable bus services, there wouldn't be a need for more cars on the roads and in parking lots.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

Whitecliffs is in dire need or a safe walking /cycling path. Its need is greater than almost all of the projects proposed, yet it isn't even in the 10 year plan.

Once again, we pay our rates, yet get nothing to benefit our community. The only road in and out of Whitecliffs is narrow, winding and unsafe. A safe thoroughfare isn't a 'nice to have' - it is an urgent need. Please put a Whitecliffs project in the 2020/21 budget.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Roading - SDC says it won't be sealing any rural roads, but I see that Coaltrack Road is scheduled for sealing. Whitecliffs has only one short, unsealed road, but Council has declined to seal it. Every other side street is sealed except HECTOR STREET. If the Council Is disinclined to seal this street, could it please seal the first 50-100m where it meets Whitecliffs Road. This section is full of pot holes because it is the stretch where drivers accelerate and brake when exiting and entering HECTOR STREET. All other gravel roads have this already.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes Targeted rate or User Rate should fund the SAC on basis that Rolleston users only, use SAC .Officers note that users of the facility come from places outside of Rolleston. In a four week survey in late 2017 . Learn to Swim participants Selwyn Central - 49%, Springs Ward 19%, Ellesmere 10%, Malvern 8% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn. SAC casual admissions Selwyn Central - 27.5%, Springs Ward - 19%, Ellesmere - 14.5%, Malvern 10.5% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support of a Rolleston based funding model is acknowledged. Staff do not support the rationale of this submission which proposes that the Indoor courts are not needed due to the development of indoor Sports centres in Christchurch. The needs analysis conducted as part of the Indoor Court proposal clearly shows a need in Selwyn for this facility in addition to the proposed Christchurch facilities. This view has been supported by a regional study of the need for sports facilities across the region conducted by Sport Canterbury. This study placed the proposed Indoor facility at Foster Park as a high priority given the lack of Indoor capacity across the region. Staff have been conscious of the need to ensure that the Foster park facility is designed in way to compliment and not duplicate the Christchurch facilities particularly around ensuring the facility is community sport level focused (as opposed to high performance).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and

these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant

used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supports the Community Funding Grants Scheme on proviso that funding of projects is across the district regardless of community size and location within Selwyn. Officers advise the Scheme is intended to have, as a principle, funding across the geographic district

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter considers that Whitecliffs to Glentunnel Cycleway should be undertaken before others because it has more safety benefits. The submitter has a valid point however it is likely only a small number will benefit anyway.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Your concerns are noted around the need to halt the loss of, and protestation of, existing biodiversity. The Council has employed a full-time biodiversity coordinator whose top priority is the management and protection of native biodiversity. As part of the District Plan Review process the (native) Vegetation clearance rules are being reviewed by a working group of stakeholders. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

SDC has the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund of approximately \$45,000 (Gst excl) per year for biodiversity protection, enhancement and management – please see our website for more information.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules. Staff also recognise that funding should be available that is solely dedicated to the protection and management of existing biodiversity.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments	This request is reasonable and aligns with NZTA recommendations to re introduce a seal widening programme. Hector St can be added to it.
-----------------------	--

[100427] - Miss Jodie Thompson

Address: 23 Kennaway Street Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I would prefer this to stay as it is. Target the community in which is most likely to use the halls and reserves.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I would love to see the same in Darfield to cater for the outlying townships. A targeted rate for Rolleston should be applied. Whitecliff residents would seldom use this. It's not sustainable to travel this distance.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

This sounds amazing. It's disappointing that all the big projects are based in Rolleston. To fund this, a targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers is my preferred option as they will benefit from this most.

I would love to see this in Darfield, so the outlying towns could use it.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I strongly oppose this decision. This should be a very last resort. I'd like our rates to be spent on fixing the infrastructure. We are not a third world country.

The long term health risks of chlorine are too high and not worth risk peoples' lives. For health and safety reasons, the risk of someone dying from chlorine over time is far greater than e.coli

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Again, target the landowners in which the race cross. They are only benefitting farmers.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I support the introduction of a new community grant scheme.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Great - target the communities who will use the halls

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

This isn't a good use of rate payers money. I'm sure service centres throughout Selwyn have spare offices. I'm sure most Council departments run quite separately. There is more to Selwyn than Rolleston. Let's spread workers around the whole district and immerse them in the communities they work for. Everyone would benefit from this.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

URGENT - please bring forward from 2032 to 2018/2019, the Whitecliffs to Glentunnel cycleway (from camping ground to Glentunnel). This cycleway / walkway must be made a priority before someone gets seriously hurt or killed on narrow, unsafe and winding roads.

The demographic has changed considerably in recent years with more school age children / mothers with prams, joggers and cyclists using this 3km stretch. - Please keep our communities safe.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

KEEP FUNDING THE ROVING SECRETARY - this role is vital for keeping committee meetings efficient and providing prompt and precise service communication between Council and Committees. Without this service, already busy committee volunteers would struggle to keep up with the workload in turn resulting in sloppy / delayed minutes, which is why the roving secretary role was initially put in place.

I would like some explanation on why Whitecliffs rates will increase so much for the next two years. I can't see anywhere on the long-term plan showing how we will benefit from this. We have no footpaths, no swimming pools, the Council does very little out here. If anything we should be getting a decrease for lack of services.

Charge the communities with the most amenities more. They are larger, and Council would have more money to play with

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes Targeted rate should fund the SAC on basis that Rolleston users only, use SAC .Officers note that users of the facility come from places outside of Rolleston. In a four week survey in late 2017 . Learn to Swim participants Selwyn Central - 49%, Springs Ward 19%, Ellesmere 10%, Malvern 8% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn. SAC casual admissions Selwyn Central - 27.5%, Springs Ward - 19%, Ellesmere - 14.5%, Malvern 10.5% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor courts funded through a Rolleston funding model is acknowledged. The importance of local community facilities are acknowledged but a network approach is needed whereby local community facilities are complimented by a regional one capable of holding major and large scale events. The regional facility needs to be based centrally where access for most people is facilitated to the greatest extent. Facilities of this scale and nature can only be built once and they need to be complimented by smaller scale local facilities.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach.

The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. “We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water

Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments

Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for Community Grants Funding Scheme is noted

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The same submitter as representing the Whitecliffs Township Committee with the same suggestions e.g. bringing forward the Whitecliffs to Glentunnel cycleway. However laments no footpaths in contradiction. The draft 2018 Walk Cycle Action Plan includes the forward Programme of footpaths for the township and a 2.2km path along Whitecliffs Rd through the township is assigned a High priority.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter questions whether the community of Whitecliffs has a rate increase of 9% for the next few years. This is because of the introduction of District Wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves. The submitter also asks what Whitecliffs residents receive for this rate increase.

The average increase for Whitecliffs residents is projected to be 9.2% for 2018/19 and 9.7% for 2019/20, with an average increase over the 10 years of 4.8% p.a. These increases are largely associated with the introduction of a district wide rating structure. The introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves reflects that Selwyn residents are increasingly using facilities right across the district - not just in their own neighbourhoods. Facilities like the Lincoln Event Centre and Southbridge Hall, and reserves at Weedons, Rhodes Park in Tai Tapu, and Whitecliffs are examples of local facilities that are frequently used by residents from other communities. Under the current system, however, these users are not necessarily funding the facilities.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Submitter requests additional funding to continue to provide paid secretarial services to the committee. Specific name of committee referred to not included in the information provided in submission to Officer

[100428] -Arthur's Pass Association Mr Sean Crawford

Address: Not provided Arthur's Pass Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: Sean.Crawford@fireandemergency.nz

Submission

Submission

Submission on behalf of the Arthurs Pass Association (APA)

Please accept our submission on the Selwyn District Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation Document. I realise this is late, but hope the contents can be considered along with other submissions.

Question 1 - introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves The APA feels its Community Centre has been served adequately with existing funding, both from targeted rates and other sources. The proposed district-wide rate is higher than the present targeted rate. With the distance from Arthurs Pass to most other community facilities precluding frequent use of these facilities, it would appear there is limited benefit to the Arthurs Pass community for moving to the district-wide rate. Consequently, the APA prefers to remain with the Targeted Rate.

Question 2 - proceed with extensions to Selwyn Aquatic Centre The APA agrees with the proposed funding of the Aquatic Centre via a Targeted Rate.

Question 3 – develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park The distance from Arthurs Pass to Rolleston precludes regular use of these facilities by most residents and limits the benefit to the Arthurs Pass community for funding via a district-wide rate. Consequently, the APA prefers option 3.

Question 4 – chlorination of water supplies Arthurs Pass enjoys a non-chlorinated water supply, with water treatment via a UV system. Residents have expressed a desire for the water to remain unchlorinated. Consequently, the APA strongly prefers option 3.

Question 5 – replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? Modest charges for maintaining water races to reflect general community benefit, such as the \$20 pa with 10% increase per year, are considered reasonable. Consequently, the APA supports proposed revised rating structure.

Question 6 – combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? The APA has no comment on this question.

Question 7 – develop new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton The APA has no comment on this question.

Question 8 – build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston The APA has insufficient information on office accommodation options to comment on this question.

Question 9 – direction of the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? The APA supports the direction of the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy, but looks forward to the opportunity for further input into the proposed programme.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supports SAC development and funding of it by targeted rate

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for sporting facilities through a Rolleston based funding model is acknowledged. The issue of distance from this facility is also acknowledged although a major regional facility of this nature has potential benefits across the whole of Selwyn for both community and sporting groups (similar to the Aquatics Centre).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission

[100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which

this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for

wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Staff Comments	The submitter is in support.
-----------------------	------------------------------

[100429] - Mr Neville Brown

Address: 5 Ashton Rise West Melton 7618

Postal Address: West melton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: neville.brown@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

The fairest way - should have been put in a place a long time ago.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

If the demand is there, go for it.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Idea support as this will benefit all of Selwyn. On that basis, it should be funded by option 1

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I have not seen enough evidence to support the need. I would strongly recommend a specific communication strategy on this issue.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Supported as proposed.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Supported.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

If this goes ahead, I would hope that the CEO is satisfied with the slimness of the current structure.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I would like Council to consider modifications to the Hoskyns / West Melton Road intersections for Wet Melton traffic.

The level of traffic on Hoskyns will increase once the Southern Motorway project is finished. The turn is currently unsafe. The corner of West Melton / Newtons Road also needs lighting.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission supports SAC development on basis of demand

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the proposed Indoor courts is acknowledged as is the support for a district funding model.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington

water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a

manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Horrorata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Intersection safety improvements are included in the 2022/23 Hoskyns Rd seal Widening Project, including Hoskyns/West Melton Rd intersection.

[100430] - Mr and Mrs Habberjam

Address: 20 St Johns Street Southbridge Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: Southbridge

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Health. Long term Taste Smell We have some of the best water in the world. Why muck around with it. Are there official stats on numbers who have become ill because of our water.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100431] - Abbi and Tom Morten

Address: 1155 Hoskyns Road Not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: abbihill@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Please accept this submission for FastForward28.

I would like the Council to put in a proposal for Hoskyns Road (north end) to be tar sealed. I feel that now with the growth of West Melton, Rolleston & Kirwee - it would be safer for drivers to have this road sealed.

In the summer, collecting the children off the school bus in a cloud of dust, makes visibility virtually nil. I worry about the safety of the school kids getting on/off the bus on this road, due to the increased traffic volumes and speed.

Also, with the recently increased stock truck traffic from and around the Reids farm (Gumshade, Painters Road), the road is subject to more wear and tear than ever before. Due to farms around us (on both ends of the unsealed part of Hoskyns Road), changing to dairy and dairy support, I can only expect more milk tankers and support vehicles causing damage to the road. Be it, delivering to Fonterra at Darfield, or Izone - Hoskyns Road is due for an increase in traffic, and heavy traffic at that.

It is my belief that it cannot stand up to this. Simply grading it DOES NOT help. It almost makes it more dangerous to drive on, and the pot holes are back within the week. A more sustainable solution is essential.

I wish you luck with FastForward28. Thank you for reading & considering our submission, may apologies for its late arrival.

Regards, Abbi (& Tom)Morten

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The request to seal Hoskyns Rd is not aligned with Council's programme to address specific strategic network "missing link" seal extensions on high volume main routes or connections to assist in the movement of people and freight. Hoskyns Road is a local road that doesn't fall into that category.

[100432] - Mr Brent Witbrook

Address: Whitecliffs Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: 136 Hartleys Road Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I would prefer NO chlorine in my water.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100433] - Mrs Jennifer Witbrook

Address: Whitecliffs Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: 136 Hartleys Road, Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I don't want chlorine in my water as it is terrible to drink. So no.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100434] -Darfield Medical Centre Dr. Abby Clement

Address: Darfield Darfield Darfield

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: abz.sanders@gmail.com

Submission

- LATE SUBMISSION -

Dear Mayor, councillors

Selwyn district Council

I am writing as a concerned local GP as well as a mother. I am aware of discussions under way considering drinking water treatment with chloride. Certainly this has been rolled out in CCC and I have been disappointed that CCC has not taken the opportunity to raise the possibility of fluoridating at the same time of this change. Please when you are having these discussions can you raise with community/councillors about considering water fluoridation.

Water fluoridation has robust evidence of reducing tooth decay from a population health approach. The biggest impact is on our most vulnerable young children. Often the arguments given against fluoridation are of an emotional and not evidence based level. Surely if we end up deciding to chloride treat, what is 1 more addition that will do nothing to the taste and improve the health of the community?

Thanks for your consideration. I would be happy to provide further information if needed.

Kind regards, Dr Abby Clement General Practitioner Darfield Medical Centre

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	<p>Consideration of the 'Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill'.</p> <p>Council takes into account the potential for the addition of fluoridation while designing and constructing new water treatment plants.</p> <p>No addition of fluoridation treatment is proposed in the LTP.</p>

[100435] -180 Degrees Trust Mr Jeremy Nurse

Address: 68 Orbell Street Christchurch 8146

Postal Address: PO Box 36-426 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jeremy@18odegrees.org.nz

Submission

- LATE SUBMISSION -

7. Proposed to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton

We support the proposal by Go Hororata for a new community centre on the Hororata Reserve. The 180 Degrees Trust has used the Hororata facilities Reserve for its programmes with vulnerable youth, and we have been regular helpers with setting up the Hororata Highland Games.

We believe a new community centre on the Hororata Reserve would be an extremely well utilized asset for the area.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100436] -Kirwee Recreation Reserve Management Committee Mr Raymond Williams

Address: Not provided not provided Kirwee

Postal Address: Kirwee

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 591 4847

Email: raymond.williams@ballance.co.nz

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments Kirwee Reserve Committee budget changes: Operating Projects: These are generally minor adjustments to timing and some extra budgets. A new budget for painting the changing rooms is to be funded from a special fund account. They have requested that internal painting of the pavilion is increased to \$25,000. This would require extra funding of \$12,000 which would need to come from rates (targeted or district). Capital Projects: These mainly involve rescheduling projects over the 10 years and tidying up budgets because of a number of factors (including carry forwards from 2017/18). There is no additional funding sought and staff agree with the changes proposed.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments Kirwee Reserve Committee budget changes:

Operating Projects: These are generally minor adjustments to timing and some extra budgets. A new budget for painting the changing rooms is to be funded from a special fund account. They have requested that internal painting of the pavilion is increased to \$25,000. This would require extra funding of \$12,000 which would need to come from rates (targeted or district).

Capital Projects: These mainly involve rescheduling projects over the 10 years and tidying up budgets because of a number of factors (including carry forwards from 2017/18). There is no additional funding sought and staff agree with the changes proposed.
