

**Hearings Panel**  
**Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options**  
**ATTACHMENTS - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS**

---

**Date:** Monday 12 October 2020  
**Time:** 9am  
**Venue:** The Gaiety Hall, Rue Jolie, Akaroa

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PAGE**

<b>5</b>	<b>Volumes of Submissions</b>	
C.	Schedule of Submitters.....	3
D.	Additional Submission - #34779 Brent Schulz .....	8
E.	Additional Submission - #34782 Ad Sintenie.....	10

---



## Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options Monday 12 October 2020

Time	Submission Number	Name/Organisation	Page Number
<b>9.00-10.00</b>	<b>Open Meeting and Council Officer Presentation</b>		
10.00	33729	Kathleen and Brian Reid	17
10.05	33775	Christine Shearer	24
10.10	34779	Brent Schultz	Attached to this document
10.15	33781	Sylvia McAslan	33
10.20	34066	Akaroa Civic Trust – Victoria Andrews	136
10.30	34076	Peter Squires	158
10.35	33937	Ian Le Page	80
10.40	34136	Marie Healy	319
10.45	34113	Kevin McSweeney	190
10.50	34139	Pam Richardson	324
10.55	34048	Ken Shearer	126
<b>11.00-11.15</b>	<b>Break</b>		
11.15	33898	Ken and Fiona Paulin	66
11.20	<i>Space</i>		
11.25	34104	Brent Martin	184
11.30	33840	John Petrie	42
11.35	33939 34063 34064	John, Carol, Emma and George Masefield	81 134 135
11.40	33782	Mark Wren	35
11.45	34081	Suky Thompson	163
11.50	33838	Donna and David Kingan – Kingan Transport Ltd	39
11.55	<i>Space</i>		
12.00	34050	Akaroa Ratepayers and Residents Association - Harry Stronach	127
12.10	34051	Harry Stronach – Personal Submission	133
12.15	34138	Peter, Fiona and Monica Buchan-Ng – Eyrie Trust Takamatua (teleconference)	321

Time	Submission Number	Name/Organisation	Page Number
<b>12.20-1.30</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>		
1.30	34103	Jan Cook	181
1.35	34132	David Brailsford	311
1.40	34008	Sue Thurston	102
1.45	34007	David Thurston	104
1.50	33732	Raymond and Susan Bruce	19
1.55	34150	Fishermans Bay Co. Ltd - Richard and Jill Simpson	335
2.00	33881	Trevor Bedford	59
2.05	33877	Gill Bedford	58
2.10	34043	Paul Chandler	120
2.15	34151	Tree Crop Farm Ltd - Alexander Lynne	337
2.20	33886	Georgiana Osborne	62
<b>2.25</b>	<b>Meeting adjourns to 12.30pm, Tuesday 13 October 2020, The Gaiety Hall, Akaroa</b>		

## Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options Tuesday 13 October 2020

Time	Submission Number	Name/Organisation	Page Number
<b>12.30</b>	<b>Open Meeting</b>		
12.35	33702	Tony Mason	16
12.40	34074	John Thomson	157
12.45	34095	Ivor McChesney	174
12.50	34039	Chris and Annette Moore	112
12.55	34016	Jeremy Moore	107
1.00	33865 33847 33863	Murray, Hanna and Will Johns – Johns Family	53 47 52
1.05	33932	Kevin and Averil Parthonnaud	72
1.10	34115	Friends of Banks Peninsula - Sue Church Also on behalf of the following submitters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craig Church - 33955</li> <li>• Shaun Huddleston - 33852</li> <li>• Karen Watson - 34110</li> <li>• Page Lawson and Stuart Jeffrey - 33920</li> <li>• Tessa Fenton - 34011</li> <li>• David and Nicola Shanks -33911</li> <li>• Tom Brennan - 34117</li> <li>• Doig Smith - 33933</li> <li>• Richard and Sue Lovett - 34086</li> <li>• Janna Robinson - 34111</li> </ul>	191 89 50 189 69 106 67 308 79 170 640
<b>2.10-2.30</b>	<b>Break</b>		
2.30	33882	Diane Carson	60
2.35	34045	Suzanne Church	121
2.40	33857	Fiona Turner	51
2.45	33652	Garth Tiffen	12
2.50	33521	Robin Tiffen	7
2.55	<i>Space</i>		
3.00	34283	Hollie Hollander	338
3.05	34782	Ad Sintenie	Attached to this document
<b>3.05</b>	<b>Meeting adjourned to 2pm, Friday 16 October 2020, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch</b>		

## Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options Friday 16 October 2020

Time	Submission Number	Name/Organisation	Page Number
2.00	33698	Mt Pleasant International Trust - Alex Eason	15
2.10	33744	Ross Blanks	22
2.15	34124	Murray Smith	309
2.20	33805	David and Wendy Fleming	37
2.25	33989	Robinson's Bay Ratepayers and Residents Association - Lee Robertson	97
2.30	34116	Brett Lea	306
2.40	34038	Bronwyn Hayward and Andrew Ashby	110
2.45	33869	Penny Carnaby	54
2.50	34031	Robinsons Bay Bach Trust - Brian Eves	109
2.55	33777	Brent George – Personal Submission	25
3.00	33892	Brent George – On behalf of Mary Browne	63
3.05	33902	Pavitt Family Trust - Brent George and Nancy Tichborne	504
3.10	34082	Grant Arthur and Elizabeth Lovell	169
3.15	34099	David and Julie-Ann Beattie	176
<b>3.20-3.40</b>	<b>Break</b>		
3.40	33919	Keefe Robinson-Gore	68
3.45	34080	Kevin Simcock - tbc (by audio visual link)	161
3.50	34134	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iaeon Cranwell - Wairewa Rūnanga</li> <li>• Debbie Tikao - Onuku Rūnanga</li> <li>• Rik Tainui - Onuku Rūnanga</li> <li>• David Painter - Technical Advisor</li> </ul>	312
<b>4.50</b>	<b>Meeting adjourned to 2pm, Wednesday 28 October 2020, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch</b>		

## Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options Submitters who no longer wish to be heard

Submission Number	Name/Organisation	Page Number
33632	Cataliotti Wines – Renan Cataliotti	11
33614	Robin McCarthy	10
34006	Akaroa Ltd – Rod Naish	100
33893	M V Osborne	65
33738	Lee Robinson - Personal Submission	20
33843	Stewart Sinclair	44
33933	Doig Smith	79
33963	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere – Jon Trewin	94
34041	Roz Rickerby and Simon Trotter	116
33957	Paddy Stronach	93

No: 34779	
<b>CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL</b> <b>Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options</b> <b><i>Submissions close on 23 August 2020</i></b>	
Full Name*:	Brent Schulz
Name and Your Role Within Organisation:	
Would you like to speak to the Hearings Panel about your submission:	Yes
Should we discharge highly treated wastewater from our new treatment plant to land or should we continue to discharge into Akaroa Harbour?	
If the Mayor and Councillors decide to develop a scheme where highly treated wastewater is used on land for irrigation, where would you prefer we irrigate? (Rank 1-3): - Inner Bays (Robinsons Bay, Hammond Point, Takamatua) - Goughs Bay - Pompeys Pillar	Inner Bays - Goughs Bay - Pompeys Pillar -
Would you support us irrigating public parks in Akaroa with highly treated wastewater?	
Would you like us to explore the feasibility of a purple pipe scheme for Akaroa, so that residential property owners could use the water for garden watering and other non-drinking purposes	
Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?  Akaroa Wastewater Submission  I strongly oppose the option of the inner harbour bay option The council choosing this option will have the following domino effects 1. Negative visual impact to the approach to Akaora beginning at Robinsons bay and Takamatua along highway 75 2. Potential offensive odour this system may produce. 3. Flies and midges that populate especially over the summer months 4. Effects of land values of all properties within the vicinity of the proposed project 5. The costs of all proposed projects have been constantly changing and in several meetings the council has been adamant that residents of Takamatua and Robinsons bay will not be charged in their rate demand for the sewer if they were on a septic tank. However that seems very misleading and very confusing after viewing the following emails  An email to Georgina on the 27th July is as follows  Here are the responses to your questions from the project team. 1. How will the cost of the wastewater upgrade be funded? Will those rate payers who currently have no wastewater / sewage charges on their rates demand also have to contribute?  Funding will be spread across all rate payers in Christchurch City who pay a wastewater rate. These are properties with a wastewater connection, or whose house is within 100 m of a wastewater network.  Then an article in the Akaroa mail dated 14th August bought my attention to the following  "Sir, I would like to correct a statement made by Council staff at the wastewater information session on August 2 that only City and peninsula properties that receive sewer service would be paying for a new wastewater scheme  My inquiries to Council financial management staff have revealed that the scheme will in fact be funded from borrowing and this cost will be met from the general rate charged to all properties - residential, commercial and rural.	



Full Name*:	Brent Schulz	No: 34779
<p>So the Council's wastewater disposal options are not only asking rural communities to accept Akaroa's waste but also help pay for this, as well as paying for their own septic systems.</p> <p>Jan "</p> <p>Subsiquently a further email from Georgina was sent to Tara King on the 14th of August quoting Jan statement and asking the council to confirm, the statement below was received on 20th August</p> <p>Running costs, or opex are funded through the sewer targeted rate, and paid by all qualifying ratepayers across the city, i.e. there is not a special Akaroa targeted rate. The repayment of borrowing is funded through the general rate, paid by all ratepayers across the city.</p> <p>I am still unsure what the word qualifying means and strongly advise the council to be more transparent as it seems you are hoodwinking the locals of Takamatua and Robinsons bay in believing that they will incur no fee at all.</p> <p>6. Choice of plants.</p> <p>There seems to be a lack of knowledge of the plants that are proposed for the varying soils types in the area. Over the many consultations there has been several species bandied about including the use of Manuka which has been proven to be susceptible to Mrytle rust... ( I strongly advise the council to investigate this developing problem and how widely spread it is to other native species) what happens when the plants die ? Will they be replaced? Has the council looked into the true cost of maintenance ... ie will weed eaters be used or spray to contain weeds which the locals will find offensive and if not kept under control the weeds will restrict the growth of the plants and the area will become a fire hazard.</p> <p>Tree roots will gravitate downhill with constant irrigation reducing the root growth uphill which will cause the tree to weaken and topple in high wind</p> <p>7. Cultural Sensitivity</p> <p>To move the treatment plant from Takapūneke because it is an offence to cultural and heritage values and then place it in the middle of communities and on another heritage site that will hugely impact the culture and heritage of other areas and residents seems unjust.</p> <p>In conclusion I would like the council to completely fix the infiltration of storm water into the waste water system in order to determine how much waste water will truly need disposing of. Watering to a horticultural crop like hemp or roses maybe grapes for an example would make better use of the water for commercial use</p> <p>I feel until the water is treated to a standard that is potable or drinkable or that it could be used for a high value horticultural crop like hemp or a tunnel house production the council have no choice but to put it out to sea.</p>		

No: 34782	
<b>CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL</b> <b>Akaroa Treated Wastewater Options</b> <b>Submissions close on 23 August 2020</b>	
Full Name*:	Ad Sintenie
Name and Your Role Within Organisation:	
Would you like to speak to the Hearings Panel about your submission:	Yes
Should we discharge highly treated wastewater from our new treatment plant to land or should we continue to discharge into Akaroa Harbour?	
To the harbour	
If the Mayor and Councillors decide to develop a scheme where highly treated wastewater is used on land for irrigation, where would you prefer we irrigate? (Rank 1-3): - Inner Bays (Robinsons Bay, Hammond Point, Takamatua) - Goughs Bay - Pompeys Pillar	Inner Bays - Goughs Bay - Pompeys Pillar -
Would you support us irrigating public parks in Akaroa with highly treated wastewater?	
Would you like us to explore the feasibility of a purple pipe scheme for Akaroa, so that residential property owners could use the water for garden watering and other non-drinking purposes	Yes
Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?  Fundamentally, what environment would you prefer Akaroa wastewater is discharged into?  <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigation of reclaimed water to trees or pasture for non-potable reuse and/or irrigation to land  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disposal via a new outfall pipeline to the mid-harbour  <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)  Please state your reasons why:  I fully endorse the submission made by the Friends of Banks Peninsula. "We do not support any of the proposed options, and instead would like to see an integrated approach to reduce, reuse and recycle the treated wastewater in Akaroa, where water is most needed. We ask Council to reject their current proposals and instead adopt this approach to build sustainability and future resilience to climate change in this community." The Friends of Banks Peninsula submission concludes with a suggested Reduce, Reuse, Recycle solution path that reflects the wishes of community, and would be affordable and consentable.  "Friends of Banks Peninsula does not support the harbour outfall option in its current form because there will still be residual disposal, and the continued use of a harbour outfall as proposed does not incorporate mitigation measures to meet Ngāi Tahu's cultural needs. However, it is otherwise a practical option and from an environment, economic and social perspective has the least impacts of the options proposed: It presents the lowest risk because it uses proven technology and is the simplest to operate. It provides the greatest degree of certainty and resilience as it is not inherently limited in the volume of water it can process, and is entirely gravity fed. It will require the least energy and has the lowest operating cost.  The disposal of the treated wastewater to the centre of the harbour would mean its rapid dispersal. The outfall would be much further away from the shore than the current one, negating impacts of nitrogen or nutrient build up. There is no need to acquire private land, no large treated wastewater storage ponds required, no risks from irrigation failure and no visual effects. The enhanced level of treatment minimises any environmental and health impacts.	

Full Name: (Cont'd)	Ad Sintenie	No: 34782
---------------------	-------------	-----------

Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?

The Harbour Outfall is the cheapest of the options both to construct and to operate. In terms of sustainability, while the outfall itself is a disposal option, the option directs the water through Akaroa where it is most needed, rather than constructing infrastructure elsewhere. The pipe would be run through the town, providing the core infrastructure for a purple pipe re-use system in Akaroa, and meaning this option can be easily expanded in future to include non-potable re-use. This is markedly different from the scheme for which consent was declined in 2015 and is now based on the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission to the 2017 consultation.

The first stage of purple pipe re-use can come on stream at the low extra cost of \$270,000 (as opposed to \$3.7 million for the land-based options). The addition of a purple pipe system means the water will be treated to higher standard than that proposed for the land-based options and provides reassurance that water will meet the consented standard. The water will receive additional UV treatment and an outflow buffer pond is included at the treatment site enabling it to be tested before it is released. If the Council decides to adopt a harbour outfall, we urge it to work with Ngāi Tahu to explore whether a constructed sub-surface wetland or some other form of land-contact could mitigate cultural concerns for the entire wastewater flow.

The long process of looking at alternatives has now suggested that there are ways to incorporate a treatment process that restores mauri prior to discharge to a water body. “

Please rate the options listed below with a numerical number according to your preference, with 1 being your most preferred option and 5 your least preferred option (please note the options below are in no particular order).

5 Option 1 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Robinsons Bay

4 Option 2 – Irrigation of trees or pasture at Pompeys Pillar

4 Option 3 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Takamātua Valley, in combination with another area

1 Option 4 – Non-potable re-use in Akaroa, in combination with another option

1 Option 5 – Disposal via a new outfall pipeline to the mid-harbour.

Choose an item. Other (please describe)

Please state your reasons for this ranking:

- High risks, high costs, impact on communities, cultural concerns.
- Social impacts: visual impact, wellbeing of community during this stressful time – 4 years of uncertainty already, close proximity of plantings/storage dam/pondsite 10 etc, odour and midge issue not adequately mitigated, sand flies among damp native plantings in warm weather, plantings close to personal boundaries (only a 5m set back from some properties), impacting rural water supply, sewage reticulation is not being provided to the receiving communities, scheme placed in populated communities, length of time for scheme to be fully operational (4 years for harbour outfall and 8 years for land based options), noise during the construction period, noise from pumps, large earthworks at Ponds site 10, threat of further land being purchased by CCC if required for scheme expansion, loss of access if dam breaks, flooding of property if dam breaks, effects on farming practices, concerns for stock, disruptions from pipeline being laid along the State Highway, biased public consultation document not expressing the risks and impacts on the community.
- Economic impacts: devaluation of peoples property, inability to sell due to the stigma surrounding the proposal and length of time involved for project completion, loss of income, Council not prepared to compensate, prime and expensive farm land being used for land based options instead of marginal land, misuse of public funds, budget blow out, landowners not all agreeing to sell, costing irregularities in latest figures, concerned about the cost of pumping over long distances to outer bays
  - o Cultural impact: effect on local heritage site

Full Name: (Cont'd)	Ad Sintenie	No: 34782
---------------------	-------------	-----------

Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?

- o Environmental impacts: land based options are unproven and experimental, planting on a known flood zone, plantings placed on top of heritage features, planting in extreme outer bays conditions where it is hard for bush to get established, watering native bush to does not require 40 years of heavy watering, planting will be shallow rooted due to heavy watering, environmental effect on land and streams and harbour mudflats from nutrient build up, build-up of heavy metals and pharmaceuticals and hormones with land based options, , I&I issue not addressed sufficiently, scheme grossly oversized due to I&I issue not being fully addressed, poor drainage, not climate change resilient, no margin of error built into the Inner Bays scheme, high rainfall area, plans to continue irrigating during rainfall periods of up to 50mm, effect on rural bores and springs.

Would you be more supportive of spray irrigation of treated wastewater to pasture or drip irrigation to trees? Please state your reasons why:

No view other than what is the best scientific option with the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.

Do you have a preference for the location of a reclaimed water storage pond(s)? Please state your reasons why:

Preferably Akaroa but where it has the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.

Do you think the Council should add aspirational projects to the Akaroa wastewater scheme (e.g. fire storage ponds, providing a reticulated wastewater scheme for Takamātua Valley)? If so, which ones do you support and why?

Without knowing what the final waste water scheme will look like, but yes, always strive for optimal use of treated water, esp as it is in short supply in Akaroa. Most waste water is produced in times when water is in greatest demand, so it is a No-brainer to use as much of it as possible. I support the purple pipe reuse system. In terms of sustainability, while the outfall itself is a disposal option, the option directs the water through Akaroa where it is most needed, rather than constructing infrastructure elsewhere. The pipe would be run through the town, providing the core infrastructure for a purple pipe re-use system in Akaroa, and meaning this option can be easily expanded in future to include non-potable re-use. The first stage of purple pipe re-use can come on stream at the low extra cost of \$270,000 (as opposed to \$3.7 million for the land based options). The addition of a purple pipe system means the water will be treated to higher standard than that proposed for the land based options and provides reassurance that water will meet the consented standard. The water will receive additional UV treatment and an outflow buffer pond is included at the treatment site enabling it to be tested before it is released.

Do you have any other comments? (Please use additional paper if required):

As a rate payer I am deeply concerned about the ever escalating costs and uncertainties of the land based options. Without the benefit of hindsight I believe the land-based options are fraught with risks and future limitations. There will be a huge burden on future ratepayers.

I would like to see the council take a more holistic approach to Akaroa's water supply and disposal problems and integrate this in all new and existing developments in and around the town. I am thinking about building consents and include measures to reduce water use ,such as collection of rain water, reuse of wash water for toilet flushing, promote composting toilets etc etc.

I am a relative newcomer to this area, but have been made welcome and feel at home thanks to kindness and openness of the people in this small town-rural community. Many people have lived in this community for a lifetime and even many generations. A caring community is a thriving community and that's what it is all about, esp in small towns and rural areas. Without that we have very little! I don't believe that exporting Akaroa's wastewater problems to neighbouring bays will be helpful to pull this community together. In fact it will divide, hurt and push people away from their homes and their lifetime dreams. It's bad for our community and it is not fair!