

Akaroa treated wastewater options – all submissions September 2020

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
1.	34336	Yes	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	No	<p>A purple pipe scheme No. The cost is likely to be excessive. That investment should be put into the land discharge system.</p> <p>Banks Peninsula, and Akaroa in particular, are not just jewels in Canterbury's crown, but are crucial hotspots of Hector's dolphin abundance. This species, the smallest of all dolphins, is considered an endangered species by the IUCN, and directly supports a significant tourist industry. Pre-COVID, that industry contributed in excess of \$24m annually to the NZ economy (Lee, 2019). Hector's dolphin faces a wide range of anthropogenic impacts, particularly from fishing activities (Gormley et al., 2012), but also from pollution (Jones et al., 1996; Stockin et al., 2010).</p> <p>As part of our study of the conservation biology of Hector's dolphin, I, along with Professor Liz Slooten and several of our graduate students, have conducted regular surveys of Hector's dolphins in Akaroa harbour and around the Peninsula, for over 36 years. On each of the many hundred times that we have motored past the current outfall at Green Point, when assaulted by the smell, we have wondered how it is possible to justify such an insult to the environment and to the toanga species that live within it.</p> <p>To service instruments logging dolphin habitat use, I have also completed almost 100 dives in Akaroa Harbour, including many in the vicinity of the discharge at Duvauchelles (Dawson et al., 2013). These discharges increase turbidity, add unwanted nutrients and biological oxygen demand where the harbour is least able to deal with it. As Councillors know, they occasionally render the waters unsafe for human swimming. Pathogens present in human effluent pose a significantly increased risk of disease to wildlife (Smith and Riddle 2009). More important even than that, are the degradations to water quality caused by detergents and cleaning chemicals that are not scrubbed from the effluent by treatment, and the estrogen mimics and other endocrine disruptors (EDCs) that are inescapably present in human effluent. These have been associated with a wide range of growth and reproductive problems in invertebrates and fish (Matthiessen et al 2018). We do know that some EDCs biomagnify - reaching much higher concentrations in predators than in their prey. Industrial EDCs have been associated with a range of reproductive disorders in marine mammals (e.g. Reinders et al 2018). EDCs are also present in domestic sewage, as active ingredients in pharmaceuticals, pesticides, personal care products additives.</p> <p>In their recent review Mathiessen et al (2018) conclude that chemicals currently in use do not pose the risk that "legacy" chemicals (such as DDT/DDE, PCBs, etc) did, and in some cases continue to do. They stress, however, that this statement does NOT apply to estrogenic effects in treated sewage. We simply do not know what effect these have on dolphins. We can be sure, however, that effects will not be positive. It is axiomatic that all reasonable steps should be taken to avoid discharge of treated sewage into vulnerable habitats.</p> <p>That we currently discharge treated effluent into Akaroa Harbour is unjustifiable. In my opinion this practice should not be continued, under any circumstances.</p> <p>References</p>	Steve Dawson	Professor; Trustee	University of Otago and NZ Whale and Dolphin Trust	Dunedin

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Dawson, S. M., Fletcher, D., &amp; Slooten, E. (2013). Habitat use and conservation of an Endangered dolphin. <i>Endangered Species Research</i>, 21(1), 45–54.</p> <p>Gormley, A., Slooten, E., Dawson, S., Barker, R. J., Rayment, W. J., DuFresne, S., &amp; Bräger, S. (2012). First evidence that marine protected areas can work for marine mammals. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i>, 49, 474–480.</p> <p>Jones, P. D., Leathem, S. V., Hannah, D.J., Day, P.J., Dye, E.A., Hoffman, K.A., Lister, A.R., Porter, L.J. van Maanen, T., Symons, R.K., van Helden, A., Buckland, S.J., Slooten, E., Dawson, S.M. and Donoghue, M. 1996. Biomagnification of PCBs and 2,3,7,8-substituted polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans in New Zealand's Hector's dolphin. <i>Organohalogen Compounds</i> 29: 108-113.</p> <p>Lee, K. 2019. Review of "Hector's Dolphin Eco-Tourism: Economic Impact Assessment" Report prepared for the Marine Species and Threats Team. Department of Conservation, Wellington. available at: <a href="https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/native-animals/marine-mammals/hectors-dolphin/review-of-economics-report-on-hectors-dolphin-tourism-2019.pdf">https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/native-animals/marine-mammals/hectors-dolphin/review-of-economics-report-on-hectors-dolphin-tourism-2019.pdf</a></p> <p>Matthiessen, P., Wheeler, J. R., &amp; Weltje, L. (2018). A review of the evidence for endocrine disrupting effects of current-use chemicals on wildlife populations. <i>Critical Reviews in Toxicology</i>, 48(3), 195–216.</p> <p>Reinders, P.J.H., Borrel, A., van Franeker, J.A. &amp; Aguilar, A. (2018). Pollution. In <i>Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals</i> (pp. 746-753). Academic Press, Elsevier.</p> <p>Smith, J. J., &amp; Riddle, M. J. (2009). Sewage Disposal and Wildlife Health in Antarctica. In K. R. Kerry &amp; M. Riddle (Eds.), <i>Health of Antarctic Wildlife: A Challenge for Science and Policy</i> (pp. 271–315). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.</p> <p>Stockin, K. A., Law, R. J., Roe, W., Meynier, L., Martinez, E., Duignan, P. J., et al. (2010). Marine Pollution Bulletin. <i>Marine Pollution Bulletin</i>, 60(6), 834–842.</p> <p>I will attach the Matthiessen et al paper. I think the councillors will find it useful. I suggest they search on the word "sewage" in order to avoid getting mired in effects of industrial chemicals.</p> <p>Nāku iti noa, nā, Steve</p>				
2.	34283	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>We endorse the submission made by the Friends of Banks Peninsula.</p> <p>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</p>	Hollie Hollander			Banks Peninsula

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>and future resilience to climate change in this community.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>“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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>5 Option 1 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Robinsons Bay</p> <p>4 Option 2 – Irrigation of trees or pasture at Pompeys Pillar</p> <p>4 Option 3 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Takamātua Valley, in combination with another area</p> <p>1 Option 4 – Non-potable re-use in Akaroa, in combination with another option</p> <p>1 Option 5 – Disposal via a new outfall pipeline to the mid-harbour.</p> <p>Choose an item. Other (please describe)</p> <p>Please state your reasons for this ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High risks, high costs, impact on communities, cultural concerns.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <p>o Cultural impact: effect on local heritage site</p> <p>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&amp;I issue not addressed sufficiently,</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>scheme grossly oversized due to I&amp;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.</p> <p>Would you be more supportive of spray irrigation of treated wastewater to pasture or drip irrigation to trees? Please state your reasons why:</p> <p>No view other than what is the best scientific option with the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.</p> <p>Do you have a preference for the location of a reclaimed water storage pond(s)? Please state your reasons why:</p> <p>Preferably Akaroa but where it has the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Without knowing what the final waste water scheme will look like, but yes, always strive for optimal use of treated water. 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.</p> <p>Do you have any other comments? (Please use additional paper if required):</p> <p>On the basis of the costs involved, it is clear that the land-based options presented are all significantly more expensive than the Harbour Outfall option. This represents a significant sunk cost toward directing water away from Akaroa rather than facilitating re-use.</p> <p>I have been a resident and part of this community here in Akaroa for 23 years. I believe that the land-based options will have a detrimental effect on the well-being of this tight knit community. We are particularly aware of residents in Robinsons Bay that have put their hearts and souls into their properties &amp; community and who are severely distraught by some of the current proposals. I find it unacceptable that Akaroa's infrastructure problems should be passed onto neighbouring bays and residents.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
3.	34282	No	To the harbour	1			Yes	No	Take our wastewater out through harbour mouth. Use the flexie pipe system used by the likes of San Francisco, Wellington etc.	Prunella Downes			Akaroa
4.	34173	No	To the land						Hi  We own holiday home at [REDACTED] Balquerie Akaroa We favour the disposal of waste water on land  Thanks Gavin Spence	Gavin Spence			Akaroa
5.	34172	No	To the land						Good morning Tara,  We would just like to express that our preference would be to use highly treated wastewater on land to irrigate new plantings of native trees.  Yours faithfully, Kevin & Christine Ward Wainui	Kevin and Christine Ward			Akaroa
6.	34171	No							Akaroa Wastewater Consultation  It is my opinion that the site chosen should negatively impact the least number of homes.  Also, it would be very disappointing to see pipes of any type lining our roads, through our fields or in any way negatively impacting our stunning big "backyards". Therefore, please budget for a vegetation corridor that the pipeline can run through to eliminate this issue.  Many thanks, Tricia Hewlett Otanerito	Tricia Hewlett			
7.	34170	No	To the land						Hi Tara,  I think it would be preferable to not pump into the harbour but I guess it comes down to price difference. Would be good to get some idea of the cost of each option.  Kind regards, John and Jenny.	John and Jenny Kirwan			
8.	34169	No	To the harbour						Dear Tara,  As a ratepayer and owner of a house in Akaroa I would like to think that there is only one sensible solution to the wastewater disposal in Akaroa. The discharge into the harbour is the only common sense solution. Any suggestion of irrigating land is ridiculous Cost would be horrendous, and I could see only problems arising with smell, flooding and of course value of properties nearby falling.  The treated water has been going into the harbour for 60 odd years and if it needs an extension on the pipes on the present system well let this be done.	Bruce and Rosemary Wales			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Surely this is one way of keeping the costs of services down in Akaroa.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Rosemary &amp; Bruce Wales</p>				
9.	34166	No	To the harbour				No	No	<p>There is nothing wrong discharge highly treated w water into the Harbour, as we have the opportunity to live near by, others can't.</p> <p>My name is Andreas Lageder, a sheep &amp; beef farmer, also 12.5 ha of Forestry, immigrated from Italy, living since over 32 years ██████████ in Robinsons Bay. I am a graduate Central Heating Engineer with Diploma, water Scientist, plumber and drain-layer. I worked before 26 years in that trade, was also employed to the Austrian Government and have installed 1 waste-water and 2 mineral water plants in North Italy in the late 1960's.</p> <p>I also have monitored and tested over 20 years, drinking water and from 3 swimming pools, (two of them where for patients (very sensitive) at the University Hospital of Innsbruck, Austria). I also worked on nuclear plants with radio-active substances and waste, I do know how such "waste-water-plant" should look like and what we here are taking about, to build a waste-water recycling plant for and "in" Akaroa.</p> <p>1. It is totally irresponsible and very primitive from Christchurch City Council to come up with such long overdue, retired system of filtering waste water with storing it in large ponds around in the nearby Valleys, while now much cheaper, smaller and Environment friendlier systems with no risk or interference to the public, are available.</p> <p>2. Do you actually know for what you are here for ...? it sounds not, because you act not like we are in a democracy, you are brainwashing us with all kind of unreasonable and inhuman option since 8 years, (also when our answer is NO since the beginning) "not listening to us, the public", this is not the way in a democracy, you are dictating us, "like no other option would exist, then to pump this human waster from Akaroa Residents, Akaroa Millionaires (who investing their money there), all Tourists, Visitors and thousands of Cruise Ship passgener, from all over the world, 7 km away, into our Valley. Our answer is NO since year 2011, but now you are already talking about a project, that is brain washing and Dictatorship!</p> <p>3. We Robinson Bay Residents had already about 30 meetings to defend our self, (some even donated money to pay for professional consultation), that you put other people septic into our properties, where else on this planet the neighbour must accept other peoples toilet and sewer on their property. "Only dogs shit on neighbours properties"!</p> <p>4. Not even our livestock would eat that smelly grass anymore, polluted from that storage ponds, I have evidenced that when the livestock refuse to drink that treated water, supplied by C.C.C. from the Duvauchelle water supply, they rather drink brown, high polluted water from the stream. I have to pipe my natural water to that place, that the livestock would drink it. Nobody would buy and eat this meat from our livestock, or vegetable, fruit (well know Walnuts &amp; Olives) grown here anymore, ... would you?!</p>	Andreas Lageder and Annabel Barino			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>5. We have selected you "the Christchurch City Council" and have put "you" in place to look after our infrastructure, where we pay very high Rates for, that we can live in, "so do it", (we in Robinson bay get nothing, from that Millions \$\$\$\$ made from Akaroa Cruise ships), but you want that we accept their toilet waste?! Such option "you suggest" is not acceptable, it is inhuman, your Engineers would do better to go home or disappear on an Island "now", not after they establish such plant, (as there is already Evidence that City Council Engineers and Bureaucrats, are hiding somewhere, after mistakes made, while in office). Educate yourself first or may ask a private company to do that job, because they would not take so many years for planning only, coming back with nothing after 8 years like you did, because you use us the public like a milking cow, rising the Rates, just how you feel.</p> <p>6. Did you actually ask that NZ Company who was advertising proudly in the Television on the Sunday Program a few weeks ago, "who is turning waste-water into drinking water", (drinking it in front of the camera), who already have sold such plants to over sea, or the Company "Algae Water Treatment NZ" who has distributed leaflets before the public meeting at Gaiety Hall in Akaroa? Have you considered filtering that waste-water to potable or clean water like Sydney, Melbourne (our neighbours) and New York do? "You haven't", because they may could show you how to do it, because you are stubborn and arrogant, you want to dictating us your way! Non come with such simple and primitive excuse, it would be too expensive, ... you haven't tried yet and you also non care much about our money either, how else could you have nothing on the table until now, but wasting Millions of \$\$\$\$\$.\$\$\$ - for nothing, 8 years in progress.</p> <p>7. Now, after 8 years in planning, you not even know how big that plant should be build, because only recently you started metering it, you have found out, "after pressure from the public", your metering was wrong and that 65% of that waste-water "you are talking about", actually is leaking into from storm water and broken sewer pipes and 20% ground water. Weak up and do something, for what you get paid for!</p> <p>8. The C.C.C. also has never consulted the public of Akaroa, which Chemicals (may nuclear waste from chemo therapy, households, commercial and others) are not allowed to put into the toilet, but want to dump that on our properties, we not even know which deadly, radio active, chemicals we get pumped into our Valley, onto our properties. C.C.C. is not even monitoring, metering and charging for water use in Akaroa, "which would make a big difference to the amount of waste water produced", if people have to pay for. You are at least 50 years behind from the developed world, as that are "third world Country" actions you want, we should accept. You can bring such waste water in an golden cup or pump it through silver and purple pipes, it is still the most horrible human toilet waste, you want to pump in our Valley, onto our properties on our door step, "where we have no control over, what is actually in there", you just call it simple, "Waste-Water"!</p> <p>9. You, the C.C.C. want to purchase and control the most beautiful and "only left, suitable, flat, beautiful building sits in and around Akaroa", to put a "Septic, Waste-Water plant - pump station" there. Which kind of advertisement for this Tourist town Akaroa, before they get into the town,</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>only total irresponsible, arrogant, poor educated Engineers and single minded, with a view not bigger than a Computer screen, bureaucrats can do that.</p> <p>10. "In Robinsons Bay are the most natural, clear, fresh water springs of Banks Peninsula", over 100.000 litre a day (30.000 litre on mine and over 45.000 litre on Ken Elliot's properties only) some (and one historic one over 160 years old) who deliver 3.000 litre a day on my property and over 5.000 litre a day on my neighbours (Kees Van Lujik) property, are even lower than that waste-water storage ponds are planned, who would get pollute if such storage ponds would go ahead.</p> <p>11. This City Council would destroy "intentionally" all our clean Water Resources for ever, would not care about future generations. Clean Water is the most value asset, "we need" in our life!</p> <p>12. Robinsons Bay will be called "the stinky Valley" if such storage ponds get installed, as it will smell "worse" than that W.W. Plant in Bromley - Christchurch, which is open to the sea and more windy. While we here in Robinsons Bay are like in a sack when Southerly or now wind and fog is hanging around, we can't breath, our laundry, our curtains, our carpets, our beddings, our clothes would smell from human toilet and chemicals, so everybody in Christchurch would know where we come from, if we go there shopping in Malls or waiting in a room.</p> <p>13. All our properties will be de-valued, nobody, also no City Council will compensate us for that. I am very concerned to get very little from my farm, if such waste water-pond would go ahead, as I am going to retire soon and my property inclusive 12.500 forestry trees and 30.000 litre water a day will be on the market, (but I will still live in Robinsons Bay). This is our most value assets in our life, the first settlers of Canterbury were living here in my house build year 1865, all the History from our places, the first Sawmill of Canterbury, (next to that pond) the first Post office of Canterbury and from our ancestors will be gone, nobody want to visit such smelly place anymore, because their clothes will be smelling from this septic-chemical ponds, when they get back home.</p> <p>14. Such ponds will attract also poisoning insects like mosquitoes and others, as that pond will be sometime only half or less empty and attract other vermin too. It will become a paradise for that Canadian Geese, "who are a pest here", eating all the pasture and poisoning the grass with their dropping, nearby Residences would no longer sleep at night, because of those noise animals. I know it, because I hear them still from the beach by closed window, which is 250 m away.</p> <p>15. We human have no control over natural disasters, Earthquake, Earth slips, heavy rains, or frozen pond. In which dangerous Environment you want to put us, ..are you the Evil, do you want to kill us?!</p> <p>16. Your plans and intention of dumping human and other waste in Robinsons Bay is over! It will never happen as long we still call New Zealand democratic. I and my neighbours will boycott and block "with our most heavy machineries like diggers, bull dozer and tractors" the access to our Valley, if</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									the C.C.C. or their Sub-Contractor want to enter. ENOUGH is ENOUGH, we have a Democracy in New Zealand and the Robinsons Bay Residents want "no" waste Water from others in our Valley, Amen.				
10.	34163	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Yes - definitely a pipe out to sea of high quality treated sewage! It's the only fesible option. The surrounding hills and Children's Bay not suitable. Hills because of high levels of water 'running off' during a down pour.  The bays near peoples properties as it is grosely unfair to the residents nearby. I am sure it will affect the resale value of their properties.	J Cook			Akaroa
11.	34152	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Question 1 - To the harbour - more highly treated than at present My son lives in Qatar Middle East. He has fond memories of Children's Bay (both sections) and has floundered there, exercised dog there, and gone on kayaks and paddle boards. He hates the yachts releasing poo into the harbour & the idea of an outpipe which always causes bacterial problems a horrible option Harbour outfall - more investment in science of treating water. Invest in broken pipes in meantime	Sebastian Sligting			Doha Qates
12.	34151	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Question 1 - To the habour - the world of science moves fast  Question 2 - Water priority is one of the biggest issues on the planet  Question 3 - Yes - definitely great idea  Question 4 - Yes - great idea  The people of Akaroa on the whole say no to land, Yes to harbour but need more science & each cleaner result.  Christchurch city is short of money.  Ngai Tahu want better water quality into harbour outfall.  Delay for now. Fix broken pipes and wait for science & international entrepreneurs to bring treatment of water systems that render land based wetlands OBSOLETE.  Invest extra millions to make harbour pipe longer and only released into outgoing tide.	Alexander Lynne		Tree Crop Farm	Akaroa
13.	34150	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Section 5. Other considerations  We strongly object to land based application of treated wastewater on Pompeys Pillar.  We are the neighbouring property and ours is the closest dwelling to the proposed site.  We have spent considerable time and money working to create a sustainable farming system and have huge concern for the natural values on the land. Pompeys Pillar is in the heart of the area known as The Wildside which is an area where landowners value the natural character of the landscape and the	Richard & Jill Simpson	Director	Fishermans Bay Co. Ltd	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>ecology this encompasses. The Wildside has been nationally recognised for its community driven conservation initiatives and in August 2020 was chosen to be one of the core areas for the Predator Free 2050 project on Banks Peninsula. We believe that if the Pompeys Pillar land based option was chosen it would alter these values not only on the immediate affected area but on any area that was later deemed necessary.</p> <p>In the CCC District Plan Pompeys Pillar and the surrounding area of clear ridges and rolling hills clear of trees and buildings in designated an area of Outstanding Natural Landscape. To be able to change this irrevocably by building ponds and planting trees is almost impossible because of this zoning. It is also undesirable from an amenity point of view as it would destroy the very nature of the landscape. Planting trees on this landscape and expecting them to grow let alone flourish is also fraught as the exposed areas of Pompeys Pillar are windswept. From experience we know that trees would take decades to establish and get the benefit of the edge effect.</p> <p>The infrastructure required and the disruption and potential damage to our natural environment would be huge by laying pipes and creating ponds. The possibility of silt entering our streams is totally abhorrent to us as these are known habitats for many species of rare native fish. Likewise our coastline is one of the last remaining areas in the South Island where Yellow Eyed Penguins are nesting and is also nationally recognised for the habitat available for Whit Flipped Blue Penguins.</p> <p>The fact that the current landowners of Pompeys Pillar are not willing to sell their land for wastewater disposal should also be a major consideration. The Johns Family and their forbears have farmed this land for many generations and if they were to lose this land there would be a likelihood that their farm would not be a viable size.</p> <p>Lastly we have a tourist operation where the amenity value of our landscape is intrinsic to the experience we deliver. We expect that the building of ponds, planting of trees and likely smell would have negative effect on the visitor experience we offer.</p>				
14.	34149	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>a. CCC figures show a great deal of non-house waste water enters the Akaroa system - a good deal even from stormwater. This extra should be diverted so the plant does not need to treat such water. All affected households can be informed and required to remedy the situation.</p> <p>b. Greater effort is needed to conserve, reduce and reuse a vital resource.</p> <p>c. Many examples of advanced technological ways of dealing with waste water exist in NZ and across the globe. Have CCC staff investigated some of these to fit into the Akaroa system?</p>	Alan Turnbull			Akaroa
15.	34148	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	<p>Question 2 - (Inner Bays) - not ideal either</p> <p>Question 2 - (Goughs Bay) - not supported at all</p> <p>Question 2 - (Pompeys Pillar) - not supported at all</p> <p>Question 4 - Yes - definitely should be utilised and available for domestic use</p>	Wendy Risdon	Clinical Nurse Lead	Akaroa Health Hub	Duvuachelle

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>e.g. boot/car wash</p> <p>I/we are most opposed to the pipelines to the Eastern Bays. The proposed native trees will not grow in these exposed areas.</p> <p>You only have to look at what grows there currently. (No shelter from strong cold sea gales). The artist impressions are simply that!</p> <p>Highly treated wastewater using modern technology like ultra violet light, algae water treatment, etc. are all able to make the water safe to discharge into the harbour.</p> <p>Maybe lengthen the pipeline. Greymouth &amp; Waikawa have systems to safely discharge into the sea.</p>				
16.	34147	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Do not approve of any Bays irrigation or holding ponds	Grant Robertson			Akaroa
17.	34146	No	To the land	1			No	Yes		Paul Broady			Christchurch
18.	34145	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>The CCC has struggled for the past 4-5 yrs to find a solution to this disposal problem.</p> <p>There is no obvious support for any of the proposals which suggests caution moving with any of the options.</p> <p>However, Govt is proposing a nationwide reform of Three Waters service delivery arrangements with the setting up of 5 water authorities. The CCC would no longer have the responsibility.</p> <p>The CCC needs to be part of the Govt 3 Waters Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p>It would be folly to go it alone on such an expensive scheme where the future may present better technical solutions.</p>	Barry Hopping			Christchurch
19.	34143	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>We are presenting this submission after attending several meetings with Council officers and have become stressed and worried, particularly concerning the proposed systems involving Takamatua and Robinsons Valley. We have chosen to live and enjoy our lifestyles in these areas and it seems we now have to deal with Akaroa's wastewater problems and help to pay for it with our rates.</p> <p>If the water is treated as well as we are told then a pipeline to the heads of the harbour must be considered as the most sensible option. Otherwise more study of systems being used in other countries where wastewater after treatment is good enough to recycle, which surely is what is needed in Akaroa.</p> <p>Trickle irrigation systems near peoples homes can cause health problems but Council people easily dismiss any such problems. We are told at meetings with Council that wastewater ponds would be beautified with trees and shrubs etc. but die-off is known, particularly with trickle irrigation. Walking tracks have been mentioned for these tracks, supposedly an attraction for holiday makers!! Akaroa's tourist industry with such plans as they are now, when they have come to this area to appreciate our areas beautiful and natural environment not wastewater ponds.</p>	Murray & Joyce Walker			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Also the problem of moving Duvauchelle showgrounds to Takamatua raises many more problems. The main road in the Takamatua area, where the road dips, is well known for speeding and having accidents. Other entrances to the show grounds would require considerable road work involving more expense to Council.</p> <p>It is to be hoped our submission will be given fair consideration, and the stress these wastewater plans have caused. Perhaps it would help if the Council people who talk at the public meetings would come and speak personally to the people most concerned.</p>				
20.	34142	No	To the harbour		1	2	No	No	<p>What about putting Takamatua on a sewage system if the Inner Bays option is chosen.</p> <p>After all Akaroa takes our water and wants to give sewage water back. Good deal (NOT)</p>	Anthony Waltenberg			Akaroa
21.	34141	No	To the harbour			1	Yes	No	<p>Native plants &amp; trees do not require irrigation for growth.</p> <p>Impact on historical properties in Robinsons Bay.</p> <p>Any Inner Bays scheme would devalue properties.</p> <p>Earthquake damage could flood Robinsons Bay.</p> <p>Infiltration of wastewater into existing spring water.</p> <p>Fix stormwater pipes in Akaroa to stop it getting into wastewater.</p>	Fran Anderson			Robinsons Bay
22.	34139	Yes							<p>1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Akaroa treated waste water options.</p> <p>2. My name is Pam Richardson</p> <p>3. I own and operate [REDACTED] a sheep and beef coastal hill country property in Pigeon Bay , in partnership with my husband Ian and son Andrew.</p> <p>4. I am passionate about the community and what can be achieved by working together and have had a long involvement in community activities.</p> <p>5. I have received a number of awards including two Environment Canterbury Outstanding Contribution Awards 2000 and 2019 and 2010 received the honour - a Member New Zealand Order of Merit for Services to the Rural Community and Conservation.</p> <p>6. As a Past President of North Canterbury Federated Farmers 2000 -2004 and a member of Federated Farmers I have had considerable opportunities and experience of working with communities to find solutions preparing and making decisions for a wide range of activities.</p> <p>7. 2007 - 2013 I was an elected member of the Akaroa Wairewa Community Board member and Chairman of the Banks Peninsula Community Board 2013-2019.</p>	Pam Richardson			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>8. I am very aware of the Local Government Act and the Resource Management Act 1991 and I have been actively involved in a considerable number of District and Regional council processes including engagement processes and submissions to a vast range of issues.</p> <p>9. I have completed two Resource Management courses –a Christchurch City Council introduction to the RMA and gained accreditation under the RMA: Making Good Decisions 2008 A Training Assessment and Certification Programme for Resource Management Act Decision-Makers. I have not continued my accreditation of recent years.</p> <p>10. In 2011 following a selection process I was appointed to the Banks Peninsula Water Zone Committee a joint committee of the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury. The Water Zone Committee is one of 11 Water Zone committees implemented as part of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. The Zone Committee worked very closely with all the Rununga of Banks Peninsula and we had a representative from Te Rununga Onuku working with us at every meeting.</p> <p>11. Water is central to Ngai Tahu life culture and identity and in the introductory training we received to the Water Zone Committee this was identified very strongly.</p> <p>12. The Banks Peninsula / Te Pataka Rakaihautu Zone Implementation Programme was developed after collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders and members of the community. One of the priority outcomes is that – ‘wastewater not to be discharged to the harbour but reclaimed to land. Waste water is treated to high quality and promoted as innovative water and irrigation source for Banks Peninsula’.</p> <p>13. I am also aware of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 [IMP] and guidance provided in this document. This is a planning document ‘mandated by 6 Papatipu Rununga of Nga Pakikihi Whakatekaeka o Waitaha and Te Patakaka o Rakaihautu [Rapaki, Onuku, Koukourarata Wairewa Taumutu and Tuahiwi] and is endorsed by Te Rununga o Ngaitahu as the iwi authority.’</p> <p>14. The IMP ‘ is essential to achieving kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga of the natural environment. The intent of mana whenua planning is important to realize Papatipu Rununga objectives with regard to protection of taonga, wahi tapu, kaitiakitanga and cultural well – being’.</p> <p>15. The IMP provides clear direction on issues and cultural values important to tangata whenua, following kaupapa,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To achieve true partnership with local government based on shared values and Te Tiriti o Waitangi including co governance.</li> <li>• Real involvement in decision making.</li> <li>• Decision making reflects Ngai Tahu values</li> </ul> <p>15. The Christchurch City Council in their Strategic Framework one of the principles identified is ‘building on the relationship with Te Rununga o Ngai Tahu and the Te Hononga - Council Papatipu Rununga partnership,</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>reflecting mutual understanding and respect. This committee meets on a regular basis to share and discuss issues.</p> <p>16. I was appointed the Christchurch City Council Representative on the Board of Waitaha Health formally known as the Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organization - an organization focusing on Rural Health.</p> <p>17. Importantly Treaty training was provided highlighting and ensuring that as Board Members we understood the issues impacting the health and well-being of their whanau - an understanding of the history and impact of colonization, understanding the Te Titiriti o Waitangi v's the Treaty of Waitangi and to understand how the loss of land has impacted on the wellbeing of whanau, hapu and iwi.</p> <p>18. Onuku Rununga hold the mana over their takiwa which covers the Akaroa Harbor surrounding coastal environment and hills and this was defined by the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.</p> <p>19. Onuku also have the responsibility as kaitiaki over these lands and are active in the environmental management of their takiwa.</p> <p>20. Kaitiakitanga is considered an inherent responsibility that comes from whakapapa and as I understand is the act of safe guarding the mauri [life force] of the environment and ensuring the takiwa is passed on to future generations in a state that is good or even better than the current state.</p> <p>21. Takapuneke is a wahi tapu site registered with the Historic Places Trust adjoining the present Akaroa Waste Water Treatment Plant and the reason for relocation of the old plant.</p> <p>22. Takapuneke is especially significant in the activities that took place on this site .The Takapuneke Conservation Report December 2012 adopted by the Christchurch City Council details the activities that occurred on Takapuneke and provides guidance to safeguard the cultural and heritage values of the site.</p> <p>23. The purpose of the Conservation report was also to assist with decisions in relation to the Takapuneke Historic Reserve and guide the development of the Reserve .The Reserve Management Plan adopted by the Christchurch City Council June 2018 is a high level document and allows a number of other plans to be developed – landscape and planting plans etc. and includes implementation and construction.</p> <p>24. The Takapuneke Reserve Co Governance Group is a working group between the Christchurch City Council and Onuku Rununga and is developing guidelines to manage Takapuneke the Historic site.</p> <p>25. I have been one of three council representatives on the Co Governance Group until October 2019 and under the Terms of Reference invited to continue as a Co Governance Supporter. Working alongside Onuku has provided opportunities to understand the significance of the site, Akaroa Harbour and the importance of the waters of Akaroa harbour.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>26. As chairman of the Banks Peninsula Community Board following a deputation from the Robinsons Bay Community, the Banks Peninsula Community Board recommended that a Akaroa Waste Water Working Party be formed.</p> <p>27. I have been a member of the Waste Working Group attending almost all the meetings. I have continued my involvement following the 2019 Local Government elections and appointed as a Community Member.</p> <p>28. Working to find solutions and coming up with feasible options for the Akaroa waste water outfall has been extraordinarily difficult.</p> <p>29. I believe that the Joint Statement of the Akaroa Waste Water Treated Reuse Working Group and the three options fairly reflected the outcome of the Working Group. The communities concerns from the three land based options are attached as an appendix to the document.</p> <p>30. The Robinsons Bay and Takamatua Communities had representatives with a range of incredible skills and qualifications. They brought considerable expert knowledge to the table and sought information well beyond what the council would normally provide for a consultation process and I believe this has contributed to the high cost of the working party.</p> <p>31. The Akaroa Community had a number of changing members during the time and there appeared to be very little interest/involvement from the wider Akaroa Community in the early stage of the development of the options.</p> <p>32. Managed Aquifer Recharge was brought to the table by Akaroa residents for further investigation but was rejected by the CCC Three Waters Team Leader because of the risk to the community water supply. There was considerable disappointment that this option was not pursued.</p> <p>33. The Consultation 26th – 2nd May 2016 Akaroa Treated Wastewater Disposal Options document outlines that a desk top study was undertaken to identify possible areas for land treatment and two of the criteria - not too far from treatment plant on Old Coach Road a two kilometer radius relatively flat and less than 15 degree slope. Land disposal options were considered in Robinsons Bay and Takamatua.</p> <p>34. Other options were also considered – pumping or tankering waste water to the Christchurch Waste Water Treatment Plant, over land flow or the use of a Rakahore chamber [typically a concrete chamber with rocks embedded in it which allows the waste water to come in contact with the land] before discharging to the harbour.</p> <p>35. The reuse of non-potable water [such as for flushing of toilets and watering of gardens] stated that it would require new pipe network and would increase the costs and was not included in that round of consultation.</p> <p>36. This consultation round was not completed largely as a result of some equipment failure.</p> <p>37. The Akaroa Waste Water Christchurch City Council website provides in</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>depth reporting of the Working Party. The presentations given at each meeting , emails from affected communities - Robinsons Bay /Takamatua Community ,Goughs Bay and Pompey's Pillar, new ideas MAR deep well injection Hinewai concept etc. are all included and provide a substantial record .</p> <p>38. The present sewerage scheme is not fit for purpose. The old infrastructure is compromised where infiltrations occur and there is difficulty managing variable flows. The present infrastructure repairs need to be completed to ensure that infiltration is manageable. Individual property owners also need to be complaint.</p> <p>39. The Akaroa Harbour Small Settlement Study recognized that a number of issues could be addressed by amending the District Plan to limit the ability for the peak population to grow. Perhaps it is time to seriously look at and plan for the future. By laws may need to be reviewed to look at more installation of water saving devices etc. - the Akaroa community needs to take up the challenge and become part of the solution.</p> <p>40. Akaroa Township is on water restrictions every year and at a recent presentation re Climate Risk Assessment at the Banks Peninsula Water Zone meeting July 2020 Marion Schoenfeld Christchurch City Council covered how climate change would look for the Christchurch district. The presentation showed projections on seasonal precipitation changes and numbers of hot days and included wind speed evaporation and fire risk. Marion also outlined some of the likely issues for humans and the natural environment.</p> <p>41. Akaroa will continue to have challenges as result of climate change and now is the time and opportunity to design a system that includes dealing with the impacts of climate change – flooding, sea level rise, fire and includes adaptive management.</p> <p>42. The Christchurch City Council should continue to work with Onuku to find a workable solution. It is vital also that our relationship, including our local communities need to be respectful and understand the spiritual and cultural significance of Akaroa Harbour and the catchment, take in to account the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi working in partnership and protection of Mana Motuhake acknowledging mana whenua beliefs to Kaitiaki.</p> <p>43. The Christchurch City Council needs to have a sound working relationship with our Akaroa Harbour and outer Bays communities. The communities involved in the Working Group discussions have clearly identified that there are considerable impacts and any resolution is going to be appealed. Any compulsory purchase is not an acceptable outcome.</p> <p>44. The Christchurch City Council should be designing an option using the ultra-filtrated water in the Akaroa township and reducing the amount of storage required out of the town boundary into other catchments.</p> <p>45. The proposal to pump treated waste water through a high-pressure pipe line up and over the hills east of Akaroa to an elevation of 677 metres surely cannot be an appropriate option.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>46. The Old Coach Road treatment plant site and the Council owned land adjoining the site should be re-evaluated to look at ways of processing the outflow /storing on that site and including wider use of wetlands.</p> <p>47. The costs should be considered with the present estimates continuing to climb as each year passes. The figures presented are not acceptable - the overall cost has to be realistic and affordable. Additional funding will need to be allocated in the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>48. There are other waste water solutions required in the Akaroa Harbour area. A new Duvauchelle waste water outfall consent and the proposed waste water system for Wainui need to be resolved. These propositions are also looking very costly. It is time to stop and have a rethink on a way forward.</p> <p>49. The Christchurch City Council needs to reflect on its own Strategies e.g. Climate Change and Risk Assessment, Te Wai Ora o Tāne Integrated Water Strategy and include in any proposed development. We need to ensure that our infrastructure is appropriate to sustain the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>50. Maybe it is time to take a fresh look at moving forward and seeking advice / new science/ funding options and working with the newly recently announced Government Three Waters Reform Programme.</p>				
23.	34138	No							<p>The Buchan Family have been part of the Takamatua community since the mid to late 1950s. Many changes to Banks Peninsula have occurred in that time, and it is the trustees of The Eyrie Trust wish to ensure that all changes have a positive impact on the environment.</p> <p>We would like to speak to the hearings panel about our submission.</p> <p>Preferences:</p> <p>None of the options provided are in the best interest of the Banks Peninsula community in the long run.</p> <p>1. Purple pipe scheme:</p> <p>a. We don't believe that Akaroa waste water should be piped out to other communities no matter how well treated it is.</p> <p>b. It is wrong to take fresh water from Takamatua and then pipe it back as wastewater.</p> <p>c. There are plenty of gardens, parks, public toilets etc within Akaroa where it can be put to good use.</p> <p>d. As Akaroa continues to grow the purple pipe system would only grow with it.</p> <p>e. It can be used within the Akaroa community to help establish more areas of native New Zealand bush.</p>	Peter, Fiona & Monica Buchan-Ng	Trustees	Eyrie Trust, Takamatua	

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
-----	--------	--------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	----------------	------------------------------------	----------------	---	------	------	--------------	-------------

									<p>f. Repair the existing system and fix the storm water leaks</p> <p>g. With climate change there will be increased periods of drought and storms.</p> <p>h. Cost should not be an issue here. The sooner it is done the cheaper it will be.</p> <p>2. To land:</p> <p>a. Prone to slipping: Banks Peninsula is well known for its slips and erosion.</p> <p>b. Visual impact: It may not seem much, however, I have seen the visual impact the wastewater system (discharge to land via ponds and irrigation pipes) has visually when taking a balloon flight in the US. It was so ugly and quite a big scar. The smell was quite significant even from above. If the Inner Bays are chosen the ponds will disturb the natural landscape.</p> <p>c. Smell: This will always be a problem. Many people chose to reside in Takamatua away from Akaroa. Suddenly the growth of Akaroa is affecting the quality of life and community in Takamatua. In certain winds that smell will be noticeable right through the whole community.</p> <p>d. Increase in Mosquitos: when Kingfisher Point was developed in Takamatua there was a noticeable increase in mosquitos. The community have worked hard to keep them down. With the inevitable increase in mosquitos from the ponds will come the increasing use of insecticides which will end up in the Bay.</p> <p>e. Birds: These are likely to settle around the ponds. The increase in birds there is a likelihood of an increase in ecoli in to the environment. This inevitably makes it way in to the Bay and affects mahinga kai.</p> <p>f. Pests: These are likely to increase as well. These would have to be well managed by traps etc forever.</p> <p>g. Impact of bush fires: It takes years for bush to regrow. What will happen to the wastewater when there are no plants to take up the moisture. The irrigation lines will be destroyed as well. That won't be cheap to fix.</p> <p>h. Leakage in to streams and waterways from the proposed ponds: We live in an earthquake prone part of the world, and the land is not all that stable. It is just a matter of time before there is a failure in the ponds and pipes.</p> <p>i. Maintenance: This will be ongoing forever. Does the Council have the funds to be able to maintain the system? I would doubt it. I would imagine that at some stage the Council is going to see maintenance as being of low priority and therefore no maintenance will be done.</p> <p>j. Ability for the system to grow as more areas are developed.</p> <p>k. Storm water and the wet seasons: These will increase in strength and intensity because of global climate change. We don't believe that the</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>proposed land will sustain both wastewater and natural storm water during a wet year. The clay soil will not be able to hold the moisture.</p> <p>I. Plantings: There is a high possibility that proposed plantings will not survive in areas that are very exposed. Also, it will take many years before the native trees (locally sourced only) will be large enough to soak up the treated water.</p> <p>3. To the harbour:</p> <p>a. We do not support this option.</p> <p>b. There is too much risk of a negative effect on mahinga kai</p> <p>c. Worldwide too many communities are dumping waste in the oceans.</p> <p>Other Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having mediated/facilitated a number of environmental RMA breaches I am aware that each small change to the environment contributes significantly to the steady decline of our right to a peaceful, quiet, safe environment. Each change always has some negative impact on our natural environment. This is no different. It will have a negative impact in some way shape or form.</li> <li>• Akaroa waste has been a problem for many years. Piping it to other communities shows a lack of respect and is offensive, especially to those outside of Akaroa who have developed their own ways of treating waste water on site and not at the expense of others.</li> <li>• Its hard to see how this will turn out especially as the Council do not, as yet, own the land.</li> <li>• Creating public access for walking/biking. Banks Peninsula could do more biking tracks that are off the road and are safe.</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We prefer the re-use of water which has been recycled through treatment to a potable standard that can be used by the whole Akaroa community.</p>				
24.	34137	No							<p>This document presents the concerns and opinions of the undersigned local community on the Wildside and in particular those in Goughs and Hickory Bays who will be affected by the proposal to create a wastewater disposal system on the adjacent headland.</p> <p>The Wildside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed area is part of the Wildside, which extends over the group of bays to the east of the crater rim on Banks Peninsula. The Wildside is an area of nationally recognised biodiversity values, and has few introduced flora species, relatively few weeds, and high rates of endemism. Much of the Wildside is in areas of Outstanding Natural Landscape,</li> </ul> <p>Ecological Significance and protected in reserves or covenants in perpetuity.</p>	Marie Haley & Asif Hussain	Member of Community	Local Community on the Wildside	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wildside is a community project that does not belong to any one agency or group. It is a collaboration over more than thirty years of passionate hard-working landowners and contributing government agencies and groups. It has been nationally recognised due to its unique community driven aspect, and that individually landowners have made costly and long-term investments into conservation outcomes on their own land.</li> <li>• This speaks volumes for the rugged, remote, ingenious and very unique community that may not see each other for years at a time but each contribute to a better and more beautiful environment. The significance of the Wildside should not be taken lightly.</li> </ul> <p>Tree Planting Proposal – Goughs Headland</p> <p>The proposal to plant a native forest on 33 Ha at the location identified on the planning map raises a number of concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wildside is predisposed to natural regeneration with a range of protected natural areas in the immediate vicinity providing rich seed source. The exemplar of this is Hinewai Reserve, which is internationally renowned for its hands-off natural regeneration, this is possible particularly on the Wildside due to the high rainfall, high native seed bank, low weed species and in some areas by using nitrogen fixing gorse as a nursery crop.</li> <li>• Natural regeneration from natural seed source is preferable ecologically to planted forest for a number of reasons, these are quite practical issues: the cost, the sourcing of enough seed source from the ecological area, the use of weed and pest guards, and getting the right plant mix to grow in the particular environment. To be successful, planting native forest is a high input job that needs regular visits to ensure weeds are controlled, plant guards are not damaged or blown away in storms, and that pests are under control.</li> <li>• Thus, planting on either the Goughs/Hickory or Pompeys Pillar headlands would be an intensive undertaking, with regular site visits to maintain the plants. The high wind environment would be a risk for wind guards blowing out to sea to simply become a marine pollutant.</li> <li>• Plant growth would be severely reduced on the Goughs or Pompeys headlands due to the harsh environment, with frequent cold winds accompanied by hail, sleet and snow at times. Plant growth will be considerably stunted compared to expectations based on the plant trials that have been carried out in Pipers Valley, and the speed of plant growth and water uptake needs to be studied in this particular environment before any sound conclusions can be drawn.</li> <li>• The suitability of this site for wastewater disposal will be especially influenced by the high rainfall that occurs on the Goughs headland. The plants will be in an already moist environment with regular high rainfall events and cannot be expected to be able to absorb or hold as much wastewater as would be possible on a more favourable site.</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New trials would need to be undertaken over many years to ensure that the plantings could withstand this environment, take up the wastewater at an appropriate rate, and that the appropriate planting area has been set aside.</li> <li>• The Goughs site is exposed to all wind directions with the North-East wind being especially frequent and harsh. Pompeys is also exposed to most winds and with especial exposure to the Southerly winds. There are almost no days without wind on either site.</li> <li>• Adjacent landowners have planted native shelterbelts that have not grown well due to the extreme weather conditions on these exposed headlands, as is evident in many places along the Wildside coast, the native forest in the area is stunted and twisted due to the persistent wind.</li> <li>• Rainfall is highly changeable across the Wildside with flood events being experienced that are not forecast. It is not at all uncommon to have 100mm rainfall events happening within a few hours at higher altitudes. The Wildside is also much cloudier than the inner harbour, with sea fogs and easterly drizzle that can cause long term dampness underfoot and reduce the growing conditions and wastewater uptake capability of plants in this environment.</li> <li>• There would be almost no recreational advantage of a planted forest in an inaccessible place such as Goughs headland because almost nobody would visit, especially when they can visit a natural and inspiring place such as Hinewai.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure Concerns - Roading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only current access to the proposed Goughs site is a grass track, and an adequate access road would have to be formed. This proposed road is mapped as going through an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL). This would have a significant impact on the Outstanding Natural Landscape and on the immediate neighbours who would be in sight and hearing of the road cutting through the ONL and the subsequent traffic on it. Both building the road, and ongoing traffic, would increase the noise levels in an environment that is of significant natural quiet.</li> <li>• The road would need to pass along the top of a BPCT covenant, and it is likely that this would have an impact on the ecology of that covenant area.</li> <li>• There has been no consultation or planning on the type of road required for the access and pipeline, the creation and maintenance of the ponds, or for the regular visits that would be required to establish and then maintain the plantings. However, it is clear that this would have to be an all-weather formed road. Thus, a formed road would be created through a ONL and through neighbouring land including a block that is in the process of becoming a QEII covenant. This would have a significant impact upon the neighbouring properties and on the significant natural environment of the Wildside.</li> <li>• While the wetland of Goughs Bay has been mapped as being of Ecological</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Significance and is thought to be the best wetland in the Peninsula's outer bays, there are many other sites of ecological significance within the Goughs and Hickory Bays, but these are not yet mapped as they have not been through the process of being surveyed and signed off by the landowners. The BPCT Goughs Multi covenant will fit these criteria, as will the Top Bush BPCT Covenant, both of which are alongside the proposed road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed road is in a high rockfall area, and in the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 several large rockfalls happened along the BPCT covenant, breaking the fence in many places. One very large rock fell across the track and fence and had to be blasted out of the way after weeks of planning and involving a team of people. If such an event happened in the future the road access would be cut to the ponds and planting site.</li> <li>• The site access road is intended to be formed along the route of the existing legal road corridor, and therefore there will be public access. The terrain is such that this may create significant safety risks when oncoming vehicles meet, exacerbated by the share drop on the southern side.</li> <li>• The entire construction process, including the movement of heavy machinery and maintenance vehicles, would pose a considerable risk of introducing new weed species to the Wildside, an area that currently has very few agricultural or ecological weeds.</li> <li>• The grass track that exists would need to be widened to be suitable for heavy machinery, and to include suitable passing areas. This would create issues with rockfalls, and risk potential cost blowout if areas of hard rock are encountered. The road forming process would be an ecological threat to the rare and endemic plant and animal life, as well as having a negative impact upon the covenant that is adjacent to the road corridor. It would of course also impact upon the Outstanding Natural Landscape and sites of Ecological Significance which are yet to be designated.</li> <li>• The proposed road will have relatively high usage by local standards, and with the nearby power lines and associated structures, would have a significant impact on the visual aesthetics of the Goughs Bay valley. In particular it would impact upon the land values in Goughs Bay, and most significantly affect 235 Goughs Rd, the Haley Hussain residence, and Vicky and Burt Turner on Hickory Bay Road. There would be a need to mitigate the land value impact through compensation to the landowners.</li> <li>• We believe that the only way to lay a pipeline along Hickory Bay Rd would be to close the road for extended periods, causing significant additional disruption to residents, essential farming services, and access for emergency vehicles.</li> <li>• In comparison, the Inner Harbour and Pompey's Pillar options already have formed roads, and there are no additional obstacles regarding Outstanding Natural Landscapes, ecological significance, or rockfall issues.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure Concerns - Pipes and Ponds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pipe to pump wastewater up and over the summit of Banks Peninsula will</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>have to be engineered to a high standard, with considerable risks if the pipe or pumping system fails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As there would be no intermediate pump station any small issue with the pump such as a power cut could reduce the effectiveness of the operation, any significant issue could cause longer term delays and spill over of wastewater through Children's Bay more directly into the Harbour. This issue would not be likely to Robinsons Bay as the wastewater does not need pumping and can be gravity feed to the site.</li> <li>• There are climate change issues arising from the proposed pumping over the summit rim, given that the annual power cost is in excess of \$100,000. Even though planting native forest (at even more expense) can offset some of the climate issues, it would be a far more sensible option for that power not to have been used, and in effect wasted, in the first place when there are acceptable disposal options closer to the source.</li> <li>• The budgeted cost of approximately \$8 million dollars to install the high-pressure pumping station and pipe along the Long Bay Road, is a significant cost to the ratepayers that would be an unacceptable burden in the post-Covid economic environment.</li> <li>• There appears to have been no study on where the material from excavating the pond sites will go. If it is moved offsite there will significant disruption and added cost. If it is used as fill in the area of the Crown Island stream catchment this will threaten the local ecology.</li> </ul> <p>Farming Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Goughs Headland site is directly upstream of two intakes for household water, one an easement to Hickory Bay and the other the house supply to the bottom house in Goughs.</li> <li>• The proposed Goughs planting site is directly upstream of farmland. Any leaching of trace contaminants such as antibiotics into the neighbouring farm, stock water or ground water, will be likely to cause the loss of value of the livestock when sold. We do not believe that there has been any specific study in this environment and soil type, regarding leaching downhill or into groundwater.</li> <li>• Both the Goughs and Pompeys sites are at present good clear productive farmland. In both situations it would cause a significant loss to the landowners if all or part of their farms were taken by any compulsory process for the wastewater project, and in both locations the landowner is unwilling to sell. In Goughs Bay a forced sale would also likely mean the</li> </ul> <p>eviction of the land manager and family from their house and disruption to their children at the local school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wastewater scheme would have a significant impact upon the values of the blocks of land being proposed. This would have an impact upon the neighbouring land values as well. We would seek compensation as a community for the loss of land value.</li> </ul>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>• Although post-Covid we are yet unsure of the future of tourism it is likely that planting at Pompeys, if not managed well, and the access road at Goughs, could have an impact upon the potential tourism value on the Wildside. Much of the additional income from farming operations have come from on-farm tourism based upon the wild remote and 'untouched' aspects of this unique community and environment.</p> <p>Issues of Fairness and Consultation</p> <p>The project for the disposal of Akaroa wastewater has been ongoing for about 10 years, but the Goughs Bay version has only appeared within the last 6 months. A meeting between CCC personnel and residents was held in December 2019, but since then there has been no further consultation even though the project concept has been fundamentally changed.</p> <p>In contrast, the Inner Harbour option has been well researched, and representatives of the local community have been heavily involved in the process from the beginning.</p> <p>It seems that both options are about to be presented in a public consultation process as they are valid alternatives and have had equal levels of applied research and community involvement. This could not be further from the truth. It is obvious that this is a fundamentally unfair process lacking in natural justice.</p> <p>In Summary</p> <p>The Goughs Bay proposal is not a well-researched or practical option. Rather it is an idea that looks like it might be feasible on paper, but which runs a high risk of failing, or of a cost blow-out, when the idea impacts with the realities of this site.</p> <p>The Wildside in winter is often a bleak, cold, and windswept, even when there is no rain or sleet. To suggest that it is realistic to establish a planted native forest there, within any reasonable timeframe and without a huge effort, shows outstanding optimism that will ultimately be shown to be misplaced.</p> <p>Local knowledge indicates that plant growth rates in the Goughs headland can be less than half what could be expected at the Inner Harbour locations and we believe that the proposed planting area</p> <p>has not been trialled appropriately.</p> <p>The size of the proposed storage ponds implies around two months capacity, provided they are empty at the start of a rain period. Experienced locals can recall that in some years the site has been continuously saturated for significantly longer periods. This implies either the need for either much larger ponds, or alternatively more robust proposals for emergency discharges from the wastewater plant.</p> <p>Taken together, the above points suggest that the Goughs Bay proposal will</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>need a significantly larger budget than that currently estimated, and the likelihood of a budget blowout is significant.</p> <p>In contrast to the poorly researched Goughs Bay proposal, the Inner Harbour option has been researched and designed in detail. There are few significant risks, while there are some potential benefits, if well managed.</p> <p>We believe that there are many similar points raised about the Goughs headland that also apply to the Pompey's Pillar headland, particularly the issues around planting on an exposed headland, being within the special Wildside conservation area and pumping wastewater over the crater rim. We do not support either proposal.</p> <p>Signed by the following residents and landowners of Goughs, Hickory and the Wildside:</p> <p>Marie Haley and Asif Hussain, Goughs Bay</p> <p>John and Carol Masefield, Goughs Bay</p> <p>Hugh Wilson, Hinewai Reserve, Otanerito</p> <p>Hannah and Will Johns, Paua Bay</p> <p>Sue and Murry Johns, Paua Bay</p> <p>Robin and Jo Burleigh, Le Bons Bay</p> <p>Janis and Richard Haley, Paua Bay</p> <p>Alex Urquhart, Hickory Bay</p> <p>Grant Jamieson and Jane Westwood, Hickory Bay</p> <p>Harry and Diana Stronach, Hickory Bay</p> <p>Jill and Richard Simpson, Fishermans Bay</p> <p>Damien Begley, Hickory Bay</p> <p>John, Oliver, Giles and Hilary Hancock, Long Bay Road, Fishermans Bay</p> <p>Warren Begley, Otanerito</p> <p>Paige Begley, Otanerito</p> <p>Eleanor Begley, Otanerito, (12)</p> <p>Vicky and Burt Turner, Hickory/Goughs Bay</p> <p>Emma and Gorge Masefield</p> <p>Christo Trought and Rebecca Nicholls, Goughs Bay</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
25.	34136	No							<p>I do not support any of the options presented by CCC for the Akaroa wastewater, apart from the purple pipe, and the Childrens Bay wetland schemes.</p> <p>I suggest that CCC looks into minimising the wastewater by 1. Fixing the pipes that allow stormwater into the system. 2. Ensuring that all new builds collect rainwater for garden and external home use. 3. Ensuring all new builds use water use reduction technology. 4. Provide some funding for retrofitting homes with water use reduction technology and rainwater catchment systems.</p> <p>I suggest that CCC pursues the Childrens Bay wetland idea, using shingle pits to filter water over</p> <p>short distances, flowing into a wetland pond system that will allow 1. the water to be highly filtered naturally over land 2. to satisfy Ngai Tahu's cultural beliefs (rightly) 3. To allow for improved wetland habitat for native species (especially if small islands are built into the pond systems for bird breeding as at Bromley) 4. To allow the water to be collected and pumped a short distance out into the harbour or 5. For reuse through the purple pipe system into Akaroa township first for use in public parks and toilets and then as legislation allows for the reuse on private property for garden and</p> <p>outdoor use, I support the council pursuing a change in legislation to allow this.</p> <p>I absolutely do not support the Goughs Bay proposal as an affected neighbour and I strongly object to the council 'consultation' process which was a joke. The Ashburton dairy company that owns the land wanted the treated wastewater for irrigation for grazing dairy cattle and was included on the working party as the only Goughs Bay representative. When I found out about the Goughs Bay proposal some 7-8 months after it being discussed by the working group, I requested that CCC staff consult with the community and had the staff member come to my home to tell us and some neighbours what the proposal was. We then pushed for a community meeting which was held in</p> <p>December 2019 in Akaroa. The Council made NO effort to contact the landowners in the community. The landowner then pulled out his support due to not being able to sell milk or meat raised on wastewater irrigated pasture. CCC never followed up with the community alerting us to the changed proposal to irrigate to plants. We submitted to the working group but were never invited to present and still felt strongly under-represented compared to the inner harbour affected neighbours. We never received mail drop submission forms even though our community is directly harmed by the proposal and we have never had a specific community meeting during the final consultation process as the Inner Harbour proposal has at least twice.</p> <p>We as a community of Goughs Bay and the Wildside conservation project have written a submission, unanimously supported by those who have been contact by myself (NOT by CCC), including by Hugh Wilson of Hinewai Reserve. It is Appendix 5 of the Working Groups Final Statement. The proposal is absolutely ludicrous and from an experienced engineers' point of view and that of the experienced local residents the cost is well</p>	Maire Haley			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>underestimated. We are seven generations of landowners on this farm that has been occupied since at least 1865 by my family. This proposal would have a detrimental affect on our land and our lifestyle. We are proactive farmers, as are most landowners</p> <p>in this community, we are currently completing a Site of Ecological Significance fencing process funded directly by CCC for the protection of significant forest habitat.</p> <p>I wish to have an opportunity to present to the hearing panel, in Akaroa, before noon.</p>				
26.	34134	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	<p>SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF ŌNUKU RŪNANGA, WAIREWA RŪNANGA, TE RŪNANGA O NGĀI TAHU AND AKAROA TAIĀPURE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ("THE NGĀI TAHU PARTIES")</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1. This is a submission on behalf of Ōnuku Rūnanga, Wairewa Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Akaroa Taiāpure Management Committee ("the Ngāi Tahu parties") on the options for future disposal of wastewater from the Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Plant.</p> <p>2. Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu is statutorily recognised as the representative tribal body of Ngāi Tahu whānui under Section 6 of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (the Act). Te Rūnanga consists of eighteen Papatipu Rūnanga who uphold the mana whenua and mana moana of their rohe. Ngāi Tahu whānui comprises over 64,000 registered iwi members. The takiwā (region) of Ngāi Tahu in Te Waipounamu covers the largest geographical area of any tribal authority.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding its statutory status as the representative voice of Ngāi Tahu whānui "for all purposes", Te Rūnanga accepts and respects the right of individuals and Papatipu Rūnanga to make their own responses in relation to this matter. Papatipu Rūnanga are marae-based representative bodies, as defined in Section 9 of the Act, and include Ōnuku Rūnanga and Wairewa Rūnanga.</p> <p>4. Ōnuku Rūnanga is the incorporated society that represents the interests of the hapū of Ngāi Tārewa and Ngāti Īrakehu. The takiwā of Ōnuku Rūnanga is centred on Ōnuku and the hills and coasts of Akaroa Harbour. Wairewa Rūnanga is the representative body for the hapū of Ngāti Īrakehu and Ngāti Makō. The takiwā of Wairewa Rūnanga centres on Wairewa, the catchment of Te Roto o Wairewa and surrounding hills and coast. Wairewa Rūnanga and Ōnuku Rūnanga share mana whenua rights and kaitiakitanga responsibilities for Akaroa Harbour. Approximately 22,000 of Ngāi Tahu registered members have whakapapa connections to Ōnuku or Wairewa Rūnanga.</p> <p>5. Mana whenua is determined by whakapapa (genealogical ties), and confers traditional customary authority over an area. Once acquired, mana whenua is secured and maintained by ahi kā (continued occupation and resource use).</p>	Philippa Lynch	Senior Environmental Advisor	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>6. The Akaroa Taiāpure Management Committee is the body responsible to Ōnuku, Wairewa and Koukourarata Rūnanga for administering the Akaroa Harbour Taiāpure. The committee has a broad membership including mana whenua, recreational fishers, commercial fishers and marine farmers.</p> <p>7. The Taiāpure was established in 2006 and further extended in 2015 to recognise the significance of the Akaroa Harbour to the Rūnanga of Ōnuku, Wairewa and Koukourarata for customary fishing. It includes an area of Akaroa Harbour from Elephant Head and Manukatahi Stream to the waters outside the harbour mouth. The vision for the Akaroa Taiāpure is to improve the sustainability of the customary fishery and create opportunities for future generations to continue to fish in the harbour.</p> <p>8. The Ngāi Tahu parties respectfully request that Christchurch City Council accord this submission the status and weight due to the tribal collective, Ngāi Tahu whānui, in accordance with the Act.</p> <p>Ngāi Tahu interests and values</p> <p>9. The Ngāi Tahu parties have a specific interest in this matter by virtue of the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 (the NTCSA). The NTCSA provides for Ngāi Tahu and the Crown to enter an age of co-operation. The NTCSA specifically records the Crown's recognition of the rangatiratanga of Ngāi Tahu in their takiwā.</p> <p>10. Overarching interests in the management of Akaroa Harbour and the surrounding lands include:</p> <p>a. Treaty Relationship: The Ngāi Tahu parties have an expectation that the Council will honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty) and the principles upon which the Treaty is founded. These include the principles of partnership, active participation in decision-making, active protection and rangatiratanga.</p> <p>b. Kaitiakitanga: Kaitiakitanga is fundamental to the relationship between Ngāi Tahu and the environment. The responsibility of kaitiakitanga is twofold: first, there is the ultimate aim of protecting mauri and, secondly, there is the duty to pass the environment to future generations in a state which is as good as, or better than, the current state. Ngāi Tahu whānui are guided by the tribal whakataukī: "mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei" (for us and our descendants after us). To Ngāi Tahu, kaitiakitanga is not a passive custodianship, nor it is simply the exercise of traditional property rights, but entails an active exercise of responsibility in a manner beneficial to the resource. The Ngāi Tahu parties hold kaitiaki responsibilities to ensure sustainable management of Akaroa Harbour, including protection of taonga and mahinga kai for future generations.</p> <p>c. Whanaungatanga: The Ngāi Tahu parties have a responsibility to promote the wellbeing of Ngāi Tahu whānui and ensure that the management of natural resources supports this.</p> <p>d. Mahinga kai: Mahinga kai refers to the customary use and management of natural resources for food and other purposes, the places where this gathering occurs and the resources themselves. Mahinga kai is a</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>cornerstone of Ngāi Tahu cultural, social and economic wellbeing. Traditionally, it was the thread that wove whānau and communities together in times of need and prosperity, and it is the platform upon which many core values have been passed down from generation to generation. Each marae is known for its unique mahinga kai.</p> <p>e. Manaakitanga: Ōnuku Rūnanga and Wairewa Rūnanga have a responsibility to care for and provide for guests. The ability to harvest food from the harbour for this purpose is crucial to the mana of Ōnuku and Wairewa hapū.</p> <p>11. Akaroa Harbour is part of Te Tai o Mahaanui, the Selwyn-Banks Peninsula Coastal Marine area Statutory Acknowledgement, recognised in the NTCSA as an area of particular cultural, spiritual, historic, and traditional association to Ngāi Tahu. As described in Schedule 101 of the NTCSA, Ngāi Tahu culture, history and identity is strongly embedded in the land and seascapes of the harbour and its catchment.</p> <p>12. Akaroa Harbour was renowned from early times for the quality and quantity of its mahinga kai, and Ngāi Tahu values associated with the harbour are strongly focused on mahinga kai. The importance of the customary fishery in the harbour is recognised by the establishment of the Akaroa Taiāpure, but the customary values are not confined to species managed under the Taiāpure.</p> <p>13. The Harbour is a home for tribal taonga, including the pahu (Hector's dolphin). It is also visited by other dolphin and whale species, and provides habitat for seals, white-flipped and yellow-eyed penguins and a wide range of seabird species.</p> <p>Ngāi Tahu concern about sewage discharges</p> <p>14. The discharge of human sewage (whether treated or untreated) directly into water is abhorrent to the values of Ngāi Tahu. The harbour has its own mauri (life force). When waste water is put directly into the harbour the mauri of the harbour is harmed and destroyed. Discharge of sewage into the harbour is inconsistent with Ngāi Tahu tikanga and incompatible with use of the harbour for food gathering.</p> <p>15. The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan describes wastewater treatment and disposal as one of the most significant issues for Ngāi Tahu in the Akaroa Harbour area. This concern includes the cumulative effect of discharges of wastewater directly into the harbour from treatment plants servicing the Akaroa, Duvauchelle, Wainui and Tikao Bay communities, together with the contamination from poorly maintained or clustered septic tank systems in other small communities around the harbour. This increases the health risks to whanau and manuhiri (guests) if they are served food from the harbour. For example, this is evidenced by recent positive results for norovirus from mussels between Hokianga Point and Pinnacle Rock.</p> <p>16. The cultural repugnance of sewage discharges to water is not addressed by compliance of the discharge with biological or physical water quality standards. If water contains wastewater, the mauri is destroyed and the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>mahinga kai that particular waterway sustains is significantly degraded. At times, contamination means that Ōnuku and Wairewa whanau cannot eat from our food basket, and have to travel to other areas to collect food.</p> <p>17. While the concerns described above are specific to Ngāi Tahu, we have also observed an increasing level of discomfort in the broader community with the practice of discharging wastewater to the harbour, particularly as it affects food gathering. For example, the Akaroa Harbour Recreational Fishing Club has consistently opposed the harbour outfall option.</p> <p>18. Water quality standards applied to the discharge focus only on specific parameters and do not address contamination holistically; for example, they do not address emerging contaminants such as pharmaceuticals. The treated wastewater discharged from the Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Plant has elevated levels of nutrients and unknown levels of contaminants of emerging concern.</p> <p>19. A more appropriate way to deal with wastewater in a modern context is to pass it through or across land. One of the roles of Papatūānuku is to cleanse. By passing wastewater through or over land and allowing for natural filtration to occur, the mauri of the water is restored and the eventual receiving water is not impaired.</p> <p>History of involvement in Akaroa wastewater issues</p> <p>20. The current Akaroa Township Sewage Treatment Plant and associated Harbour outfall were first commissioned in the 1960s. Since the mid-1990s, it has been recognised that better solutions are required:</p> <p>a. In 1994, resource consents were granted for 3 years (expiring August 1997), on the basis that the Council would carry out an upgrade of the treatment plant;</p> <p>b. In 1998, replacement consents were granted for 9 years (expiring June 2007), on the basis that the next consents would involve decisions about the future of the plant. For perhaps the first time, the option of disposal of treated wastewater to land was discussed at this point;</p> <p>c. In 2008, replacement consents were granted for 5 years (expiring July 2013), with conditions including the establishment of a Community Working Party and investigation of the long term treatment and disposal of Akaroa wastewater;</p> <p>d. In 2013, replacement consents were granted for 5 years only, with that term extended to 7 years after a Council appeal to the Environment Court was settled by agreement with the Ngāi Tahu parties and others. As a condition of those consents, the Council was to apply for new consents by the end of June 2014. By virtue of a side agreement, the parties to the Court proceedings committed to engage on matters including future wastewater reuse and discharges, shellfish monitoring and investigations into discharge of treated waste to land, with the stated goal being for the Council to have a new system operational within 5 years and avoid any further replacement consents;</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>e. In 2015, the Council was granted consent to construct and operate a new wastewater treatment scheme, but was declined consent to discharge treated wastewater to the Harbour via a new, extended outfall pipe. The Council appealed the declined consent(s) to the Environment Court and the proceedings were adjourned a number of times (with the agreement of the Ngāi Tahu parties and Environment Canterbury) to allow for investigation of other options for reuse/disposal of wastewater. That appeal was ultimately withdrawn in June 2019, as the Council resolved that it was better to devote its resources to the continuing investigation of alternatives, rather than a hearing on the Harbour outfall option.</p> <p>21. At least as far back as 1998, the Ngāi Tahu parties were on the record as opposing any discharge to the Harbour and that issue has been a significant one in all of the processes that followed. In the 2013 decision noted above, the hearing commissioners recorded:</p> <p>There is agreement that the discharge is having significant adverse effects on cultural and spiritual values and is likely to be contributing to intermittent breaches in water quality standards with regard to microbial contamination.</p> <p>In our view in the long term such adverse effects on cultural and spiritual values can only be avoided by either disposal onto land or by achieving a high level of treatment and passing it through land before discharge into coastal waters.</p> <p>22. Similarly the 2015 hearing commissioners concluded:</p> <p>There is a strong policy theme running through all these statutory documents that disposal of even highly treated human effluent into the Coastal Marine Area is no longer to be regarded as a good option. Rather it is to be regarded as an option that may be necessary in some circumstances after other options have been thoroughly investigated. This theme is firmly based on the imperatives in section 6(e), section 7(a), section 7(aa) and section 8 of the Act, which give specific statutory recognition of Māori cultural concerns.</p> <p>The documents provide very little support for disposal of effluent into the marine environment to balance this contrary theme....</p> <p>.... There is no dispute that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the environment from the perspective of tangata whenua...</p> <p>23. In parallel to the current process of selecting a preferred option for wastewater reuse/disposal, it has been necessary for the Council to apply for yet another set of 'short term' resource consents to permit the continued operation of the current scheme, including the outfall to the Harbour. If granted, those consents will have a duration of up to 8 years, which is estimated the maximum time that may be required for a replacement scheme, including reuse via irrigation to land, to become fully operational.</p> <p>24. As the chronology above demonstrates, the Ngāi Tahu parties have now been objecting to the disposal of wastewater into Akaroa Harbour for more than 20 years, and the Council has been investigating alternatives to the</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>current Harbour outfall for nearly as long, albeit that in 2015 the thoroughness of such investigations was questioned by hearings commissioners.</p> <p>25. Since the 2015 decision, the Ngāi Tahu parties have been engaged with the Council in a substantial process of identifying and evaluating potential land-based alternatives. Since 2017 this has included broader engagement through the Akaroa Treated Wastewater Reuse Options Working Party. Our experience is that the investigations have been comprehensive and that Council has taken an open approach to considering all practicable land-based options. In our view, it cannot be seriously suggested that yet more investigations will uncover some series of options that have not yet emerged.</p> <p>Land-based options</p> <p>26. For the Ngāi Tahu parties, land application is the preferred method of discharge provided appropriate conditions of soil type, slope, and assimilative capacity of the land are available, and the design and management of the system avoids over-saturation or contamination of the soil. We consider that this can be appropriately provided for in a system comprising a combination of sufficient storage, filtration through a constructed wetland and irrigation to land.</p> <p>27. A system incorporating a wetland and irrigation to trees, particularly where this incorporates indigenous vegetation, has significant environmental benefits. In addition to the primary purpose of cleansing wastewater, these benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Enhancement of indigenous biodiversity by establishment of new habitats in wetland and irrigated areas;</li> <li>b. Contribution towards meeting national climate change objectives through carbon capture by trees in the irrigated areas;</li> <li>c. Amenity and educational benefits associated with the establishment of wetland and irrigated vegetation.</li> </ul> <p>28. The preferred option of the Ngāi Tahu parties is the Inner Bays proposal (Option 1). We consider that this proposal provides the most beneficial solution of those identified. As highlighted in the consultation document, it has the lowest cost of the land-based options because of its closer proximity to the wastewater treatment plant and the ability to rely on gravity to feed wastewater into the system. This advantage will increase in future if energy costs rise. It also provides the greatest potential for amenity enhancement and carbon capture of the available options. This option is also the most resilient and adaptable to changing needs if there are better than expected reductions in stormwater inflow and groundwater infiltration and/or increased uptake over time of non-potable reuse.</p> <p>29. We acknowledge that some residents living near the sites of the Inner Bays proposal have concerns about the impact of this proposal on their amenity, as well as about the potential for a dam failure in the storage pond. We consider that these concerns could be reduced by refinements in the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>design of the system to reduce the volume of storage that is needed at Robinsons Bay, and we encourage the Council to pursue such refinements.</p> <p>Reduction and reuse of wastewater</p> <p>30. The Council has also requested comment on whether there is support for further work to be done to pursue a scheme to reduce wastewater disposal needs by providing for re-use of some of the treated wastewater for irrigating Council-owned parks and sports grounds and for flushing public toilets. If regulations are changed in future to enable residential non-potable re-use, this could also be incorporated. We support this proposal as a means to reduce the volume of wastewater requiring disposal, and we encourage the Council to pursue it further.</p> <p>31. While the focus of this submission is on the disposal of wastewater, we also consider it is important to give full attention to the potential to reduce the generation of wastewater. We encourage the Council to take all practical steps to reduce the volume of wastewater requiring treatment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Continuing efforts to reduce the volume of stormwater infiltration into the wastewater system; and</li> <li>b. Education of residents and businesses about measures that can be taken to reduce the amount of wastewater generated.</li> </ul> <p>Local Government Act considerations</p> <p>32. The decision on which of the wastewater re-use/disposal options should be adopted is to be made under the Local Government Act 2002 (the LGA). Among other things, the LGA requires local authorities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of their communities, taking a sustainable development approach (s.3(d) LGA);</li> <li>b. facilitate participation by Māori in local authority decision-making processes in order to recognise and respect the Crown's responsibility to take appropriate account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (s.6 LGA);</li> <li>c. promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future (s.10(b) LGA); and</li> <li>d. act in accordance with a series of principles, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) giving effect to the local authority's priorities and desired outcomes in an efficient and effective manner (s.14(1)(a)(ii) LGA);</li> <li>ii) taking into account the interests of future as well as current communities (s.14(1)(c)(ii) LGA);</li> <li>iii) taking into account the likely impact of any decision on each aspect of well-being referred to in section 10 (s.14(1)(c)(iii) LGA);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>iv) ensuring prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of the local authority's resources in the interests of its district or region, including by planning effectively for the future management of its assets (s.14(1)(g) LGA); and</p> <p>v) in taking a sustainable development approach, taking into account the social, economic, and cultural well-being of people and communities, the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment and the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations (s.14(1)(h) LGA).</p> <p>33. In considering the four options through the lens of these requirements, it is clear that while all have been adjudged technically feasible, and therefore worthy of consideration under the LGA, one – the harbour outfall – is incapable of promoting the cultural well-being of the affected community. Rather, it would positively diminish that well-being for Ngāi Tahu. There are also good arguments that it would not promote other well-beings.</p> <p>34. The Ngāi Tahu parties do not consider that pursuing a continuing harbour outfall would reflect a sustainable development approach and be consistent with the focus in the future reflected in many of the considerations above. Discharging wastewater to coastal waters is a 19th century solution, not a 21st century one. Finally, we note that hearing commissioners have already once (in 2015) declined to grant consent for the harbour outfall option. It would be difficult to conclude that pursuing that path again would be an efficient and effective use of the Council's resources.</p> <p>35. Of the remaining three options, the Ngāi Tahu parties take the view that all are capable of promoting the 'four well-beings' to a greater or lesser extent, though they will not do so equally. Of note, for example, are the fact that Options 2 and 3 are more expensive than Option 1 to construct and to operate, and are predicted to store less carbon. Both of those options also require the acquisition of land from unwilling landowners and offer lower resilience, as a result of the risks associated with pumping over longer distances.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>36. The Ngāi Tahu parties are strongly opposed to any direct discharge of treated wastewater to Akaroa Harbour through a harbour outfall. This is culturally repugnant and has a devastating impact on the ability of Ngāi Tahu whānui to engage in mahinga kai practices.</p> <p>37. We recognise that discharge to land is complicated by the availability of suitable land and acknowledge that there is a range of potential effects of any option that will need to be considered. However, we consider that eliminating discharges of contaminants to Akaroa Harbour is in the interest of other harbour users and the community as a whole, and not just tangata whenua. Given the 20 years that have elapsed since a land-based alternative began to be considered, we strongly believe that a decision on an appropriate option must be made now, rather than being delayed further.</p> <p>38. For Ngāi Tahu, it is too expensive not to discharge to land. The expense</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>is not monetary; it is the environmental cost of an inappropriate harbour discharge that we must be concerned with. The cost to the environment, our taonga and the loss of values for future generations far outweigh the dollars. Ngāi Tahu seek an outcome which will be both regenerative and resilient and which places the health and wellbeing of people and environment first.</p> <p>39. We support land-based disposal of wastewater by means of the Inner Bays option. We consider this option has clear advantages, in terms of cost and environmental benefits, over the other options, and we request the Council to adopt this option. However we also encourage the Council to pursue refinements in design of the system with the aim of reducing the storage capacity required at Robinsons Bay to address concerns of residents.</p> <p>40. We also encourage the Council to pursue all practical measures to reduce the volumes of wastewater needing to be provided for in the disposal system, including through appropriate non-potable re-use of treated wastewater.</p>				
27.	34132	No					Yes	Yes	<p>I do not support any of the options. They are all extremely expensive. For that sort of expenditure the Council should be aspiring to a truly sustainable and future-focussed system.</p> <p>The land options are dressed up as beneficial re-use, but are all actually still just old-fashioned dumping of waste 'somewhere else', where it is not needed or wanted. There is clearly a fundamental problem with Akaroa's leaking sewerage pipes and the Council must fix these before wasting money on any of its proposed options.</p> <p>The Inner Bays scheme is extraordinarily complex and appears very risky. It is not in any way reasonable or justifiable for Akaroa to impose its waste on the rural community in such a manner. The statement by Council staff that its only disadvantage is that is more expensive than a harbour outfall is utterly disingenuous. Staff must be very well aware of the opposition of the people who live at Robinsons Bay and Takamatua.</p> <p>I support the submission of the Friends of Banks Peninsula. I commend the vision of its proposed solution. As we face global climate, health and economic crises, I ask the Council to embrace such a vision.</p>	David Brailsford			Akaroa
28.	34130	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Graeme Curry			Akaroa
29.	34129	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Frank Shaw			Akaroa
30.	34127	No	To the land	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	<p>Protect our beautiful harbour that is used by so many to gather kaimoana, water sports and our beautiful Maui dolphins.</p> <p>The marine reserve is such a positive step. Hopefully it will see the return of many sea life that have sadly been decimated over the last few decades. We do not want anything in Akaroa Harbour that could jeopardise the good work done so far.</p> <p>So much time was spent by the locals of Robinsons Bay re-building the local wharf in the hope in would bring future generations back to the bay to enjoy the water.</p>	Malaika Smith			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
31.	34124	No				1	Yes	Yes	<p>We do not want waste water pumped into our harbour.</p> <p>When considering a project that hopefully will last for the next 50 years, I think this is a wonderful opportunity to spend a little extra money and do it right. While I don't have the exact latest costing, whatever it is divided by 50 years is very small amount per annum. In return we remove the potential risks to our beautiful harbour, while the increasing the environmental benefits.</p> <p>The risks that deeply concern me;</p> <p>Akaroa Population increases</p> <p>Once the sewage system is upgraded, I believe in time this will lead to more development in the township which will increase the impact and risks to the inner harbour.</p> <p>Land Slides</p> <p>With what seems to be an ever increasing number of large rain events, the clay around the harbour regularly gives way. (Maybe not the winter past, but 2017 was very wet). I just can't see how it is a good idea to put a lot more water on the landscape. More water = more land erosion. I fear the ponds could give way, flowing straight into the harbour.</p> <p>Leakage into the Harbour</p> <p>It just doesn't make sense to me, that options such as piping it over to Robinsons Bay for land based disposal. Bays at the head of the harbour are so shallow, any leakage, or worse an accidental leakage would not get flushed away quickly. This could lead to a whole season of the public being unable to use the water. This would not be great press.</p> <p>Smell</p> <p>Why store waste water in open ponds on the east side of the harbour, when the prevailing wind is the easterly? Smell is not good for the tourist trade.</p> <p>Insects</p> <p>I am very concerned about a large increase in insects around the inner harbour due to the storage ponds.</p> <p>I favour;</p> <p>1/ Piping over to Pompeys Pillar, where I understand the water would be welcomed. Sounds like a real win-win.</p> <p>2/ Reusing what is possible around the Akaroa township.</p> <p>3/ Water storage options, so it could be used for any possible water shortage / fire in the summer.</p>	Murray Smith			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>4/ Spending more on the best long term option. Not just trying to make the cheapest option work. I personally would support a levy across local rate payers to make up some of the shortfall, so that we select the best option for the future.</p> <p>I firmly oppose the irrigation of the waste water and associated storage ponds in Robinsons Bay and Takamatua.</p> <p>I don't fully understand the harbour pipeline option, I hoping it would be designed so that the prevailing current would take it out to sea. I would be against it, if all it did was wash the waste up the harbour.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to have my say. Yours Murray Smith</p>				
32.	34123	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Suz Wyborn			Akaroa
33.	34122	No					Yes	Yes	<p>It worries me about the future of the sea water in the upper harbour, as I'm a keen flounder fisherman and seafood gather. As the Paua has just come back in the last few years.</p> <p>Every summer we did a lot of water sports in Robinson's Bay.</p> <p>I fear there is too much risk of leakage from the proposed ponds. This will surely affect the Whitebaiting that I have been doing in the bay for over 40 years.</p> <p>I would hate to see the day in say 5-10 years time, when we are banned from enjoying the top of Akaroa harbour, due to a leakage and the southerly wind just keeps all at the head of the harbour.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the smell and insects around the ponds. Especially since the easterly wind is very common.</p> <p>I cannot understand why it is not pumped over to the eastern bays and protect our beautiful harbour.</p>	Richard Smith	Mitre10 MEGA	Richard Smith	Christchurch
34.	34121	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Joseph Wyborn			Akaroa
35.	34118	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	<p>Recognise the negative effects on residents in the Inner Bay's option.</p> <p>Question the assumption that estimation of four days/yr where irrigation to land cannot be done because of high rainfall events. When the soil here reach field capacity, it will take many more days than four, before irrigation can again take place. Added to this is the topography and further runoff</p>	Derek & Sue Marr			Akaroa
36.	34117	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>My responses to the items listed on the last page of the paper booklet are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To the harbour</li> <li>2. None of the options</li> <li>3. Yes</li> <li>4. Yes</li> </ol>	Tom Brennan			

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>I would like to speak to the hearings panel about my submission.</p> <p>My daytime phone number is [REDACTED]</p> <p>I would appreciate an acknowledgement of this email and the fact that it is admissible at this time....just after 6pm on Sunday August 23rd.</p>				
37.	34116	No							<p>Regarding the inner bays option that the council staff prefer.</p> <p>I would like to start my submission with an analogy. If you imagine Takamatua and Robinsons Bay to be like the suburbs of Merivale and Fendalton of Christchurch then we the residents are very anxious that they aren't turned into a Bexley and Bromley of ChCh.</p> <p>Now the councils project team will no doubt say that it would be an unfair comparison and that mitigation will mean that won't happen.</p> <p>But with Ngai Tahu's cultural values seemingly sacrosanct if the inner bays plan option goes ahead we the residents of Takamatua and Robinsons Bay will have become the Akaroa version of Bexley and Bromley.</p> <p>Thereby trampling all over the cultural values of our two communities.</p> <p>There surely has to be a middle ground.</p> <p>Nowhere in the green booklet do the council project team say they are going to seriously try to eliminate the infiltration within Akaroa, though it is mentioned in the consultation FAQ's .</p> <p>There is in the green booklet , page 12 a plan to deal with a 1 in 5 year wet winter , whereby excess water is spilled from the wetlands (pond 10) across land and into Childrens bay . Why can't this be the basis for an elegant solution to the issue that would keep the answer within the Akaroa Boundary.</p> <p>As a ratepayer of Christchurch CC it is unbelievable to me that a CC project team has dared to present this Have your Say Document as a summation of 3 years of work to find a solution to the Akaroa wastewater problem.</p> <p>It does not have 4 options . it has one.</p> <p>It gives solutions that are ridiculously expensive to implement \$ 60 million on average for a total of 1200 properties, \$50,000 per property !!!</p> <p>Why should the ratepayers of greater Christchurch be saddled with this massive cost ??</p> <p>This looks for all the world like the team ran out of enthusiasm for the task and consigned it to the 'too hard basket' maybe it's time to let people outside the council more used to dealing with this kind of problem be given an opportunity to find a solution.</p>	Brett Lea			

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									thank you for the chance to give some input I would like to speak to the hearings panel re this submission				
38.	34115	Yes					Yes	Yes	See attachment - (Resending after emailing through yesterday and not receiving an acknowledgement)	Sue Church	Secretary	Friends of Banks Peninsula	Banks Peninsula
39.	34114	Yes							<p>I do not support any of your wastewater discharge options. They are not designed to reuse or recycle wastewater in any shape or form. They will harm the environment, devalue Akaroa and Bays as a tourist destination and cause angry social unrest in our community as they are all incredibly expensive 'waste discharge' schemes.</p> <p>There are 'recycling options' available that you have not seriously considered. Those solutions are at less cost than your current proposals. They benefit the environment and come with the added bonus that Akaroa can solve its shortage of drinking water within the same package. Recycling reduces all the footprints for processing plants and eliminates the need for storage dams. Our community is ready for such technology and residents will welcome the benefits of recycling warmly.</p> <p>Covid has given the CCC a wonderful opportunity to postpone the current planning project with a clear conscience and allow time to work with Central Government to be guided by the 3 Waters Steering Committee and work with Peer groups eg Auckland City Council who are already onboard with studying recycling.</p> <p>Delay will benefit the cashflow forecast for CCC and reduce overall Capex by investing in superior recycling technology.</p> <p>Do the right thing Councillors and get it right this time.</p>	John Baker			Christchurch
40.	34113	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	<p>Modern technology means wastewater exiting the system should be potable although I understand that extreme events (floods) etc mean there is a possibility that the quality may be slightly lower (but still better than the water that is used for the piped water prior to treatment). Given this fact the objections to harbour discharge are null and void so that is the only sensible optioning my view. However I think the current proposal should be modified by greatly extending the pipeline length, ideally to the open sea or alternatively at least to the point in the harbour flow that is in the strongest currents.</p> <p>A risk with all schemes is that extreme events or systemic failure may see some overflow into the wider environment. The harbour choice is the less risky as this is only one point where this can happen - the treatment plant which one assumes will have massive backup capacity such as bunds. Land based schemes have this problem but, in addition, there is the possibility that inadequately treated discharge could go to the land chosen and then be washed into the sea where they could contaminate the foreshore and beaches which are the most vulnerable areas.</p> <p>The argument against sea discharge seems to be one of potential contamination. Much of this is anecdotal (cultural comes into this category too). However there is no actual solid evidence for this. Water testing</p>	Kevin McSweeney			Akaroa



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									(which is always set at an extreme risk level - the worst case scenario) only shows high coliform levels after heavy rain events and this is due to failures in the current infrastructure not the existing outfall. Algal blooms are a perennial problem around the peninsula and while some attribute this to sewage it's actually agricultural (and natural) contamination as is evidenced by the fact it is all over the area.  Clearly current infrastructure is The real problem and the consultation above shows the council is aware of this. This should be a priority. There is, however, a deeper problem and that is a lack of future planning. Looking around Akaroa a huge amount of development has been allowed without an accompanying increase in capacity. This applies to all services. In terms of wastewater this could include pretreatment plants in new subdivisions, more use of septic tank technology, total separation of sewage and stormwater (and even black and grey wastewater) and realistic charges to cover the costs of the increased demands on current infrastructure. I read (in reputable publications) of modern and innovative technologies to cope with these issues but reading the proposals it appears the planners are risk adverse and only consider "tried and true" technology which may have been OK last century (or earlier) but are not future proof.				
41.	34111	No							I do not wish to choose the options provided by Council and also please see my submission below.  I fully endorse and support the submission of Friends of Banks peninsula and the Robinsons bay rate payers residents association.	Janna Robinson			Robinson's Bay
42.	34110	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Robinson's Bay residents mental well-being.  We find ourselves living in unprecedented and uncertain times. We live in a city that has tested our resilience more than most other NZ cities in recent history. The belief that Canterbury residents are more resilient due to adversity is simply not true.  The mental well-being of our people should always be highlighted as a priority in community decision making.  I believe the impact on the mental well-being of the stakeholders in the inner bay was-tewater option has not been considered.  As a society we must put people first before profit before progress. We must nurture ourselves and neighbours to promote healthy relationships and cohesive lives. We need to show empathy and compassion for all to grow healthy communities.  Make people the priority  I refer to the Christchurch City Council social well-being policy dated 24th August 2000 where it states  * People participate in community life and have a sense of belonging and identity  * People and communities participate in decision making and political	Karen Watson			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									processes.				
43.	34108	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	<p>I endorse the FOBP submission to reject the inner bays proposal.</p> <p>I live in Christchurch but I have jointly owned of a holiday house at ██████████ Akaroa, since 2003, so I am a ratepayer in Akaroa and will be directly affected by this. I spend about 7 weeks a year in Akaroa and know the area well. I am an ecologist at the University of Canterbury so I understand the importance of proper wastewater treatment, providing more wetlands, cleaning up the harbour, and alleviating Akaroa's summer water shortages by where possible reusing highly treated water (the purple pipe scheme).</p> <p>I oppose the Harbour Outfall scheme, as I accept this is offensive to Ngai Tahu, and I consider it is also not ideal from an ecological point of view. Akaroa harbour is important ecologically and for ecotourism, so I believe we should not be discharging even well-treated wastewater there.</p> <p>I support the Inner Bays irrigation scheme. The cost is the lowest of the land-based options, and just makes more engineering sense. The proposed tree areas and wetlands will be good assets to the area. Native birds will find those areas useful, and so I would expect to see more native birds around the inner harbour if this scheme goes ahead. There is less energy involved in not having to pump the wastewater over the crater rim. All in all, this is the most sensible and affordable option, and I believe will enhance the inner harbour. That is my opinion as an Akaroa ratepayer, and as a professional ecologist.</p> <p>I do not support the Goughs Bay or Pompeys Pillar schemes. Both seem to be more expensive and more difficult in engineering terms than is acceptable.</p> <p>I support the purple pipe scheme if this option can be added at modest extra cost.</p>	Prof Dave Kelly FRSNZ			Christchurch
44.	34107	No							<p>I do not wish to choose the options provided by Council and also please see my submission below.</p> <p>I fully endorse and support the submission of Friends of Banks peninsula and the Robinsons bay rate payers residents association.</p>	Tim McGoldrick			Robinsons Bay
45.	34106	No	To the harbour				No	Yes	<p>Considering the Inner Bays scheme properties affected run septic tanks it seems preposterous to ruin two Bays for a service they don't use. As a seaman who has been around the world and spent a lot of time gathering seafood from Akaroa Harbour, I have not seen any effects of the current system.</p> <p>The only option is the harbour outfall!!</p>	Harry Thurston			Akaroa
46.	34105	No							I endorse the Friends of AKAROA submission.	Humphry Rolleston		Children's Bay Farm	
47.	34104	No					Yes	Yes	<p>1. Wastewater should be re-used in Akaroa, with any surplus used to recharge the Akaroa streams or, as a last resort, discharged to harbour</p> <p>2. I do not support any of the land-based options</p>	Brent Martin			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>3. I support irrigating public parks in Akaroa with the highly treated wastewater</p> <p>4. I would like you to pursue the feasibility of a purple pipe scheme for Akaroa, along with other water reuse in Akaroa township</p> <p>5. I support the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission, and agree with its central arguments:</p> <p>I. The Akaroa wastewater network is in extremely poor condition, with excessive levels of inflow and infiltration (I&amp;I). This increases costs and reduces resilience; this should be dealt with before developing a new treatment plant and disposal.</p> <p>II. The approach taken until very recently has been to look for ways to dispose of the wastewater to land rather than re-use it where it is needed.</p> <p>III. Akaroa suffers from water shortages over summer, so there is a need to be met</p> <p>IV. Land disposal on Banks Peninsula carries a high risk, requires a large capital outlay, delays the closure of Takapūneke and does not enable beneficial re-use in Akaroa, but rather spends money directing the recycled water to other places.</p> <p>V. A purple pipe network for external use (chiefly garden watering) has the potential to absorb all of the treated wastewater during the summer peak.</p> <p>VI. Focussing on beneficial re-use in Akaroa opens other ways to use the treated wastewater, such as replenishing the streams, particularly when flows are low.</p> <p>VII. Combining beneficial re-use in Akaroa with a transitional harbour outfall is a cost-effective, pragmatic approach that minimises risk and allows time to develop the most beneficial outcome.</p> <p>The Akaroa network needs fixing first</p> <p>1. The discovery of a faulty flow meter in 2017 (for a second time; Council were also aware that the meter was reading incorrectly in 2010) means Council staff are now aware of the excessively high levels of ground water and storm water that infiltrate the network; previously (because of the faulty flow readings) it was assumed Akaroa had very low inflow and infiltration (I&amp;I) levels.</p> <p>2. The high I&amp;I levels (over 60% of total flows) significantly increase the costs and footprint of the project:</p> <p>a. The designed treatment plant is unable to treat all flows during the peak summer season; a raw sewage buffer pond is now required across the road to even out these flows. The alternative would have been to increase the plant's throughput.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>b. The amount of land required for irrigating trees is proportional to total flows.</p> <p>c. The storage required by land-based options is critically dependent on flow levels during wet weather. Reducing I&amp;I would significantly lower this requirement.</p> <p>3. Where I&amp;I flows in, raw sewage can flow out. Raw sewage making its way into the storm water network will flow out the drains onto the beach; is this what really causes the bacteria levels at Akaroa's main beach to spike during wet weather?</p> <p>4. Climate change modelling indicates substantially rising sea levels over the lifetime of this system, increasing the likelihood of inflow during storm surges and increasing groundwater pressure; in other words the problem is going to get worse. The poor state of the network makes it highly vulnerable to these impacts.</p> <p>5. Council staff have indicated that reducing I&amp;I is costly, with no means of knowing how successful they will be, yet also claim that I&amp;I reduction is a way to add growth capacity to the system. This is a bizarre way to size and plan a large infrastructure project.</p> <p>6. Council staff's approach to-date has been to perform piecemeal repairs and replacement.</p> <p>Given the level of the problem and its impacts, it would be prudent to consider more major remediation (such as relining the network) or replacement of the critical lower section with a pressure system to eliminate most of the I&amp;I. This would potentially pay for itself by lowering the cost of the treatment plant and disposal scheme, and reduce the need for further costly investigation and repairs in the future.</p> <p>7. Spending up to \$45-76million on an oversized plant and disposal system, only to end up with something less resilient than before is, quite literally, money down the drain.</p> <p>A disposal approach has been taken</p> <p>8. When Ecan declined the application for harbour discharge, the commissioners argued that alternatives had not been reasonably explored, because Council staff had only considered disposal to small areas of land. They had not, for example, considered irrigating a larger farm at a much lower rate. This same approach persists, with all land irrigation options being assessed through the lens of irrigation at the highest rate to the smallest area of land</p> <p>possible. This is disposal, and it maximises any risks from excesses of water, nutrients and emerging contaminants.</p> <p>9. The potential for re-use via a "purple pipe" system has been considered, but the only option seriously looked at was re-use for toilet flushing, which carries a very high per-connection cost and uses only a small quantity of the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>reclaimed wastewater. Other uses, such as garden watering, have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>10. Managed Aquifer Recharge was considered but discounted on the basis of risk to the Akaroa water supply. This failed to consider the possibility of treating the water to a safe (potable) standard. Reverse Osmosis was considered for this purpose but discounted on cost, however the actual costs have never been presented, and experiences elsewhere suggest it carries a similar cost to ultrafiltration. Similarly, the disposal of retentate has been cited as an issue, but has not been adequately explored, and there are solutions available.</p> <p>Akaroa suffers from water shortages over summer, so there is a need to be met</p> <p>11. Akaroa's water usage soars over summer, peaking at around four times the winter flow rate.</p> <p>12. The Akaroa streams run as low as 4l/s in summer, when demand is highest. Low flows impact aquatic life, including by raising the water temperature.</p> <p>13. Watering restrictions are already in place in Akaroa for up to five months over summer. In 2019/20 a full watering ban was abruptly put into place after stream flows plummeted. This is a worrying development.</p> <p>Land disposal on Banks Peninsula carries a high risk, requires a large capital outlay, delays the closure of Takapūneke and does not enable beneficial re-use in Akaroa</p> <p>14. Wastewater disposal to land is challenging on Banks Peninsula because of the topology and soil type. This introduces significant risk, including the potential for slips. Harrison Grierson identified the risk already caused by the Peninsula's high annual variability in rainfall and noted that the proposed loadings are comparable to a doubling of rainfall. This in itself raises the risk of slope instability beyond what has ever been experienced before. There is potential for irrigation field failure, and flooding caused by collapsed river banks (the latter is identified by Beca as a risk in Robinsons Bay).</p> <p>15. Climate modelling predicts Canterbury's climate will become drier overall, but with a more even spread of rainfall summer and winter, and a greater frequency and severity of intense rainfall events. Beca have identified that the Inner Bays 19,500m<sup>3</sup> storage pond increases the flooding risk on houses below, particularly if it coincides with a significant storm.</p> <p>Increased storms brought about by climate change exacerbate this risk.</p> <p>16. A significant cost and impact of the land-based disposal is storage ponds. Beca acknowledge that the actual storage required is preliminary only, and that getting the storage amount right is crucial to avoiding spilling the wastewater into local waterways. Further, the storage required is critically dependant on both the quantity of wastewater to be disposed of, and the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>irrigation rate. These are further dependent on achieving a 20% reduction in I&amp;I, plus a number of modelled assumptions, including the ability for the trees to intercept 37% of rainfall, the long-term ability of the trees and soil to remain healthy with continuous watering to (and beyond) field capacity, and the ability of soils continually saturated to (or beyond) field capacity to remove nutrients from the wastewater.</p> <p>17. There is a high up-front capital cost, with no guarantee there won't be additional costs: in several land-based disposal systems (including Whakarewarewa, Ashburton, Rakaia and Leeston) the system has required further capital injection because it either failed to meet its original design performance (with a resultant pollution problem and inability to meet consent conditions) or it was outgrown by the population it serves.</p> <p>18. A 100% land-based disposal solution is an all-at-once approach, which means there is little ability to spread the high cost.</p> <p>19. Irrigation to land costs money to run, with little or no return on this cost.</p> <p>20. Land disposal comes with a high opportunity cost. The land currently identified as potentially suitable for irrigation is high-value farm land, with the land earmarked for the Inner Harbour scheme in particular having further development potential. It does not make sense to take this land out of circulation. If the Council wants to restore biodiversity and sequester carbon (which I wholeheartedly support), the additional cost would be far better spent purchasing marginal land for this purpose, and leaving it to naturally regenerate at a fraction of the perhectare cost.</p> <p>21. The establishment of a land-based disposal solution does not aid the beneficial re-use of reclaimed wastewater in Akaroa for two reasons:</p> <p>a. It involves a high sunk cost, which dis-incentivises spending on the water re-use reticulation network.</p> <p>b. A tree-based land disposal field would still be being established at the time it was needed most, and would only be able to take up all of the remaining wastewater once the need had ideally passed because the re-use network was meeting most or all of the supply. It therefore works against the needs of a re-use network.</p> <p>A purple pipe network for external use (chiefly garden watering) has the potential to absorb all of the reclaimed wastewater in summer</p> <p>22. In summer a large proportion of the potable supply is used for garden watering and other outdoor use. This is a waste of precious potable water and increases demand on Akaroa's streams when flows are at their lowest.</p> <p>23. A purple pipe network for garden watering could be considerably less expensive than one for toilet flushing because:</p> <p>a. The connection only needs to go to the edge of the property. Also, adjacent properties could share the same connection by "teeing" the end point, requiring only half the number of connections.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>b. The network could be rolled out over time when other underground work is being carried out, reducing the overall cost and spreading it over many years.</p> <p>24. Using reclaimed water for municipal and private watering is common overseas, particularly in areas where water is in short supply such as California, Florida and Perth.</p> <p>Focusing on beneficial re-use in Akaroa may identify other ways to use the reclaimed wastewater</p> <p>25. Reverse Osmosis (RO) has the potential to enable the reclaimed wastewater to be treated to a potable level, allowing further re-use options such as recharging of Akaroa's streams, or Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR). These options do not require large storage structures. RO is used in other places to treat wastewater before indirectly recycling it via stream recharge, reservoir recharge or MAR. RO also removes excess nutrients and chemical contaminants.</p> <p>26. Stream replenishment could occur below the potable intakes to replenish flows, until regulation (and perceptions/need) means it is feasible to direct the (now potable) water to above the intake and indirectly recycle it into the drinking supply. Whilst this approach may bring cultural challenges with regard to mixing waters, stream discharge is used in other parts of New Zealand so it should be possible to overcome this concern.</p> <p>Combining beneficial re-use in Akaroa with a transitional harbour outfall is a cost-effective, pragmatic approach that minimises risk and allows time to develop the most beneficial outcome</p> <p>27. The upgrading of Akaroa's wastewater treatment is a very expensive project, working out at approx. \$60,000 per connection. This high cost is significantly driven by the decision to relocate the plant up the hill above North Akaroa, which also increases running costs. At such a high cost it is prudent to try to maximise the benefits gained from the upgrade.</p> <p>28. A transitional harbour outfall enables "purple pipe" reuse by conveying the treated wastewater back through town.</p> <p>29. Beneficial reuse with transitional/emergency harbour outfall is a pragmatic, cost-effective solution because it:</p> <p>a. Extracts benefit by addressing a genuine need (Akaroa water shortages), and having an immediate impact by removing the water used for public toilet flushing, and greening Akaroa's public spaces. It also has the potential to reduce the environmental impacts on Akaroa's streams by reducing the water take and</p> <p>replenishing flows in summer.</p> <p>b. Achieves the requirements of relocating from Takapūneke and, if stream replenishment can be adopted, removes the harbour outfall altogether.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>c. Sinks the most capital into reusing the water and the least cost into disposal of surplus water.</p> <p>d. Reduces the up-front cost and allows the total cost to be spread over a longer period. If some form of harbour discharge is required in the interim, the existing one might be used to further free up funds for the reuse solution.</p> <p>e. Leaves the way open for other beneficial uses of the reclaimed wastewater to be included as perception and regulation allows.</p> <p>23. In choosing to move the wastewater treatment plant to the top of Takamātua hill (in part driven by the decision to ultimately dispose of the treated wastewater to land), the Council has committed to the most expensive of the options originally explored. Given the ballooning costs in the intervening years, is it time to reconsider the entire plan and look for a more cost-effective way for the Council to meet its obligations?</p> <p>To conclude, the Council plans to upgrade Akaroa's wastewater treatment plant at high expense such that it will have the potential to produce high quality reclaimed water. It makes sense to make the best use of this substantial capital outlay re-using the recycled wastewater in Akaroa to alleviate water shortages. A combination of re-use with transitional/emergency harbour outfall is a cost-effective, low-risk way to achieve this outcome.</p>				
48.	34103	No							<p>I have lived in the rural area at French Farm for 30 years. I became involved with the issue of Akaroa' wastewater treatment in the early 1900s through my interest in environmental issues and my membership of the Friends of Banks Peninsula. I participated on their behalf in a series of resource consent hearings for applications by the Banks Peninsula District Council to extend consents for the Akaroa treatment system at Takapuneke. From 2003 to 2013 I was a member of the Akaroa Harbour Issues Working Party that was set up by the BPDC and continued by the CCC. I have remained informed about this issue through my membership of Friends of BP and the Akaroa Harbour Marine Protection Society, who both had representatives on the Akaroa and Duvauchelle wastewater working parties set up by CCC in 2008, and through subsequent community involvement and public consultation processes.</p> <p>I have carefully considered the 'Have Your Say – Akaroa treated wastewater options' consultation document, and its supporting information, in particular the Beca Technical Report, the Ngai Tahu Statement and the Joint Statement of the Working Party. I have attended two Council information sessions.</p> <p>In the early 1990s the Friends of BP set up the first recycling facility in Akaroa (at a time when there were still open coastal rubbish dumps at Barrys Bay, Wainui and the outer bays). We were also increasingly concerned about the poor performance of the Harbour's wastewater plants. Wouldn't it be better, we thought, to dispose of the treated wastewater onto or into land? After all this is what our rural septic systems do, and these systems were becoming increasingly sophisticated. We also advocated strongly for reduction - education and incentives to encourage more careful water use -</p>	Jan Cook			Akaroa



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>but successive Councils have never taken any initiative in this regard.</p> <p>It would be fair to say that at that time the fundamental nature of the Ngai Tahu cultural beliefs around human waste were not still well known or understood in the wider community, or indeed by Council.</p> <p>What became clear to me over the next decade or so was that disposing of the volume of</p> <p>wastewater from a small town was a vastly different proposition from that of a rural household. It was not so much a treatment problem as a volume problem.</p> <p>Where was this land for disposal?</p> <p>It needed to be stable, flattish land and located where it won't create problems downstream or downslope. Such land is scarce in the Akaroa area and already has very high value for residential and community use, and agricultural production.</p> <p>The conclusion by around 2010 was that irrigation to land would be very expensive and would still require some level of harbour discharge during wet weather and over winter.</p> <p>The Council applied for resource consent for a harbour discharge, and this was declined in 2015 because it would have a significant adverse effects on tangata whenua and alternatives had not been adequately considered.</p> <p>The last round of public consultation about alternative options in 2017 was invalidated by the subsequent discovery that the wastewater volume was actually more than double what the Council had believed it to be. This consultation did however reveal very high level of public support for reuse in Akaroa.</p> <p>This was the moment in time for the Council to rethink Akaroa's problems, look to the future and develop a sustainable and resilient sewerage, wastewater and water supply system for Akaroa.</p> <p>Reading this latest Consultation Document I felt great disappointment, frustration and sadness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The options proposed are substantially the same as those in 2017, but with much higher costs and in the case of the Inner Bays scheme an even greater footprint.</li> <li>• They are all essentially a continuation of the age old approach of dumping waste 'somewhere else' and heaping up the burdens for future generations.</li> <li>• There is no consideration of dealing comprehensively with the stormwater water and groundwater infiltration that makes up at least 60% of the wastewater and substantially increases both the costs, and the risks and impacts of its disposal. It is unconscionable that the Document completely glosses over this fundamental problem.</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apart from the limited purple pipe potential in the Harbour Outfall option, the problem of Akaroa's water supply is left unresolved, and requiring even more expenditure in the future</li> <li>• The terminal pump station, for which consent has already been granted in 2015, is located only meters from the coast on a former rubbish dump/landfill. This should have been reviewed in light of what we now know about the inevitability of sea-level rise and coastal inundation, and the Fox River disaster last year.</li> <li>• The claimed biodiversity and carbon benefits of the land-based options are just window dressing. On Banks Peninsula indigenous vegetation regenerates naturally and rapidly on marginal land once grazing is excluded, and without irrigation. A relatively small investment by the Council in this area would yield vastly more benefits than would be achieved by the proposed land options.</li> <li>• All the options come with very high sunk costs and are 'out of sight, out of mind' for the Akaroa community that creates the waste, so there would be little future incentive to either the Council or Akaroa to reduce, reuse and recycle.</li> <li>• The Harbour Outfall option does nothing to address the cultural concerns of tangata whenua.</li> </ul> <p>I understand and respect this cultural belief, though I do not share it. I believe that there are now a range of treatment processes available to ensure that treated wastewater is very safe from a public health and environmental perspective, including treatment for potable re-use.</p> <p>We now know that we have a climate emergency and the effects of drought and extreme storm events are upon us. Water supply shortages are a reality in many areas of NZ including Akaroa and Duvauchelle. Previously unthinkable, the idea of recycling wastewater for public use is now firmly on the table at a national level. Three waters reform is being proposed by central Government .</p> <p>I believe that the fundamental principles that we apply to other waste – REDUCE REUSE RECYCLE - must also be applied to our wastewater.</p> <p>I oppose the discharge of large volumes of wastewater to Akaroa Harbour because it is wasteful, and I oppose all the proposed land-based options for the same reason, as well as their expense, high risk and effects on people and communities.</p> <p>I am not directly affected by any of the proposed options, but I have lived in this community for 30 years. I have seen the distress and anxiety that this process has brought to those affected.</p> <p>The storage ponds and levels of irrigation are enormous; nobody would want this on their doorstep, least of all those who do not even receive the benefit of a reticulated sewer service. I am disturbed (though not surprised) by the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>indifference of some people in Akaroa itself, who, it seems, really 'don't care, so long as its not here'.</p> <p>The Inner Bays scheme combined with the Duvauchelle wastewater plans would see a trail of treatment and disposal sites all the way from Akaroa to Duvauchelle. Such a high footprint is completely unacceptable and unnecessary. It is not reasonable or fair to ask rural communities to accept all the consequences of Akaroa's wastewater.</p> <p>As a rural property owner, responsible for my own septic system, I will still be expected to pay through general rates for the cost of Akaroa's wastewater system. This cost will be mostly met by borrowing. A large proportion has not even been budgeted for this stage and will require more borrowing, or the sacrifice of other projects elsewhere. It doesn't look like value for money to me.</p> <p>We now face a global climate, health and economic crisis. Our children and their children are facing ever increasing burdens. It is more important than ever that funds are used wisely to create infrastructure that is efficient, robust, resilient and sustainable.</p> <p>I fully support, and wish to adopt, the submission of the Friends of Banks Peninsula. It proposes a sustainable alternative pathway for our future.</p>				
49.	34101	No					Yes	Yes	<p>My main concern is the risks of pollution to our beautiful land and sea and streams Our harbour and mudflats are very vulnerable to any change and it would only take one spillage to cause havoc for many years to come This would also increase the smell which has gradually improved in recent years I support the family's living near proposed pipes and ponds which has caused huge stress and concerns to all involved culturally emotionally and financially The council needs to invest in upgrading all of Akaroa's water and sewerage to highest possible standard before before committing to the other proposed alternatives.</p>	Raywyn Stronach			Akaroa RD
50.	34100	No							<p>We find ourselves living in unprecedented and uncertain times. We live in a city that has tested our resilience more than most other NZ cities in recent history. The belief that Canterbury residents are more resilient due to adversity is simply not true.</p> <p>The mental well-being of our people should always be highlighted as a priority in community decision making.</p> <p>I believe the impact on the mental well-being of the stakeholders in the inner bay was-tewater option has not been considered.</p> <p>As a society we must put people first before profit before progress. We must nurture ourselves and neighbours to promote healthy relationships and cohesive lives. We need to show empathy and compassion for all to grow healthy communities.</p> <p>Make people the priority</p> <p>I refer to the Christchurch City Council social well-being policy dated 24th August 2000 where it states</p>	Karen Watson			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>* People participate in community life and have a sense of belonging and identity</p> <p>* People and communities participate in decision making and political processes.</p> <p>I endorse the FOBP submission to reject the inner bays proposal.</p>				
51.	34099	No	To the harbour			1	Yes	Yes	<p>We chose to live at ■ Takamatua Valley Road because of the community, open space and quality of life the property offers.</p> <p>This submission is provided in opposition to the Inner Bays Irrigation Scheme proposal including land identified in Takamatua.</p> <p>We find this option being the planting of native trees and subsequent irrigation to be a poorly considered option, this option has a high opportunity cost to the residents of Takamatua and Robinsons Bay and unfairly forces upon them the burden of disposal of wastewater disposal from the Akaroa Township, whilst these residents remain on septic tanks.</p> <p>The information provided by council is misleading by omission and deficient of any management plans.</p> <p>We consider that the Harbour outfall option is appropriate for Akaroa wastewater. Council have a responsibility to ensure this remains a live and viable option. They have a responsibility to develop the harbour outfall proposal further and present accurate costings.</p> <p>We strongly object to the Inner Bays irrigation scheme for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Council Misinformation</p> <p>There is no model of wastewater to native trees model in NZ. Council staff have been mischievous in referencing it to the Wainui irrigation scheme, which is based on a stand of pine trees and wastewater from a very small non-resident community. Not native trees with a significantly higher peak population.</p> <p>Without empirical evidence, council staff have relied upon 'modelling assumptions' which loads the model with assumptions around the ability to irrigate all year round and the nitrate uptake of native trees.</p> <p>The photographs in the consultation document show planting of a young age, yet the trees specified will grow fast and high, quickly becoming a visual and daylight block to adjoining residents.</p> <p>2. Impact on Takamatua residents</p> <p>As adjoining landowners to the proposed native tree irrigation zone, we would not be compensated for the burden or stigma associated with our property adjoining the midge laden native tree zone, we are one of the most affected landowners, in that within 20 metres of our tranquil property we would be exposed to:</p>	David & Julie-Ann Beattie			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>i. Uncontrolled Midge Population</p> <p>The sodden irrigated land will quickly attract a midge population and Council do not have a track record in this area. The Councils own Waste Water Manager , Mr John Mackie admitted in an interview on their management of the Aranui waste water ponds that there is 'There is no silver bullet to control midges' and admits they have been 'unsuccessful in controlling midges in populated areas', forcing residents indoors to avoid the plague of midges. What right does council have to introduce a midge population on our property boundary destroying our quality of outdoor living? Council are mistaken for thinking this is a rural location, Takamatua Valley and Takamatua Foreshore residents will have their quality of life directly affected by plagues of midges.</p> <p>Council have provided no Management plan for residents to review; not only for the control of midges but of all pests which will inevitable be attracted to the land.</p> <p>Midge control strategies require the clearing of vegetation yet planting native trees without a spray management regime will increase not decrease midge populations.</p> <p>The following extract from Stuff NZ quotes the following failed management controls from Christchurch City, the proposed operator of Pond 9:</p> <p>"The council has approached a number of pest control companies throughout New Zealand and was using an insect hormone called S-Methoprene to limit midge numbers.</p> <p>"Any chemicals used for midges control must comply with the treatment plant's resource consents and not affect bird life."</p> <p>The council was unable to do a bulk application of airborne insecticides over the entire ponds, but was experimenting with point spraying, Hoven said.</p> <p>It was clearing vegetation around the oxidation ponds to reduce breeding habitats. It had started a project to monitor midge populations and help test future midge control measures.</p> <p>Midges breed in freshwater and improved treatment at the plant meant cleaner water was entering the oxidation ponds. This had contributed to a midge population increase in the past 10 years, Hoven said."</p> <p>The irony of Mr Hovens comments is that the treated wastewater and the tree irrigation in the Valley will only exasperate the midge population in Takamatua should the irrigation of native trees proceed</p> <p>ii. Traffic Hazards from Midge Population</p> <p>It is well documented that Midges present traffic hazards through swarming, the location of Takamatua native tree stand with underlying stagnant water will create additional traffic hazard for users of State Highway 75. This</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>stretch of road already has had a road fatality due to visibility issues, midge swarms will just add to the traffic risk. There is much evidence across the peninsula already of midge swarming around Lake Forsyth and Little River, where stagnant water exists.</p> <p>iii. High Ground water levels</p> <p>The Takamatua native tree zone, is barely above sea level. During winter this site remains bogged for many months of the year, acting as a natural 'soak pit' for run-off from the upper Takamatua Valley catchment. It has no capacity to take the proposed discharge rates for many months of the year, not the minimal days as modelled.</p> <p>iv. Odour Control</p> <p>No management plan has been provided to convince ourselves as adjoining landowners that Council are committed to an odour management plan arising from the stagnant water from the irrigation field.</p> <p>v. Uncontrolled discharges into Takamatua stream and the impact on native fish population from pumping and distribution failures</p> <p>The Council consultation document has not considered uncontrolled discharges to the Takamatua stream in the event of pumping and failures in the irrigation lines. Irrigation lines will degrade over time from UV, algae blockages and pests. These failures will be difficult to track if the underlying grasses and weeds are not sprayed frequently. Information that is missing from a management plan.</p> <p>Does Ngai Tahu support the discharge of uncontrolled wastewater and nitrate leachates to the adjoining Takamatua Stream? A stream well known for its native eel population and whitebait spawning areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Takamatua Stream discharges directly into Takamatua Bay an amenity enjoyed by fishermen, swimmers and recreational boaties. Has the impact of wastewater discharges been considered on the fish population and users of Takamatua Bay? Has the risk of failure and impact on the Takamatua mudflats been discussed with Ngai Tahu?</p> <p>vi Nitrate Leaching into Takamatua groundwater</p> <p>Council have not provided any evidence that the irrigation field proposed will not leach nitrates into ground water and the Takamatua Stream. The irrigation zones adjoin the Takamatua Stream and fish populations within the stream include native eels and whitebait spawning zones.</p> <p>Additional leachate into the ground water levels of the Takamatua Valley could be detrimental to residents' health, with nitrate build-up in the ground water affecting stock, vegetable gardens, fruit and nut orchards.</p> <p>The levels of nitrate in the consultation document is not reflective of modern removal standards. Native Trees as a medium for the removed of nitrogen</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>are known as a poor choice to remove nitrogen, a native plant such as Kanuka could only be expected to remove 20% of applied nitrogen.</p> <p>vii Aerosol Dispersion of Contaminated Wastewater in Winds</p> <p>As an adjoining landowner, the aerosol dispersal of contaminated wastewater onto our property during winds must be mitigated.</p> <p>The consultation document provides no management plan to deal with the dispersal so close to residential properties. The statement in the consultation document 'low risk to public health' is not a risk an adjoining residential property owner should be forced to accept from a commercial operation. Stating that drippers will be used and not sprayers is not a mitigation.</p> <p>Zero risk from pathogens and viruses must be the minimum standard.</p> <p>There is no outflow buffer incorporated in the system as designed. Meaning the wastewater leaves the treatment site without testing for compliance. This could see the irrigation fields at risk of receiving inadequately treated wastewater.</p> <p>viii High Groundwater Levels – Septic Tank System Failures in Takamatua – ECAN commitment required</p> <p>As Takamatua Valley and foreshore residents will still be operating in-ground wastewater septic tank systems, we have real concerns that increased ground water conditions may cause these systems to fail, placing a financial burden on residents for their systems to comply with ECAN discharge requirements. No information has been provided on the impact of groundwater levels on adjoining landowners to the irrigated land.</p> <p>A guarantee is required from ECAN that they will not pursue Takamatua landowners for Septic Tank failures arising from Council artificially increasing groundwater levels. Or if they do Council will indemnify landowners for any costs associated with Ecan compliance.</p> <p>2. Impact on Takamatua Valley from Native Tree Irrigation</p> <p>i. Fragmented Land Holdings – The Social Consequence and Economic Loss</p> <p>The land holdings identified in the Inner Bays Irrigation system are extremely fragmented in nature and do not make for an efficient tree irrigation system.</p> <p>Conversion of high value flat pasture into a low value smelly bush stands, creating shady, midge ridden visual blockers in the Valley has a negative impact on Takamatua and Robinson Bay residents.</p> <p>An immediate consequence will be the low loss of amenity and lifestyle from the removal of open land and pasture, which will translate into the loss of value of our property, with no compensation from Council.</p> <p>We chose to live in a populated valley, with open space, not in the bush.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Council have shown a total lack of respect for the Takamatua and Robinson Bay communities, who currently receive little infrastructure support. The water resource of Takamatua Stream is already siphoned off to support the high needs of Akaroa Township, returning their wastewater to our community is offensive and culturally insensitive to us.</p> <p>ii. Valley Catchment – Inability of the Takamatua Valley soil to cope with saturated soils</p> <p>Disposal of waste water into the Takamatua Valley catchment increases the risk of erosion and potential soil structure failure in the event of a Storm event. The resulting damage from flash flood events would materialise in the bank erosion of the Takamatua Stream causing bridge and approach failures, including downstream State Highway 75.</p> <p>There are many water tributaries which feed into the Takamatua Stream; in storm events they already fail to cope with water-flows from the Valley above – with visible flooding of the lower valley properties. Saturated sub-soils in the lower valley will only exasperate the water flows forced into these streams, creating a higher risk of flooding, road closures and slips.</p> <p>iii. Tree Replacement Zones</p> <p>Takamatua Valley is a natural micro-climate and as a result trees do grow well. However we have not seen any information on where replacement land will be supplied from when the trees mature and require felling, if all the flat land is covered with trees, where will the replacement land come from in 10-15 years, when the trees have reached maximum growth. Native bush stands will reach maximum height and cease to grow. At that point continuing to irrigate land will increase saturation levels.</p> <p>Failure to provide for tree replacement zones will see the saturated soils yield the trees to fungal disease, weed infestation and an increased fire risk.</p> <p>iv. Tree Fall due to Storm Events</p> <p>With the soils continually saturated, trees will not be forced to send their roots in to deeper soils for stability; the resulting shallow roots; will make them extremely susceptible to tree fall in Storm event. Native Trees are not invincible.</p> <p>What planning or contingency has been given to such an event? If the irrigation infrastructure becomes damaged and no further irrigation possible for many months whilst damaged trees were removed and infrastructure replaced – what is the contingency?</p> <p>v. Management Plan – Fungal Disease, Weed Control, Pest and Possum Control</p> <p>The consultation document has no information on a management plan for the establishment and long-term control of the effects from the irrigated trees. Native trees are even more susceptible to fungal disease from soil</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>saturation, how will this risk be mitigated?</p> <p>In the establishment phase there will need to be intensive weed management and grass clearing to mitigate the fire risk to the Takamatua and Robinsons Bay communities. This will require a 24/7 Council response every day of the summer period, holiday periods included to reduce the fire risk.</p> <p>Native bush stands will increase possum and hare infestations in our property and pose a greater risk to stock from TB, destroy gardens and increase the predator population targeting native bird populations in the Valley. With rampant possum and hare populations in Takamatua Valley, introducing hectares of new plantings will grow the base population. What humane management controls are proposed?</p> <p>Council staff seem blasé to the 'how' and assume they can 'contract out of this responsibility'.</p> <p>At the Christchurch City council session on 4th August, we were alarmed to hear council staff -make the statement that there would be a contract sum for tree establishment and a contract 'tail' of a couple of years and then naively think the trees would look after themselves, yet the impact on residents in the Valley is forever.</p> <p>Council need to be up front with how they will manage the irrigated trees, the infrastructure needed for the irrigation field and not assume they can contract out of their responsibilities.</p> <p>In purchasing our property, we did not seek to live in a heavily bushed area, instead we chose a flat open area with view of stock and open spaces.</p> <p>vi. Fire Control</p> <p>As responsible landowners we work hard to ensure the risk of Fire in the Peninsula is always mitigated, by ensuring grass is kept to minimal levels, and trees are well pruned, and dead wood removed.</p> <p>The nil commentary on management does not take a responsible view to mitigating fire risk in the Valley and ultimately the Peninsula. Planting hectares of combustible material adjoining a state highway, which if ignited would act as a torch to the valley and the greater Peninsula is negligent.</p> <p>Native trees zones are more susceptible to fire from lightning strikes – as evidenced by the 2011 fire in the Hinewai Native Reserve on Banks Peninsula.</p> <p>An effluent pond in Robinsons Bay should not be considered as a water source in control due to the health and safety risk to fire officers in accessing wastewater.</p> <p>Do the NZ Fire Service support the Inner Bays native tree plantings in populated areas, and do they have the volunteer resources to fight fires arising from the native bush stands?</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Summary</p> <p>The Inner Bays Irrigation Scheme is flawed in its design and intent.</p> <p>It places an unfair social and financial burden on Takamtaua and Robinsons Bay resident</p> <p>The Inner Bays Irrigation Scheme will require intensive management and ongoing costs, Council have failed to demonstrate they understand the consequences of the ongoing management and financial cost in the consultation document.</p> <p>The disposal of wastewater in Takamatua Valley will bring with its extraordinary management responsibilities that Council must not only manage to the latest International best practice but ensure the negative outcomes of wastewater irrigation do not become a lifelong burden for Takamatua and Robinson Bay residents.</p> <p>Midge population control, bird, pest eradication, fire risks are the most obvious management responsibilities. However we are merely guardians of the land and Council has in innate responsibility to protect the natural Takamatua Valley environment and not subject it to erosion, nitrate leachates and irreversible damage through failure to plan for another community's waste water disposal.</p>				
52.	34096	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Akaroas wastewater should be dealt with in Akaroa- not transporting to surrounding communities as an out of sight out of mind solution -with detrimental consequences of taking land from landowners- against their wishes, use of land against the landowners existing rights, access on paper roads contry to the legal purposes of paper roads, detrimental effects on wild life and no reseach into this delicate coastal eco system, impractical ideas of tree planting success on easterly facing slopes exposed to wind storms and salt.	Louisa Narbey			Akaroa
53.	34095	No	To the land		1		Yes	Yes	<p>I welcome the opportunity to provide a summary of my comment on these proposals.</p> <p>Harbour Outfall Scheme</p> <p>With reference to this option, I object to the disposal of semi-treated and un-disinfected wastewater to the central part of the harbour. The long term effects on marine life, bathing quality and silting of the harbour and bays is unknown and risky.</p> <p>Ticked Option</p> <p>I have ticked the box for Gough's Bay land-based option, not because I believe it to be the best option, but because I view this as the least worst option. None of the options available would be my first choice. This is consistent with my preference expressed at the Working Party. I have considerable reservations about both the site selection and irrigation process proposed, particularly the risks associated with complete reliance on native tree planting to soak up intensely irrigated treated wastewater, especially in exposed locations. Native trees do not normally require irrigation; otherwise</p>	Ivor McChesney			

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>they would not be native trees.</p> <p>Intention and Result</p> <p>My view is that the land based irrigation scheme presented for consultation fails to adequately satisfy the scope or intentions of the Consent Commissioners' tasking statement of 2015. All options presented for consultation introduce significant amenity and wellbeing issues into established bay communities, who also suffer the indignity of Akaroa wastewater imposed upon them.</p> <p>It is equally clear that 'technically feasible' as a principal pre-requisite for screening sites has prioritised flatter land and brought site selection into direct conflict with established farming and settlement on the lower coastal plains. I doubt it was ever the intention of the Commissioners to shoehorn an agricultural based wastewater disposal system into and around the populated areas of the Peninsular bays as the only possible option - yet this is what has happened. As a direct consequence of this approach, no community acceptable location, or land-based discharge solution as been found.</p> <p>Disposal via Irrigation</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed intensity of wastewater disposal arriving constantly from a treatment plant operating 24/7 to agricultural irrigation requires a number of significant engineering additions. In effect these represent little more than a series of engineering 'fixes' to make the unworkable, workable. They are prevalent throughout the proposals and in each of the options. They include the substantial storage ponds within bay communities, the need for multiple discharge sites and multiple storage locations, including a considerable expansion of the treatment site adjacent to the main road into Akaroa. This site now includes another critical fix, a substantial covered, but raw sewage pond, to enable the previously consented treatment works to operate efficiently, and further ponds including a wetland to achieve storage and discharge to the inshore waters of Childrens Bay whenever necessary. Both of these should introduce very considerable concern to Akaroa residents.</p> <p>In effect, these fixes and associated cost engineering are the principal generators of adverse social and visual effects generated by the proposals and, if proven to be un-mitigatable, will bring significant and unnecessary long-term change to both the targeted option bays and to Akaroa at both Pond Site 10 and Childrens Bay. Additionally, if selected, the cumulative effect of the Inner Bays Irrigation Scheme Harbour with other potential treatment proposals, would likely establish an empire of wastewater treatment sites extending along the Christchurch to Akaroa road from Duvauchelle to Glen Bay. This seems a high price for proposals that fail to either address or offer, any significant opportunity for sustainable reuse of water as a natural resource, and a guarantee of future water supply to Akaroa.</p> <p>Wastewater as a Resource</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Treating wastewater to a standard suitable to supplement potable water shortages appears not have been seriously considered. Treatment standards have now been determined by other factors, and disposal, albeit to irrigation, has become the driving ethos, rather than an integrated management approach to water as a scarce natural resource.</p> <p>This attitude was clearly reflected in a subsequent decision to deny investigation into MAR (Managed Aquifer Recharge/Replenishment). Failure to investigate this technically advanced process as a serious alternative demonstrates an ever-increasing commitment to disposal by irrigation as the only feasible option. It also demonstrates that the council have not investigated all potential land based-disposal options.</p> <p>It is my intention to prepare a separate paper for the hearing, but my initial conclusion is that the current proposals come with both a significant price tag and significant risks. The burden of decision to adopt any one of these options cannot be taken lightly. But perhaps it is not even necessary?</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>My recommendation to Members is that a decision on this proposal is premature given likely future government changes of direction in relation to the sustainable use of water resources. We may well be expending significant financial resources in a time of austerity on a scheme that is only achieving half the answer we need.</p> <p>I will alternatively suggest that we draw a line under the present proposals and investigate a temporary wastewater upgrade to the existing plant to provide sufficient time for further investigation into options we have so far failed to consider. These would include,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious investigation into aquifer replenishment methodologies - these are technically advanced land-based options that have no direct effect on or requirement for land acquisition</li> <li>• Raising the level of wastewater treatment process sufficient for it to cross the threshold between being a waste to being an asset (probably reverse osmosis or similar)</li> <li>• Consideration to extending the harbour outfall to a location closer to the heads to improve flushing in association with increased treatment standard and other initiatives</li> </ul> <p>These measures would open the door to both a safer and more acceptable interim harbour discharge solution, whilst simultaneously offering the opportunity to facilitate experimental longer term reuse to supplement public water supply in times of drought. This would provide a greater level of certainty as a prelude to a revised wastewater scheme based on sustainable management rather than one based on asset disposal with all its attendant risks and adverse effects to amenity and community wellbeing.</p>				
54.	34094	No							I endorse our submission - friends of banks peninsula. This has closed early.	Rachelle Connolly			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
55.	34093	No							<p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <p>I fully endorse the submission lodged by the Friends of Banks Peninsula proposing the council investigate options that adopt potential for re-use of wastewater and have a long-term plan and vision that is sustainable for managing and dealing with Akaroa's wastewater and water supply. Akaroa's water shortage issues are predicted to get worse. To me it makes more sense to have the water treated to a level where it can be used to address a problem rather than finding a solution which is purely for disposal.</p> <p>The Friends of Banks Peninsula's submission provides all the scientific and technical evidence and the purpose of my submission is to express my own concerns, feelings and thoughts on this issue and how it impacts on me and my connection with Robinsons Bay.</p> <p>I would like to lodge my submission against the wastewater options proposed by Christchurch City Council and in particular the Inner Bays option which includes Robinson's Bay and Takamatua for the disposal of the wastewater generated in Akaroa. This option has the most significance for me as a landowner in Robinson's Bay.</p> <p>BACKGROUND:</p> <p>I am the owner of land in Robinsons Bay [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] This land has been in my family for several generations being purchased by my grandfather from his brother John Duxbury in 1951 and put in the names of my late mother and aunt. The land in Robinsons Bay was subsequently farmed by my grandfather Alex Duxbury and this particular piece of land became solely my mother's after her sister's death. It was my grandfather's wish that his daughters never sell this block of land. Robinsons Bay has particular significance in my family with my mother growing up there and my grandfather farming there until his death.</p> <p>My wish is that this property remains in the family and is a place that future generations can use, visit and enjoy through the heritage that we have been privileged to inherit from our forefathers. For me this is also about maintaining the integrity of Robinson's Bay and what it offers not only to the residents but also all bays of Banks Peninsula. To put this at risk is a dangerous precedent and one that needs to be avoided for not only the residents and the environment but also for the reputation of this highly regarded area which has proven value for so many visitors.</p> <p>CONCERNS:</p> <p>I have been considering exploring options of possibly building and residing on this block if consent was approved. These plans have been impacted by the proposed plan of having wastewater ponds in close proximity and not being fully confident that many factors of concern can't be fully mitigated. These include risks around environmental impact with the proposed scheme being close to existing waterways.</p>	Pamela Fisher			

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>The impact of such a solution in the identified location in Robinson's Bay is significant with it having a large footprint on the landscape and being in a high profile area of the valley using prime land and with several homes in close proximity. Although we have been informed that there won't be any odour and the issues of midges and sand flies are acknowledged, I think this still provides reason for concern from experience as I believe it is still an unknown and climate and seasonal factors play such a huge part in this.</p> <p>With any scheme, there is going to be significant impact with the construction and development. For this Inner Harbour option this is huge with it being so close to homes and construction will take a lengthy period of time. This in itself will have a serious impact on the social wellbeing of the community. It also has the potential to have an economic impact for people who have chosen Robinson's Bay as their home because of what it has to offer in terms of lifestyle and values. Because of the stigma that is already being expressed around having a wastewater system in the heart of the valley, it could well depreciate the values of surrounding properties and make it difficult for people to be able to sell.</p> <p>From what I understand land based options are still unproven and experimental so for this reason, I consider the Robinson's Bay site is too visible to be considered as an option for wastewater disposal. The site is also a known flood zone and often has a high water table so I have concerns about the ability for this site to absorb more and whether the planting will be sufficient to alleviate the impact of this. This also poses a drainage issue for this area. There is also the environmental impact on the land and streams from nutrient buildup as well as the building up of heavy metals, pharmaceuticals and hormones.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>On a more holistic level, I find the intention to use Robinsons Bay and Takamatua as areas for disposal of wastewater that is not required or needed extremely disappointing in the effect this would have on the integrity, character and nature of these bays. This will irrevocably be destroyed and the impact on the social wellbeing of these communities would be at very high risk.</p> <p>Through attending several meetings where this issue has been discussed, I have experienced this first hand. The strong community connection is evident and these residents are passionate about maintaining their current environment, not putting it at risk or having it threatened for the land or the people.</p> <p>I don't feel that enough research has been done to instill confidence in the residents of Robinsons Bay or Takamatua to reassure everyone of the potential worst case scenarios and what contingencies would be actioned in the event of unpredictable events. These could include natural situations eg. Cyclones producing unseasonal and extreme rainfall as has occurred recently, breakdowns in the treatment process and the consequences of frequent disposal of wastewater on land and potential buildups of elements that could be detrimental to the natural environment.</p> <p>Finally I do want to say that I understand the position the Christchurch City</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Council is facing with trying to develop options to deal with the wastewater from Akaroa that will be successful and comply with consents and be accepted by the Banks Peninsula community.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION:</p> <p>I fully support the proposal from the Friends of Robinsons Bay for the council to explore re-use options for the wastewater from Akaroa. This would address a need for water as a valuable resource in a community that is often deprived of this during particular months. I believe it is a much better option to find a use for this water which helps provide a solution rather than dispose of it as a waste product.</p> <p>A solution that maximises benefits and minimises risks definitely makes sense to me as I am sure it does to many others.</p>				
56.	34092	No					Yes	Yes	<p>I have not decided on a preferred option:</p> <p>If the local rūnanga, of Ōnuku and Koukourarata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu are not happy with a harbour outfall then I do not support this either.</p> <p>If a land based option is chosen I support the provision of reticulated water systems being provided to "downstream" land owners. I have some concerns regarding a relatively untested method of irrigation into a planted indigenous forest where the irrigation "hoses" need to be maintained for the life of the waste water plant.</p> <p>I support planting or better still managed regeneration on dedicated land to offset any residual carbon emissions of the scheme.</p> <p>I advocate for a focus on minimising the necessary size of the wastewater scheme, and the resulting discharge of treated water:</p> <p>through community education and advocacy on conservation of water use and volume of wastewater production, being mindful of the geographic constraints for treatment and discharge in the Akaroa harbour catchment</p> <p>through improved capture and isolation of wastewater collection, to minimise unnecessary treatment of stormwater</p> <p>high level treatment of water to allow for maximum reuse in irrigation or domestic non consumption uses</p> <p>advocating for appropriate national level policies and guidelines for re-use of treated wastewater</p>	Diana Robertson			Christchurch
57.	34091	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>This is additional to an email I forwarded to Tara late Sunday evening just before midnight in haste!</p> <p>The so called waste water is a valuable resource to a community that regularly advertises water restrictions throughout the summer.</p>	Susan Elizabeth Bain			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>I urge the council to look into developing legislation that would support the use of highly treated waste water. And there fore I support a purple pipe reticulation system for the use in gardens etc.</p> <p>I would further support that the waste water be treated to an extremely high standard so that it would meet 21st century best practise, and that it could be reused safely. Everything should be done to re use this asset. It was disheartening to hear at the consulataion meetings held in Akaroa that the outer bays farms had become less keen on using any of the proposed water because of the standard of treatment, and because of other farming regulations.</p> <p>I find it difficult to understand why a wetland would be sited on top of a hill located by the Old Coach Road.</p> <p>I do not support the inner bays waste water plan. The Robinsons Bays ponds, (as big as football fields and with high bunds topped with roading and security fencing, and later described as a dam) -- does not meet the cultural, historical, and food production values and needs of the families that live and earn their livelihoods in that valley. No amount of detailed landscaping plans and replanted native bush will negate the fact that local residents have little confidence in any part of the plan. I believe it will be detrimental to our overall security, health and wellbeing, it will effect livlihoods, it will be out of scale and place in valley which did not seek this intrusion, and it will effect property values.</p> <p>I am concerned about the drip irrigation proposal of native trees on the inner harbour hill side in Robinsons Bay. Extreme weather events, and we have had a few, cause flooding and slipping here. I know the parameters regarding slope and the amount water to be dripped have been changed for this latest 2020 plan.</p> <p>I understand the reluctance of having a harbour outfall pipe in the inner harbour. So ask why a longer outfall pipe that reaches beyond the heads is not considered. Waste water from Christchurch City is piped out into the sea of the New Brighton shore. I would support this measure.</p> <p>I am shocked at how the cost projections have ballooned in the time this project has been mooted.</p> <p>And finally, I am confused at how the treated waste water is spoken of as a high standard, but seemingly not high enough for any use. So lets set the bar higher. And use it.</p> <p>Please urge the city council to initiate some legislation concerning the use of the treated water for a purple pipe supply to Akaroa township.</p> <p>The sea out fall should extend beyond the heads.</p> <p>I heard the ponds planned for Robinsons Bay described as having a road on top of a large bund, and with security fencing. Eventually the ponds were referred to as a dam. All this at the consultation meeting in Akaroa. What are we really being served with.</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									I do not support the land based options.				
58.	34090	No	To the harbour	3	1	2		Yes		Bernard Rennell			Akaroa
59.	34089	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	The Inner Harbour option provides unique opportunities for connecting with the landscape. It creates new environments and ecosystems in the development. It allows visitors and residents to Akaroa better understand the resource of water, our relationships with it, and a platform to educate on these.  Outer bay options have the potential to filtrate into the volcanic aquifer system, and may result in impacts to potable (spring) water supplies and natural spring systems.	Sam Hampton			Christchurch
60.	34087	No	To the harbour	3	2	3	No	No		Robyn Fleck			Christchurch
61.	34086	No						Yes	Please note: this submission would have been done on the website however it has been brought to our attention this has been closed early. This is totally unacceptable and it appears council staff are determined to thwart any opposition to their proposal.  • Introduction – Richard and Susan Lovett ■ Tizzards Rd, Robinsons Bay, Akaroa  We are settlors of the Kimberley Farm Trading Trust which owns the Tizzards Road property and a commercial property in Akaroa. The Tizzards Rd property is on a triangle of land the apex of which is the intersection of Kingstons Hill Rd and Tizzards Rd. There are views across the valley and harbour including the target properties for the Inner Harbour proposal.  In 2001 we moved into the Tizzards Rd property having spent considerable funds on renovation of the existing cottage originally built in the 1800s, and construction of an addition with the intention of developing a sustainable bed and breakfast business.  We planted extensive orchards and gardens, and thousands of native trees and plants; cleaned up a variety of weeds including periwinkle, montbretia, aluminium plant, iris, and sycamore; undertook pest control targeting feral cats, rats, stoats, possums and ferrets; renovated the stream banks with native grasses, flaxes and toi toi removing gunnera, pampas and ivy. We were involved in bird monitoring for Ecan and trapping in the wider area. Unbanded tui were seen in our garden within 12 months of the reintroduction of tui to Banks Peninsula. We have photographic evidence of their nest building at this time.  The produce from our lifestyle property combined with as much local produce as possible was used in our boutique 5* bed and breakfast business.  This business endured many challenges of earthquakes, the GFC and personal challenges. It was developed with a view to providing a peaceful retreat for others and ultimately our retirement. It was also a base for two smaller businesses developed post-earthquake to provide cruise passengers with more options.	Richard & Susan Lovett		Kimberley Farm Trading Trust	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>When we purchased the property it was carefully chosen for location, quietness, the stream, the view, the lack of industrial and intensive residential development and factory farming, the climate, potential for development of gardens, orchard and native bush, natural amenities, and the overall ambience including a predominantly like minded community. We have both enjoyed discovering the history of the bay area including the</p> <p>The cottage and land, form part of the valley history with dams, sheds and relics of the dairy industry on site. The house and garden were part of a holiday retreat in the mid 20th century with a collection of cabins in the garden.</p> <p>Both of us have been involved in the Robinsons Bay School Road Reserve for over 15 years with working bees, secretary and chair of the committee. We have donated time and artefacts to the displays and were extensively involved in the design and layout of the current Reserve.</p> <p>Currently our home and property are rented to a long standing peninsula family. This decision was made in 2017 when it became apparent that we would be fighting the proposed wastewater disposal for many years. We simply did not have the energy to invest in ongoing battles, maintaining the property and running businesses. Therefore, we have closed all the businesses until such time as a decision is made on the wastewater as there is no point continuing to pour money and energy into further developing something which could be ripped away from us.</p> <p>We have been developing other options on Stewart Island as well as travelling. Ultimately, we would like to return to continue with the vision we started in 2001. However, we are not prepared to endure years of uncertainty and potential losses through the destruction of the many values dear to us should the pond option go ahead in Robinsons Bay.</p> <p>We are not going to address each option as we believe these have been covered in various submissions including Friends of Banks Peninsula which we fully support. Instead we will concentrate on our personal views of the option that will have the biggest impact on us, and on solutions that will directly involve the creators of the waste rather than the current out of sight out of mind proposals.</p> <p>The Options</p> <p>Our first preference is for the Akaroa storm water and ground water ingress into the sewer system to be addressed more quickly than the current rate of repair. It is patently unfair to require residents of an area not utilising the sewer system in any way, to suffer the consequences of the inadequacy, and outright abuse of the sewer system by illegal stormwater connection and disrepair of an ill maintained system. The gains for the Akaroa residents should not be at the expense and losses of another community. Akaroa residents should be taking responsibility for their problem rather than moving it elsewhere.</p> <p>Our second preference in addition to the first, is for the reuse via purple pipe.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>New Zealand is not special. Reuse is successfully employed in many countries of the world. The environmental impact of developing a sustainable reuse policy is preferable to creating unsightly and disruptive ponds in environments where no such wetland system is naturally occurring.</p> <p>The recycling of water is undertaken in areas with shortages. Akaroa is a prime candidate for reuse. It is ridiculous to take water from an area that suffers annual shortages and restrictions, build expensive, potentially damaging and unsightly infrastructure with ongoing expenses to achieve nothing more than can be achieved by judicious planting. We suggest if the supporters would like a native forest they plant one just as we have done. Our native plantings have grown without any form of irrigation let alone times of full saturation with nutrient laden waste water.</p> <p>We do not agree that the inner harbour scheme is the best option for many reasons.</p> <p>We fully acknowledge the inappropriate siting of the current wastewater treatment system. Unfortunately, the protagonists of this abomination will not suffer the consequences of it being moved. Instead another wrong will be imposed on another community many of whom, including ourselves, find the proposal offensive on many levels. This will be imposed again by people who do not have to suffer the substantial consequences, losses, and disruptions to their lives, onto those who will suffer.</p> <p>It has become apparent some people will gain financially at the expense of others in their community yet this is of no concern to them. They are quite happy to selfishly push their own agendas.</p> <p>We do not believe that the reality of the proposed construction of the Inner Harbour option has been made clear by the CCC. The use of pictures of ponds without security fencing, roading etc is deceptive at best.</p> <p>The pond will be lined, it will not be continuously full, it will be a haven for insects and Canada Geese. It will create a stigma and be unacceptable to surrounding property owners and potential buyers, it will be unsightly, the construction will be disruptive, unsightly, noisy and proposed mitigation will be years from being screened. It will have a large security fence. None of this has been depicted in the CCC diagrams or doctored photographs therefore there is no ability to fully understand the consequences.</p> <p>We are concerned about the threats to downstream properties from contaminated runoff, potential dam break, unsightly time consuming earthworks, the health of the harbour particularly Robinsons Bay which already suffers from high nutrient loadings and contamination from Canada Geese. We do not accept the argument that the sewerage water will have less nutrients than cattle on the same land. This is a specious argument. The land is not currently heavily stocked in adverse weather conditions or indeed all year round. The potential of runoff from a small number of cattle intermittently on pasture is in no way comparable to the huge modification of land form and natural environment proposed.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>The timeframe for construction is double that of harbour outfall.</p> <p>While harbour outfall is not, theoretically, our preferred option it is the best of a bad bunch with the least visual, environmental, financial and cultural impact. The is less risk of contamination to the upper harbour area which does not flush readily.</p> <p>The timescale for construction is significantly less than other options. Once complete it will not be adversely impacted by any reduction in inflow as the stormwater and broken sewer pipe issues are addressed, whereas the inner harbour option has the potential to become an oversized white elephant causing unnecessary damage and adversity.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the proposed costs are excessive when compared to other communities. E.g. Southland District Council maintains sewage treatment for 19 towns with a total estimated replacement cost of \$123million whereas CCC are proposing a scheme to service 1 town of less population than several in the Southland total.</p> <p>Additionally the Stewart Island system has staff a few minutes drive away and on call to deal with any problems and emergencies. Unless CCC are proposing to have resident technicians in Robinsons Bay the time from the notification of a problem to the resolution is likely to be hours rather than minutes. This leaves land and water open to contamination.</p> <p>We have seen many ponds similar to the proposed in many parts of the world. The things in common are unsightly security fencing, a large number of warning signs surrounding the area and impacting on the character, background noise of agitators and pumps, odour, and insects. As the ponds age rather than problems decreasing they tend to increase as equipment and structural failures become more frequent.</p> <p>These ponds are generally situated in lower socio economic areas due to a reluctance to live near waste water ponds and consequently the property values being extremely cheap. The surrounding properties are often run down and unkempt, with collections of old vehicles, semi permanent shelter, transient populations, and totally out of character for the Robinsons Bay valley area.</p> <p>Costs – if as an example 1000 connections were replaced with composting toilets at the retail price, it would cost \$1.6m excluding installation. It doesn't take much to work out there are more cost effective environmentally friendly options than building a massive pond which will literally involve pushing shlt up hill.</p> <p>We do not believe the costings provided by council are a true reflection of the actual costs of each proposal.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We have only addressed our particular concerns while supporting the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission to address the scientific aspect on our behalf.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>We have concerns for our community and environment with the inner harbour proposal. We see no positives to the inner harbour proposal.</p> <p>We do not think sufficient consideration has been given to reuse and to mitigation of ground and storm water inflows and effects of climate change. We would like council to give further consideration to the national 3 Waters Reform Project before rushing in and spending vast amounts of money on a project which may well not fit with national policy within a short time.</p> <p>We do not think our community should be punished for the past wrongs and ask that our cultural values be duly considered. i.e we find it incredibly offensive to have wastewater disposal on our doorstep.</p> <p>We do not think the costs are being fairly apportioned i.e. some Robinsons Bay residents stand to lose, or have already lost, significant values in property due to prolonged construction noise and disruption, upgraded infrastructure and destruction of natural amenities while others will be compensated for land. That said there is no amount of money would compensate for the destruction of the future aspirations of ourselves and our neighbours.</p> <p>There is also a significant disruption to lives and future planning affected by drop in property values, inability to sell, uncertainty of outcomes, and projected prolonged construction disruptions.</p> <p>We wish to be heard in support of our submission.</p>				
62.	34084	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	No	No	Culturally it is offensive to put it on the land. Akaroa needs to sort there own waste water not ruin other Bays. The Harbour outfall is the only common sense option to respect the majority rights of the people of the Peninsula.	Tom Thurston			Christchurch
63.	34083	No	To the harbour						<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Our waste water system is a wasteful high water use system.</p> <p>This needs addressing particularly with the increase in population, wastefulness of potable water and not looking at reducing water use.</p> <p>Have spent large amounts of money just looking at options– surely a national working party to help would save costs and provide national direction as to future proofing systems. Akaroa is not the only town or place needing to update sewage – need a national direction (help with gaining a national direction and ideas particularly from places like Australia water is valued)– not every place recreate the wheel.</p> <p>People need to value water. Need to charge for water use as well as waste removal to ensure households think about, take ownership of impacts.</p> <p>Options costs are too high and they do not address long term needs or future water use or availability of water resources.</p> <p>Level of water - thinking can reduce storm water component even when gaining further population, calculations are likely to underestimate volumes</p>	Natasha Coad			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>and future volumes, and need much bigger storage and higher wastewater disposal rate – or more land.</p> <p>Akaroa is one town that can lead the way in having an effective, water efficient and good future proofed modern systems in place.</p> <p>Of the options presented -currently with the amounts of water – need a harbour outfall as dealing with too high volumes of water.</p> <p>To respect Ngai Tahu wish to restore maui to the water – need to identify how this is achieved – and if can go through series of wetland settling ponds then run to pond to pump sea.</p> <p>Like an idea suggested of generating power on the run back down the hill- even if it covers power needed to pump up hill or out to sea.</p> <p>Water quality must be of high level. No discharge of any untreated sewage should be allowed. There was talk of an emergency release/ discharge valve – this is crazy to be allowed to discharge straight out even if filtering through Childrens Bay land– must be contained into another backup storage or contained area.</p> <p>The US have individual water reuse toilets or fancy composting toilets. For the cost of the number of households this could even be a feasible option rather than a whole archaic sewage system.</p> <p>Seen a huge expense on investigating options which even without much knowledge knew were not going to be feasible, nor information being correctly provided (i.e. can graze stock – make hay - how to do this while irrigating and wanting to be dry – and then can't feed to stock ....); soils are prone to slippage and concern that cannot sustain the level of irrigation calculated.</p> <p>Overall:</p> <p>Need to address the current use of water – look at changing household toilet systems and the cost of replacement?? "Water means life – don't waste a drop!"</p> <p>Our Takamatua Stream cannot sustain Akaroas water requirements.</p> <p>Reuse of water and rest to ocean outfall (after being highly treated and then maui restoration process)</p> <p>Ensure containment of all non treated sewage.</p> <p>Want all Akaroa residents to value and respect water use.</p> <p>Not "Irrigation" options. High cost and high failure risk and too much water to dispose of.</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
64.	34082	No	To the harbour						<p>1 Overview:</p> <p>2 Summary of our views on the options presented we do not support the options as currently presented but make the following observations.</p> <p>3 Council consider further the Harbour Outfall option, but it must be modified with some form of land contact to restore mauri to water, such as a constructed sub-surface wetland post the wastewater treatment plant.</p> <p>4 Given the large cost difference between this and the landbased options, it would still be the lowest-cost option with the least environmental and social impacts.</p> <p>5 This option will have a lower annual operational cost which will benefit all the landowners in Akaroa.</p> <p>6 This system has the most resilience (In-terms of effects by hazards and climate change) of the options suggested by Council</p> <p>7 We would suggest that the Council investigates further and targets substantial repairs and renewal of the existing waster water network system to minimise the over capitalisation of the treatment plant.</p> <p>8 With climate change occurring we would suggest that the CCC also investigates further and implement a long term plan to head towards a "purple pipe reuse" system for irrigation of parks and reserves in Akaroa and to those property owners who wish to receive the highly treated wastewater.</p>	Grant Arthur & Elizabeth Jean Bain Lovell			Christchurch
65.	34081	Yes							<p>I have lived in Robinsons Bay for 30 years and developed a strong connection to the land, the people who worked it before me, and the community who live here now. We are bound by a shared sense of history and appreciation for this environment. There is a love of this place and a commitment to it that runs deep.</p> <p>Representing Robinsons Bay on the Akaroa Wastewater Working Party has taken much of my personal time over the past four years. I have gained a thorough understanding of the Inner Bays proposal and the impacts of the Inner Bays proposal on the Robinsons Bay community, and of the community views as I have held many meetings with the community to gauge this as their representative.</p> <p>The Council is putting our people and environment, heritage, values and properties at risk with its proposal to store and irrigate Akaroa's wastewater next to our homes. The closer people are, the more at risk they are of adverse effects and the more they will suffer over the year of excavation to dig the storage pond. Downstream neighbours will live with an ongoing heightened flood risk. All of us will see this storage pond every time we drive through or walk in our once beautiful valley. Odour, noise, midges will be problems than can pop up any time. Our heritage will be trampled on, destroyed and planted over. Possibly people will drift away, taking a hit on their property values. The system may need to creep out and expand if it proves short of room or we could just be left with an environmental mess if this experimental system fails. This is a genuine worry. The Akaroa wastewater system has been poorly managed for years as evidenced by the</p>	Suky Thompson			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>faulty flow meter debacle. A resource consent and two consultations have been based on the wrong data, and now, even when the correct flows are known and most of it is infiltration, the proposal is still based on collecting up Akaroa's stormwater and then digging a hole in Robinsons Bay to put it in.</p> <p>The problem is the same team has been working on this for years, and they are wedded to the current heavily engineering focussed solution. This is a social problem to solve and the Council needs to put a forward thinking multi-disciplinary team on the job so it can change direction.</p> <p>Water is a precious resource – but only when it is clean and under control, wanted and needed. Water that is contaminated, out of control or when there is too much is a threat.</p> <p>The community has been consistent in its demand that the water is treated to a potable standard because that is what changes it from a contaminated waste product to a precious resource. If it is in a potable state then it will be wanted and in times when there is too much of it (such as winter), people will trust that it be let go on its natural course to the sea.</p> <p>Nobody has been found willing to take the Council's treated wastewater in its current form because it is not up to that potable standard. The Council has refused to acknowledge or accept the risks associated with it. Hence communities are up in arms, farmers have walked away, the DHB has put the kibosh on much purple pipe use, and the Council itself on Managed Aquifer Recharge. The Council has earmarked the land in the Inner Harbour by finding owners looking to sell anyway, not because anyone wanted the water.</p> <p>Hence the Council has been stuck in the disposal paradigm – it must get rid of water no-one wants and on the smallest piece of land it can, given that the harbour appears out of bounds.</p> <p>The team of engineers have been unable to cope with the social issues that result and have ignored them. The upshot is a solution that solves one cultural offense by creating another.</p> <p>I wholly support the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission. It gives the Council a path forward to a practical, feasible, affordable and consentable solution and has huge support from the community. I am confident that the Council will get there if it appoints a new multi-disciplinary team, in tune with the fast moving legislation and technology, who can understand the social as well as the engineering concerns and opportunities, and work with government initiatives that are seeking to build nationwide three waters resilience. I wish to be heard in support of my submission.</p> <p>Appendix – Flooding Concerns,</p> <p>In 2008 I was engaged by Christchurch City Council to research historical flooding in the area as part of the Akaroa Harbour Settlements Study. The report "Historical Flooding Research and Mapping Project, 8 February 2008" revealed how vulnerable the Inner Harbour settlements are to flooding. Some the worst floods have been caused when debris washed down by swollen</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									streams gets trapped at a constriction point such as a bridge, and water then backs up causing a flash flood when it eventually releases. I am concerned that if a blockage occurs at the Sawmill Road bridge below the dam, water could back up right under the dam face on the Thacker land exacerbating the risk of dam failure and with potentially catastrophic and life-threatening consequences for the historic Pavitt Cottage sited immediately below t and only meters from an already eroding stream bank.  Please see attached for photos				
66.	34080	No	To the land				Yes	Yes	<p>The Have Your Say document from the Christchurch City Council for the proposed disposal of the Akaroa wastewater lists 4 options for that disposal. None of those options are a good option. It is my strongly held view (as someone who has been on the Akaroa wastewater working party from the beginning in 2012 and who is active in the Duvauchelle Wastewater working party) that the City Council has not explored all the options nor adequately researched and costed the current options.</p> <p>The major issue not investigated in detail is the treatment of the wastewater to a level where it can be recycled into the human use system. We were told consistently in the working party process that CCC already had a resource consent for the plant and the wastewater treatment and it was not part of the working party terms of reference to review the treatment standard. How short sighted. As a result, the solutions offered now are all disposal of the wastewater rather than beneficial reuse.</p> <p>That treatment level NEEDS to be reverse osmosis (and pre and post treatment) with the final product being to potable standard. This no longer becomes disposal, but rather opens up opportunities for the beneficial reuse of the wastewater product. Akaroa already experiences water shortages. With climate change the shortages are becoming more frequent and will continue to worsen. Akaroa is currently taking water from the Takamataua system to supplement its own supply in the drier months. There will come a time when that water is needed for the Takamatua community. Treatment of the Akaroa wastewater to potable standard will allow its reuse for domestic functions, fire fighting and the watering of CCC facilities in and around Akaroa. In short it allows Akaroa to be self-sufficient in water for the foreseeable future. It is such a simple solution.</p> <p>I am particularly strong in not supporting the Inner Bays solution. This takes wastewater from one community (Akaroa) and "dumps" it in 2 others (Takamatua and Robinsons Bays). Both those "other" communities having thriving local organisations. Those organisations are so active they have recently both completed refurbishment of their wharves (involving extensive hours of work from the residents) in Council / Community partnerships. To receive Akaroa's wastewater into those communities is just not fair. The lack of fairness is more dramatic when neither of the receiving communities is budgeted to be connected to that wastewater system. In fact, Robinsons Bay is not even included in the wastewater volume calculations for the Akaroa plant, but yet is expected to receive the wastewater from that plant. If this lack of fairness was addressed (ie the reticulation costs for the Takamatua and Robinsons Bay communities were include in the cost of this solution) it is clear that the inner bays solution would become the most expensive option. I note that the CCC staff recommendation for this solution</p>	Kevin Simcock			Takamatua

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>was based on it being the cheapest solution (as declared by Bridget O'Brien at the information evening for Takamatua Bay residents). That cheapness is based on an unfair assessment.</p> <p>The costings show an overlap between the Inner Bays and Goughs Bay solutions. A more expensive Inner Bays solution is already possibly more expensive than the cheaper end of the Goughs Bay solution. Hence it is not certain that the Inner Bays is the cheapest solution even now. I know that it is the solution which has had the most and longest input from CCC. The Goughs Bay costs have not had that attention and so have an inbuilt conservatism. In short, the costings for all schemes are neither accurate enough nor certain enough parameters on which to base a recommendation.</p> <p>When questioned at the Takamatua information evening Bridget O'Brien confirmed that community effects were not part of the CCC staff consideration when those staff recommended the Inner Bays solution. It is those very effects that make the solution so unpalatable. Those effects include the negative of living next to a wastewater disposal site, the incredible imposition on the Community life of the construction process, the breeding ground for midges and mosquitoes that the inevitable stagnant pond sites will provide, the risks associated with a poorly thought through dam and pond storage area, the effect on property values of those in the immediate area of the disposal sites and the unattractive viewing of the disposal areas with their coverings of trees (vs pasture as at present) and polythene lined ponds that will be empty for a good proportion of the time. Robinsons Bay and Takamatua do not deserve to be treated as wastewater dump sites like this.</p> <p>There are other solutions that I believe should be considered. The Akaroa Golf Club Course at Duvauchelle is being looked at for the reuse of Duvauchelle wastewater. There is about 18 Ha of irrigable tees, greens and fairways at this site. My calculations for a septic tank type wastewater solution indicate that all the communities, from Akaroa to Duvauchelle, can be managed on a septic tank bed of about 6 Ha. This is only 33% of the available golf course land. Hence there is plenty of "working room" for the crudeness of my calculation. The solution requires all the golf course to be excavated, a sand bed formed and new pasture grown. The sand required can be imported for about \$8,000,000 which leaves a lot of money in the combined Akaroa and Duvauchelle budget for the required reticulation and construction work. Recycling wastewater on to golf courses is well proven internationally. This solution will create a better golf course (a tourist attraction in itself) and usefully reuse the wastewater from the Bays' communities.</p> <p>Another potential solution is to take the Reverse Osmosis treated water and trickle it down the gully to the Western side of the highway at Akaroa. The existing gully and stream already has a natural wetland at the foreshore end. There is a natural pond basin at the top of the stream with only a small catchment area above. This system could take the properly treated wastewater and further purify it by passing over land before flowing into the harbour at Children's Bay. Combined with irrigation to land in the Akaroa township and a purple pipe system, this allows Akaroa to recycle its own wastewater. That water will still be available for potable use when it is</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									required in the future.  In short the Akaroa wastewater reuse options currently presented are all "a bad bunch". I believe that there are better solutions available and that the right technical and community team needs to be put together to properly develop those solutions. The three waters are so crucial to the future of this community and the world. Let's take this opportunity to best use the available Akaroa and Duvauchelle funding to prepare an exemplar solution, with resilience, true beneficial reuse and respectful of the Communities within the harbour.				
67.	34079	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Jane Richards			Akaroa
68.	34076	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>LAND-BASED IRRIGATION SCHEMES.</p> <p>These three schemes have a similar list of advantages and disadvantages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "Carbon storage" benefit.</li> </ul> <p>The claim that carbon is stored, aiding the council's "Carbon neutral" objective is totally misleading. Certainly, carbon is initially captured by growing trees, but mature forests, as these will become, are carbon-neutral. Dying and rotting trees release the carbon that was captured during growth, so eventually trees lose what they gained. There is an initial carbon lockup but this just delays the eventual neutral cycle.</p> <p>Ask Google "What gases does compost release?"</p> <p>Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) are all by-products of the composting process</p> <p>From the U.S. Environment Protection Agency:</p> <p>After carbon dioxide is converted into organic matter by photosynthesis, carbon is stored in forests for a period of time in a variety of forms before it is ultimately returned to the atmosphere through respiration and decomposition or disturbance.</p> <p>A Google search on the Amazon rainforest yields this:</p> <p>The world's tropical forests are rapidly losing their ability to absorb carbon dioxide from greenhouse gas emissions, with the Amazon rainforest at risk of turning from carbon sink to source within 15 years. (See <a href="https://www.sciencealert.com/african-forests-and-the-amazon-are-flipping-from-carbon-sinks-to-major-sources">https://www.sciencealert.com/african-forests-and-the-amazon-are-flipping-from-carbon-sinks-to-major-sources</a>)</p> <p>If trees could lock up carbon on a permanent basis, the Amazon would have vast build-ups of coal, oil, or peat by now, and it doesn't. Carbon neutrality can ONLY be achieved by not burning fossil fuels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrigation benefits.</li> </ul> <p>"Water will be available for farm irrigation and stock water along pipeline route." There is no evidence that this is of interest to any of the landowners; in fact, most are hostile to the proposal. Although the water will be</p>	Peter Squires			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>"available", it is of no benefit unless someone wants it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity benefits.</li> </ul> <p>It is claimed that wastewater would be "beneficially" re-used to create wetlands and/or bush areas. The benefits have not been explained or evaluated. We all accept that native areas are "nice" but that is hardly a benefit, given the other negatives. Any ensuing benefit is subjective and dubious, and the claim that this use is "beneficial" should be ignored.</p> <p>Cultural, educational, and recreational benefits are not explained nor evaluated. With pipes spread all over the ground, there are unlikely to be any popular walking or mountain-biking tracks. All areas except Takamatua and Hammond Point are fairly remote and it is doubtful if they will attract significant interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks of land-based schemes.</li> </ul> <p>Banks Peninsula soils and substrates have an un-predictable and unstable history. All the proposals to distribute to land have an inherent uncertainty, and therefore risk, attached. Any problems which arise either during or after construction may entail significant restoration costs, and these could persist into the future.</p> <p>Significant areas of land will be in a permanently semi- saturated state. A sudden rainfall event will cause a rapid surface run-off which would otherwise not have happened. There is no evidence that the impact of this on adjacent streams has been studied. Claims that there will be no sudden runoff, and that the excess water will trickle through subterranean flow over several months, needs to be demonstrated.</p> <p>All of the land-based schemes have been designed to handle a one-in-five year rain event. Any statistician will tell you that this a very common occurrence, and that two such events can and have happened within a very short time of each other. What happens in the one-in-a-hundred year event? It will happen. There will be no option but to overflow the ponds, with the resulting erosion damage and possible undermining of pipes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storage ponds.</li> </ul> <p>There is concern that these quite-large areas may permit the breeding of mosquitos and other insect pests. Although the ponds are intended to be lined with waterproof membranes, where a "clean" floor will stop insect breeding, experience with poorly maintained swimming pools shows that a soil does build up, from accumulated dust, leaf litter, bird poo, windborne seeds etc. There is no consideration in the maintenance costs for the considerable effort of vacuum-cleaning the ponds every few years.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay is well known for its large population of Canada Geese. Will they be attracted to the ponds, and graze on the surrounding land?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Old Coach Road wetland.</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Peak overflow from the Old Coach Road wetland will drain into the Children's Bay stream. While the actual flow will not be a significant addition to the natural flow, it does constitute a direct flow to the foreshore, which is far less desirable than the remote and distributed outflow from the harbour outfall scheme. The wetland is supposed to be sub-surface water, so how will it cross the main Akaroa Highway without surface runoff over the road? If the water table does rise to the surface, there is the risk of midges and mosquitoes breeding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other concerns.</li> </ul> <p>There have been no surveys of the opinions or concerns of the people in the affected areas, none of whom will benefit from the scheme, and may have to tolerate considerable disruption during construction.</p> <p>Looking ahead, occupation in Akaroa and the surrounding district will grow. The land used by the Inner Bays scheme may well be needed for subdivision, but even without this, the scheme has no capability to be expanded beyond its one-off design. The Harbour outfall scheme is easily expanded, and is by far the most reliable and immune to weather events</p> <p>DISCHARGE TO HARBOUR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disadvantages - a discussion.</li> </ul> <p>The first three disadvantages listed can be dismissed, based on the previous arguments. The fourth one states that it undermines the cultural values of the tangata whenua, and this is true. This particular cultural value perhaps needs a fresh perspective.</p> <p>The objection by Maori to harbour outfall is based on "Culture", which states that human waste should not be deposited directly into the sea. The origin of this is probably founded when a tribe got sick, and noticed a correlation between waste disposal to the sea and their health. To prevent future generations of having to learn the hard way by the same experiment, and without a written language, the knowledge became, very wisely, a part of their "culture". The bulk of their diet came from the sea, and particularly close to shore. The experiment has never been tried again, for good reason.</p> <p>Today, the scenario is very different. With water treated to drinking standard, and disposed of far from the shoreline, the risk of contamination is zero. Add to that the fact that modern Maori derive very little of their diet from the sea and foreshore in Akaroa, the "Culture" value no longer holds significance for its original purpose of safeguarding health, and should be reviewed in the light of current science, knowledge, and technology. If the experiment was tried again, the outcome would be completely different.</p> <p>The Carbon Impact comparisons are invalid. As mentioned earlier, land-reuse is carbon neutral, and there is no explanation of the 1,300 tonnes emitted from the Harbour Discharge scheme.</p> <p>Although there is no beneficial re-use of the wastewater, the land-based schemes have not demonstrated any tangible benefit either, considering the</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>lack of enthusiasm from land-owners.</p> <p>• Advantages.</p> <p>This is the ONLY scheme with no risk; from natural events, unforeseen problems, or future demand. It is also the lowest cost both initially and in maintenance, and it does not require the risky "wetland" on the Old Coach Road.</p> <p>RECOGNITION OF WORK DONE BY COUNCIL STAFF.</p> <p>The Council staff have shown commitment to their work and have made extensive investigations on our behalf. Their presentation is clear and unbiased, and is a good explanation of their findings. I, for one, appreciate the effort they have made to explain their work to the local community.</p>				
69.	34074	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>FRESH WATER:</p> <p>THERE ARE AN ESTIMATED 50 IN USE SPRINGS IN THE ROBINSON BAY , TAKAMATUA VALLEY AREA AND IT HAS BEEN SHOWN BY MASSEY UNIVERSITY THAT FERAL CATS, POSSUMS, PUKEKO AND DOGS CAN TRANSMIT GUARDIA, COVID19 AND CAMPYLOBACTER FROM WASTE WATER TO THESE SPRING CATCHMENTS. THE COUNCIL HAVE TO SHOW THAT ANY LAND BASED SYSTEM HAVE 1 MICRON FILTERS TO PREVENT CONTAMINATION OF SPRING WATER FROM GUARDIA. QUESTION: HOW IS THE COUNCIL GOING TO PREVENT CAMPYLOBACTER AND COVID19 GETTING INTO OUR SPRINGS IN A LAND BASED OPTION.? (THESE COMPONENTS OF WASTE CANNOT BE FILTERED EFFECTIVELY)</p> <p>ONCE CONTAMINATED, THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE TO FIND ALTERNATE FRESH WATER SOURCES. THE HAVELOCK NORTH EXPERIENCE IS SURELY ENOUGH EVIDENCE OF HOW FRESH WATER CAN BECOME CONTAMINATED. THERE HAVE BEEN DEATHS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS DISASTER. HAVE THE COUNCIL CONSIDERED THE LEGAL COSTS OF LOCAL WELL POISONING.?</p>	JOHN THOMSON			CHRISTCHURCH
70.	34070	No							<p>Whilst our club has not met to specifically discuss land disposal options, at our AGM the following motion was put, "that we write to the Taiapure management committee supporting their action for the cessation of ANY waste water being discharged into the harbour"</p> <p>This action was taken and we oppose waste water, treated or not, from being discharged into Akaroa Harbour.</p>	Mike Harding	Secretary	Akaroa Harbour Recreational Fishing Club (Inc)	Christchurch
71.	34068	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>I am a property owner in Robinsons Bay. I believe the council should first eliminate as much stormwater as possible from Akaroa's sewage network, begin construction of the infrastructure at Akaroa and Old Coach Rd (pumping station, treatment plant and wetland) while continuing to use the current outfall in the meantime. A better solution should be sought for the treated water than pumping huge quantities of stormwater needlessly, disrupting the lifestyles of small communities and degrading property values. This should involve a high level of treatment (e.g. reverse osmosis) which would eventually allow various levels of reuse and/or release to streams or the harbour via a wetland. A small community like that in Robinsons Bay</p>	Geoff Harris			Glenorchy

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									should not have such a disruptive scheme as the inner bays option, from which they relieve no benefit, forced on them. Thank you.				
72.	34067	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Shirley Fernyhough			Porirua
73.	34066	Yes							<p>Introduction</p> <p>The Akaroa Civic Trust is a volunteer organisation that has worked since 1969 to preserve the town's historic character and the surrounding countryside's rural amenity and cultural landscapes.</p> <p>In the 1960s the Akaroa County Council built the Akaroa sewage treatment works on a small area of land next to Takapuneke in Red House Bay. The Council later added a rubbish dump near Onuku Road in 1979.</p> <p>In 1999 the Civic Trust recognised the need to protect Takapuneke, a historic site located adjacent the Britomart Memorial, from residential development. At the time, the land was owned by Banks Peninsula District Council (BPDC). In 2008 the Council formed a working party to investigate the wastewater consent to discharge water which was due to expire in 2013. The Council recognised that the existing plant was culturally offensive to Ngai Tahu. Working closely with George Tikao and Onuku Runanga, the Civic Trust supported greater recognition of the overall area as a significant bicultural landscape.</p> <p>The BPDC was abolished in 2006 at which point Christchurch City Council assumed responsibility for the administration of Banks Peninsula. A determining factor with regard to the abolition was the need to upgrade the water infrastructure based on a population of 7,500 ratepayers.</p> <p>The Takapuneke Historic Reserve was created in 2010 and was predicated on the closure of the treatment plant. The event was marked by three days of commemorations. However, in 2020 the matter of the appropriate disposal of Akaroa's wastewater treatment has yet to be resolved.</p> <p>The Civic Trust's submission is based on the following information and documents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environment Canterbury (ECan) became the first council in New Zealand to declare a climate emergency.</li> <li>2. Following ECan's lead, the Christchurch City Council declared a Climate Change and Ecological Emergency in May 2019. The Council voted to recognise the urgency of the environmental situation and ensure the council puts climate considerations at the heart of its thinking.</li> <li>3. The Banks Peninsula Community Board Plan 2020-2022 states that its priority is for the Peninsula's environmental sustainability and biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. The following are excerpts taken from The Plan via the BPCB agenda dated 20 July 2020.</li> </ol> <p>(page 124) Why this matters:</p> <p>It is important to play our part in contributing to carbon neutrality and</p>	Victoria Andrews	Deputy Chair	Akaroa Civic Trust	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>mitigating climate change to ensure our environment is protected for future generations. We are committed to balancing tourism with environmental sustainability so that we have healthy harbours and lakes and thriving biodiversity.</p> <p>Response to the council's declared Climate and Ecological Emergency: Taking the current Climate and Ecological Emergency into account in all decision making and planning for our area.</p> <p>(Page 126) Why this matters:</p> <p>Our beautiful, dramatic landscapes are a much-loved place for locals, both those living on Banks Peninsula and in Christchurch. Our scenic beaches and bays are also a top destination for visitors from the region.</p> <p>Appropriate maintenance and development of infrastructure, including greenspace, wastewater networks, marine structures and land drainage, are vital for sustainable tourism as well as the environmental, economic, cultural and social health of our settlements. In addition, appropriate transport, power and communication networks are key for keeping our many isolated communities connected and safe.</p> <p>What the board will do:</p> <p>Advocate for wastewater treatment systems that minimise environmental damage and respect cultural and community values.</p> <p>Approve and implement the Akaroa, Duvauchelle and Wainui wastewater projects.</p> <p>(page 130)</p> <p>The cultural, environmental and built heritage of Banks Peninsula is valued and enhanced</p> <p>Why this matters:</p> <p>The unique character of each of our communities creates a sense of place that forms part of our identity. Of particular importance are our scenic landscapes, tangata whenua's taonga, local stories and historic buildings. It is important to look after this heritage so we can continue to pass on our shared identity to future generations. What the board will do:</p> <p>Support the preservation of our heritage, including buildings, structures, features, historic cemeteries and cultural heritage.</p> <p>4. Christchurch City Council, Our Heritage, Our Taonga, Heritage Strategy 2019-2029 The main points are as follows.</p> <p>The introduction written by the Deputy Mayor states: Our heritage, our taonga defines us. It is who we are, where we have come from and it guides what we will become. It contributes to our own personal sense of belonging and identity and anchors us to our communities and our city. Heritage</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>connects us: to this place, to each other, to the past and to those who will follow us. Our heritage is precious and valuable. It has social, cultural, educational, recreational and commercial benefits. It contributes to our cultural wellbeing and brings visitors to the district. We are guardians of our taonga, charged with caring for these treasures and passing them on to our children.</p> <p>Heritage Strategy: Executive summary</p> <p>This strategy recognises that the Council has a leadership role in facilitating a collaborative approach with its partners and communities, ensuring a broad range of our built and natural, tangible and intangible heritage is recognised, protected and celebrated.</p> <p>This strategy is based on the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility – this strategy includes people of all ages and abilities through a range of accessible options.</li> <li>• Respect for all cultures – this strategy includes and respects all people in the district, their heritage and culture.</li> <li>• Heritage Conservation Principles – The Council will implement this strategy in alignment with best practice conservation management of heritage places and the safeguarding of intangible heritage.</li> </ul> <p>- Heritage conservation principles and processes in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, 2010 (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010)</p> <p>(Appendix C).</p> <p>- The Nara Document on Authenticity 1994; Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter) 1982; The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites 2008, Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage 2003; Quebec</p> <p>Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place 2008.</p> <p>Our Heritage, Our Taonga is tangible and intangible, built and natural, and comprises places, objects, stories, memories and traditions.</p> <p>Our Journey, Our Stories</p> <p>We have all journeyed here, and brought our own stories, traditions, objects and memories. In this place we and those before us have shaped the land, left our mark and created new memories, stories and traditions to be passed on to future generations.</p> <p>Our Heritage, Our Taonga is visible – and includes tangible, physical evidence such as buildings, public spaces, places of worship, monuments, archaeology, objects, artefacts, colours in the landscape, urupā and graveyards, sports grounds, artworks, literature, documents (physical and</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>digitised) and infrastructure.</p> <p>...and not so visible – it may be intangible, or it may be hidden. It includes knowledge, stories, waiata, sounds, oral histories, smells, trails, past landscape features and vegetation. It also includes past events and their associated sites and the people and groups connected with them; hidden archaeology, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga, ingoa wāhi, music, kapa haka, dance and language.</p> <p>Tangible and intangible aspects usually co-exist in heritage places and items, and are interwoven.</p> <p>Our Heritage, Our Taonga is varied in scale and type. It can be an individual building, place, garden or tree, or it may be an avenue of trees, a neighbourhood, street, area, view or a cultural landscape on a large scale.</p> <p>Our Heritage, Our Taonga includes cultural landscapes.</p> <p>Usually there are important connections between buildings, places and items and their settings, and this can extend to other nearby places and the wider landscapes in which they are located. Ngā Tūtohu Whenua is a heritage concept which conveys the interaction of people with their environment over time, and the connection between culture, nature and landscape and intangible and tangible values within particular areas. Most of our landscapes have cultural values as well as natural values, because of human interaction with the land over time. Whakapapa is embedded within the natural environment and this relationship is reinforced through the naming of landscape forms, myth and legend.</p> <p>Our Heritage, Our Taonga is valued for different reasons and is seen through different lenses by different groups within a community. This strategy acknowledges that we need to recognise all values and aims to improve understanding of different viewpoints as there may be multiple heritage values and stories all residing in one place.</p> <p>What will the Council do to lead implementation of the strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council will ensure that internal plans, policies, strategies and regulations are in alignment with this strategy.</li> </ul> <p>Our Submission</p> <p>The Akaroa Civic Trust does not support the proposed inner bays irrigation scheme as it has been presented for the following reasons.</p> <p>Banks Peninsula is identified, in its entirety, as an Outstanding Natural Landscape under the RPS and 'Landscape' being defined by the NZILA as "the cumulative expression of natural and cultural features, patterns and processes in a geographical area, including human perceptions and associations."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme will significantly alter long established cultural landscapes.</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme does not recognise and is contrary to the purpose and intent of the Environment Canterbury's declared state of Climate Emergency, Christchurch City Council's Climate and Ecological Emergency, Our Heritage, Our Taonga 2019-2019 and the Banks Peninsula Community Board's Plan 2020-2022.</li> <li>• Christchurch City Council has failed to recognise the importance of European settlement and farming heritage in the context of the rural amenity landscape which is an integral component of the inner harbour's wider cultural landscape.</li> <li>• Christchurch City Council has not given due consideration to Appendix W, Pavitt Cottage archaeological assessment May 2020.</li> <li>• The council has not given due consideration to European associations, spiritual and cultural values in relation to the affected land and areas of water.</li> </ul> <p>The Submission Focuses on Robinson Bay and Valley</p> <p>The stream and bay were first known by Maori as Kakakaiau. Robinsons Bay has largely been a working, pastoral landscape. Peninsula families have long and well established histories, cultural associations and relationships as well as having made their livelihoods working the land since their arrival in 1840-50s. Natural resources and the quality of the soil provided a sound basis for farming and timber milling for the early settlers.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay has been a working, cultural landscape altered over time by traditional farming and sawmilling practices. The hills and valleys can be viewed in a manner similar to reading pages in a book for those who look closely at the landscape. (See Archaeological Assessment of Lot 1, DP82749, Robinson's Bay, Canterbury for the Pavitt Family Trust; Justin Maxwell and Jennifer Huebert, Sunrise Archaeology Report No. 20203, May 2020).</p> <p>The rural landscape forms the setting and context for rich oral traditions and family histories.</p> <p>The Sawmill Road location holds an invaluable range of early European history with visual evidence of how life was lived around the 1850s period. The valley contains a transformed, working landscape as pasture replaced trees. European settlers started small dairy farms, grew cocksfoot grass and grazed sheep. Banks Peninsula's first sawmill opened at this location in 1855.</p> <p>Farming practices and organic production continue in Robinsons Valley to the present time.</p> <p>Visual Effects</p> <p>The assessment of visual effects contained in Appendix 5 does not take into</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>consideration the following issues which could be deemed to be "fatal flaws".</p> <p>The area is listed as a Rural Amenity Landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area of the upper Robinsons Bay Irrigation Concept is of historic importance. It is unique in the rural setting which is located in proximity to Akaroa</li> <li>• View shafts and the visibility of the proposed activity are not restricted to Okains Bay Road as shown in the consultation document</li> <li>• No consideration has been given to the visual impact of the proposal on residents in the area as well as visitors</li> <li>• The new irrigation areas and associated storage ponds require extensive tree planting and landscaping that will alter to a significant degree the amenity of the existing cultural landscape and may alter and/or destroy important archaeological material and sites</li> <li>• Due to the location of the proposal it is not possible to "blend" the new activity with existing open pastoral, working landscape by the extensive planting of new trees</li> </ul> <p>As stated in Appendix 5 there are no existing or established ponds in close proximity. Therefore the ponds will be a "new activity" as well as a visual feature in the landscape.</p> <p>The proposed earthwork and the creation of a large holding pond will alter and/or destroy a significant heritage site as well as a living, cultural landscape.</p> <p>The proposed work would possibly include the following requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a massive holding pond for of treated wastewater</li> <li>• extensive irrigation fields</li> <li>• a high embankment and dam with a 4m high bund adjacent to the Pavitt cottage</li> <li>• safety fencing</li> <li>• extensive tree planting</li> <li>• formed public walking tracks that will likely be wheel chair accessible</li> <li>• working access to the site</li> <li>• visitor car parking</li> <li>• pump equipment and building</li> <li>• possible lighting</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>The proposed mitigation of tree planting to shield the new, massive 19,000m<sup>3</sup> holding pond lined with plastic, divided in the centre with a bund, will significantly impact and alter the existing visual qualities and rural amenity of the working landscape as well as potentially damaging an archaeological site. However, the actual berm area of the large holding pond will likely not include trees as a visual shield since roots may cause damage to the structure. Therefore the new pond will be visible from numerous viewpoints especially during the long, dry summer months and winter when trees have few leaves.</p> <p>The visual assessment, Appendix 5, is superficial with regard to the amenity and heritage values of the existing rural landscape. The assessment appears to have been written from the viewpoint of urban professionals who might not be familiar with the values of rural communities and the traditions of Banks Peninsula. The assessment refers to "Heritage Items as mainly built features" and does not include areas or landscapes. This statement in itself is contrary to the Christchurch City Council's Our Heritage, Our Taonga Heritage Strategy 2019-2029 as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga is tangible and intangible, built and natural and comprises places, objects, stories, memories and traditions.</li> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga is visible – and includes tangible, physical evidence such as buildings, public spaces, places of worship, monuments, archaeology, objects, artefacts, colours in the landscape, urupā and graveyards, sports grounds, artworks, literature, documents (physical and digitised) and infrastructure.</li> <li>• ...and not so visible – it may be intangible, or it may be hidden. It includes knowledge, stories, waiata, sounds, oral histories, smells, trails, past landscape features and vegetation. It also includes past events and their associated sites and the people and groups connected with them; hidden archaeology, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga, ingoa wāhi, music, kapa haka, dance and language.</li> <li>• Tangible and intangible aspects usually co-exist in heritage places and items, and are interwoven.</li> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga is culturally diverse, reflecting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all the cultures of our communities, and includes places of worship, traditions, customs, folklore, language, festivals, food and clothing. Welcoming visitors and new residents is part of our heritage.</li> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga is varied in scale and type. It can be an individual building, place, garden or tree, or it may be an avenue of trees, a neighbourhood, street, area, view or a cultural landscape on a large scale. It ranges from grand masonry public buildings, to humble timber cottages or fragments of a lost building. Our heritage places reflect the broad ranges of themes of the development of the district, including settlement, transport, industry, politics,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>entertainment, commerce, recreation, business and the arts. Our heritage is contained within our built and natural environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We know these lands and these lands know us. We are in every blade of grass.</li> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga includes cultural landscapes.</li> <li>• Usually there are important connections between buildings, places and items and their settings, and this can extend to other nearby places and the wider landscapes in which they are located. Ngā Tūtohu Whenua is a heritage concept which conveys the interaction of people with their environment over time, and the connection between culture, nature and landscape and intangible and tangible values within particular areas. Most of our landscapes have cultural values as well as natural values, because of human interaction with the land over time. Whakapapa is embedded within the natural environment and this relationship is reinforced through the naming of landscape forms, myth and legend.</li> <li>• Our Heritage, Our Taonga includes built heritage which represents different styles, materials, designers and eras, and the people, uses and stories associated with them. Our built heritage reflects a variety of traditional English and other international influences and is also unique to this place. The extent of remaining colonial buildings in Akaroa makes it a highly intact township. Original uses for buildings have in some cases continued to the present day, creating a long tradition. Our built heritage also reflects our different cultures, provides us with landmarks and contributes to our distinctive neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore the Council has failed to recognise the importance of cultural tourism. Visitors as well as residents walk, hike, cycle and move slowly through the landscape absorbing features that cannot be seen by individuals travelling past in a speeding car or tour buses full of cruise passengers heading into Christchurch for the day.</p> <p>Photo: Robinsons Bay School Reserve, Robinsons Bay Valley Road, promoting a 20 minute walk and passive recreation.</p> <p>Signage: courtesy Christchurch City Council.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay and the valley contain a rich and varied collection of heritage features, rural amenity and farming traditions that form an important cultural landscape in a modified, working setting of cottages, farm structures and houses.</p> <p>View of the historic Pavitt cottage mill house c. 1855-1861 located to the far right as seen from Tizzards Road. The red arrow shows the approximate location of the holding ponds.</p> <p>Numerous archaeological sites are located in the general area including the site of the original sawmill and flour mill, farm buildings, mill dam,</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>waterwheel, spillway, flume and bridge foundation.</p> <p>The following is an excerpt from Archaeological assessment of Robinsons Bay for the Pavitt Family Trust May 2020.</p> <p>7.6 Robinsons Bay archaeological landscape</p> <p>The mill cottage is but a small part of the larger cultural and archaeological landscape of Robinsons Bay. While the exact location of the Pavitt/Hughes/Saxton sawmill is not certain, the evidence suggests that it was not far from the present-day location of the mill cottage. At its peak, upwards of 30 people were working at the mill (Jacobson 1914:291) and they (and probably their families) were living in the bay. The sprawling footprint of a Banks Peninsula sawmill such as this in the mid-19th century heyday would have been considerable (see Figure 7-20 and Figure 7-23). Artworks that illustrate the valley in the 1870s suggest numerous structures existed; many of these buildings would have been poorly built and not lasted long after they were abandoned.</p> <p>Numerous vestiges of the 19th century European landscape do however remain, including components of the sawmilling infrastructure, trees planted by the early settlers, and a number of other historic structures. In addition to the schoolmaster's house there are easily visible, but unrecorded, structures such as the small derelict 19th century cottage on Lot 2, DP 82749, which is next to the mill cottage. Thanks to limited development over the last 170 years, this lot has retained much of its 19th century character as well as above-ground vestiges of the early industries in the bay.</p> <p>Further investigation is likely to uncover additional examples of the 19th century European land use throughout the valley. During this assessment, a number of new sites were recorded throughout the valley: the remnants of bridge foundation (Figure 7-49), cocksfooter's camps (Figure 7-43 to Figure 7-46), the remains of what may be 19th century structures (Figure 7-47, Figure 7-48), and a well (Figure 7-50). Further research will be necessary to determine whether they all relate to 19th century activities. There are, for example, 19th century camp sites beside the creeks further up the valley in less accessible areas; these small camps are notable by low stone walls or what were once chimneys, and the presence of 19th century bottle glass and metal artifacts.</p> <p>Heritage New Zealand, formerly Historic Places Trust, installed three sign posts directing visitors specifically to Sawmill Road to view the location of the first working sawmill on Banks Peninsula. The area is of historic significance as recognised by Heritage New Zealand.</p> <p>9 Assessment of Effects on Archaeological Features</p> <p>At the present time, there is no planned work that would affect the mill cottage or old mill site. The following assessment recounts what effects development would have on these archaeological features.</p> <p>The cottage is an important historic building, already recorded as Archaeological Site N36/155. It should be preserved and protected from</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>further modifications that would compromise its unique character. It is highly likely that archaeological materials will be encountered below the surface in Lot 1, DP 82749. These could include historic rubbish pits, latrines, remnants of structures that are no longer standing, and materials related to the use of the cottage, schoolhouse, and nearby sawmill.</p> <p>The sawmill site, recorded through this assessment as Archaeological Site N36/260, is an expansive historical landscape that borders Lot 1, DP 82749, and spans Lot 2, DP 82749 and other neighbouring lots. Any ground-disturbing work in this area is likely to uncover remnants of the old mill, flume, tramway, blacksmith's workshop, and other outbuildings. Earth-moving projects that would modify this landscape will also compromise what remains of the engineering footprint of the water-driven mill operation, including the spillway, dam, and ponds. These features are readily visible on the ground, and in aerial and satellite photographs.</p> <p>In addition, the planting of native species on Lot 2 would significantly alter the existing environmental diversity of an important cultural landscape. Exotics, including oaks, walnuts, macrocarpas and fruit trees, are an important heritage element in this cultural landscape. Members of the public are currently able to view remnants of early 19th century European culture and lifestyle in association with the historic Pavitt Cottage and mill site. It would be inappropriate to introduce the extensive planting of native species in the context of early colonial settlement as well as being contrary to the Christchurch City Council's Banks Peninsula contextual historical overview and thematic framework by Louise Beaumont, Matthew Carter and John Wilson, June 2014.</p> <p>The planting of native species may be a Council policy. However, in this particular context and setting it is not appropriate.</p> <p>In Conclusion</p> <p>The Akaroa Civic Trust has concerns regarding the visual impact of the new treatment plant, Pond Site 10 and the wetland area located in the vicinity of Old Coach Road as well as the already consented pumping station that will be built behind Akaroa Mini Golf on the recreation ground parking next to the designated two night freedom camping area.</p> <p>Appendix A, figure 5.2 includes information relating to cruise ship passenger numbers and tourism. It concludes that Akaroa has a modelled population of 2,418 between the months of October and April. However, double and triple ship days bring more passengers than the graph illustrates. The population figure shown is likely to be low when the volume of cruise passengers and holiday home owners, as well as casual visitors, are factored into the equation over the peak holiday season between December 26-January 19.</p> <p>Information contained in the Have Your Say Akaroa treated wastewater options pamphlet fails to recognise the importance of maintaining and enhancing the historic character, existing rural amenity, heritage landscapes and the need to retain, reuse and recycle treated wastewater for use by the town of Akaroa.</p>				



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Wastewater should be treated to the highest possible standards, reused and recycled as required. Scientific research advises that the east coast of the South Island will continue to become drier as the climate continues to change. Drought conditions may become common over the dry summer months. Leaking pipes and a general lack of maintenance also need to be investigated and remedied by the Council.</p> <p>In our view, the Council needs to reconsider the wastewater treatment system and bring it into line with its 2019 Integrated Water Strategy which includes providing people, communities and future generations with access to safe and sufficient water resources through international best practice. The proposal as presented is contrary to Council policies and objectives and it is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Banks Peninsula Community Board Plan 2020-2922.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Akaroa Civic Trust urges the Council to reconsider "concepts" that are presented in the Have Your Say consultation booklet. Neither the land based or harbour outfall are acceptable as long term options for future generations.</li> <li>• The proposal should be updated to the highest possible standard to meet the needs of the community as well as visitors well into the future.</li> <li>• Building strong community resources will assist in the protection of the historic character and amenity of not only Akaroa but the surrounding countryside for future generations.</li> <li>• The Akaroa Civic Trust supports the submission of the Friends of Banks Peninsula</li> </ul>				
74.	34064	No	To the harbour				No	Yes	I have been working hard for years to get into the family farm to become the 6th generation to farm, if you were to place waste water on a neighboring farm it would potentially completely ruin this farming business for me and my family.	George Masefield			Akaroa Christchurch
75.	34063	No	To the harbour				No	Yes	You can not easily let it be discharged onto farm land with out it causing the farming business to lose income with sales of their stock. Even if its contained it's still not going to be aloud and will cause the farmers to lose a substantial amount of income which is putting them out of business which is very unfair and cruel to do that to people that have been on this land for hundreds of years	Emma Masefield			Akaroa Christchurch
76.	34062	No	To the harbour						Be aware, because we in New Zealand are living in a Democracy, "the public decide", not the Mayor or City Councillors.	Andreas Lageder			Banks Peninsula
77.	34061	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes		Alarna Rankin			Christchurch
78.	34060	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes		L Kotok			Christchurch
79.	34053	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Discharging highly treated wastewater to the harbour is the only rational decision. The land in the inner bays is unstable, prone to flooding, has poor drainage and is most unsuitable for irrigation schemes. Waterlogged soils would cause massive problems and many landowners would be affected. Also many people in the inner bays rely on springs for their water source and these must be unaffected at all costs. The sea is huge and the land area is small and vulnerable.	Helen Briggs			Akaroa
80.	34051	No	To the harbour	1			Yes	Yes	I will provide further submissions at the hearing	Harry Stronach			

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
81.	34050	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Please see attached submission	Harry Stronach	President	Akaroa Ratepayers and Residents Assn Inc	
82.	34048	No					No	No	<p>The options proposed are all flawed and it is time to look outside the square, or should i say the Crater.</p> <p>1/ Clean up the existing storm water issue in Akaroa , make available low interest loans for property owners that don't comply, this can be secured by an agreement to place the loan on the rates over 5- 10 years period depending on the cost.</p> <p>2/ Pump sewerage to the head of the bay to a collection facility.</p> <p>3/ Davauchelle &amp; Wainui sewerage can also be pumped to this facility.</p> <p>4/ Sewerage is then transported via truck and trailer similar to the milk tankers at night to save congestion on the hill in the first instance, with a pipe line terminated at Little river when funds are available.</p> <p>5/ Rolleston has one of the best sewerage plants in the country. For the record they support Prebleton , Lincoln, Springston, West Melton on top of there own rapidly expanding city of the future.</p> <p>6/ Little river and Birdlings Flat can also be accommodated in this proposal.</p> <p>7/ This proposal eliminates the capitol cost of treatment plant.</p> <p>8/ This proposal will solve all the problems.</p> <p>9/ We think nothing of sending our rubbish to North Canterbury, why not send our sewerage to Rolleston .</p>	Ken Shearer			Akaroa
83.	34047	No					Yes	Yes	<p>I think it is vital we have a long term view when undertaking such a huge investment project. Akaroa faces water shortages every summer and this will continue to worsen as climate change progresses. This is a grave problem for the whole community on many levels, we need water to be a resilient sustainable community, where our parks, people, gardens. businesses and environment can thrive. Water is the most important resource we have and right now we are wasting it down leaking pipes. Our new wastewater scheme needs to be bold and be a solution now and into the future. We need to fix the pipes in Akaroa first (over 60% of the current wastewater is from stormwater and groundwater filtration), we need to recycle our waste water to the highest standard possible (as done in many other countries) so it can be reused in Akaroa. I believe none of the irrigation schemes are a suitable choice as all have huge environmental and social impacts. They also risk wasting huge amounts of money to dispose of the wastewater in other areas, when the water could be used in Akaroa. First step however is fix the pipes, therefore greatly reducing the amount of wastewater that needs to be dealt with. We don't need an expensive bandaid, we need a future focused solution. Thank you for your time.</p>	Hannah Armstrong			Akaroa
84.	34046	No							We are strongly against the Inner Bays Irrigation option because it is high cost and will have a high impact on the environment and is high risk and	Kevin Sibley			Rangiora

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>does not provide a long term sustainable solution.</p> <p>The land on the Peninsula is not suitable for sustained water ingress because it consists of Barry Bay Loess made up of Loamy clay soil on Basalt rock. You only have to look at the landscape in the area to see the slip scars due to heavy rain events over the years. Having lived in Takamatua for the last 50 years we understand what can happen when soil becomes saturated with water followed by heavy rain. Saturated and impregnated soils will end up in streams and out into Akaroa Harbour.</p> <p>As we are moving into a climate change environment we are going to see more of these heavy rain storm events.</p> <p>We strongly support the Friends Of Banks Peninsula submission which is what is the best long term sustainable solution.</p>				
85.	34045	Yes					Yes	Yes	See attached comments	Suzanne Church			Banks Peninsula
86.	34043	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>1. If as you have said you have taken into account the fact that it is culturally unacceptable to put this wastewater any closer to Onuku and the Maori people, Then you are legally obliged to treat the rest of the population in the same manner, as it is unacceptable to every culture.</p> <p>2. The council has failed to provide us with a fully formed option of dumping to sea at or near the heads.</p> <p>3. There is not enough information provided for us to give an informed opinion, information like the size of the pipes required to take the water, what is the transpiration rate and how much water will not be taken up but will flow straight into the sea, thereby negating the Maori objection of not putting it into the sea.</p> <p>4. It is difficult to come to terms with this forced plan when this council is dumping 170 million litres a day into the sea out from New Brighton.</p> <p>5. The options for a new treatment plant have not been fully explored. There is a suitable piece of land a couple of hundred metres around from the present treatment site and out of sight from all but those at sea. This site should have been considered and would have had the council not hobbled its self with the idea that it can't discharge to sea.</p> <p>6. It is hard to come to terms with the council costings for the present plan for sea discharge, again not enough information has been provided for us to come to an informed decision. How your planners have come to costing of 45 million is beyond me. Because we have not been given the information on how they came to these costings, we can't be expected to come to an informed decision and therefore you cant expect us to endorse any decision you make.</p> <p>6. The council has wasted ratepayer money investigating alternatives to dumping at sea. For example, any child with a couple of classes under their belts on the geology of the peninsula would have been able to tell you that it was very unlikely that drilling would find a level where water could be pumped into a porous layer at depth.</p>	Paul Chandler			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
87.	34042	No							Do not put a sticking plaster on a cancer. Fix the wastewater pipes in Akaroa first. Fix drainage from properties in Akaroa. Water streams down roads from properties when it rains. Once these are fixed the water to be 'disposed of' will not require your expensive and fancy schemes and would be better used to assist with water shortages in Akaroa township. The cost, the ravaging of our beautiful countryside, the stress and ruining of businesses, lives and homes is just criminal. We are called to be wise guardians of our land or did the council not receive that memo? Listen to the people. Do not take the easy option. Be courageous and do what is right.	Chris and Kim Smith			Banks Peninsula
88.	34041	Yes					Yes	Yes	We will not rank the land based options as we reject all three options.  Attached is our submission.	Roz Rickarby and Simon Trotter			Banks Peninsula
89.	34040	No	To the land		1		Yes	Yes		David Singleton			Moncks Bay
90.	34039	Yes					Yes	Yes	We do not agree with any of the options in questions 1 and 2.  We strongly support and endorse the submissions by The Friends Of Banks Peninsula and Robinsons Bay Residents Association.	Chris & Annette Moore			Akaroa
91.	34038	Yes	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	Please see the attached file of significant issues that should be considered BEFORE and ALONGSIDE the inner bays scheme	Bronwyn Hayward and Andrew Ashby			Banks Peninsula
92.	34037	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	I cannot find any information given as to what rate of irrigation is proposed. Is this equivalent to 25mm of rainfall per hour, per day or per week? At low rates, this option may be acceptable. At high rates, can our fragile soils support this – 24/7? What research has been done to prove that this land can accept this rate of irrigation in the long term?	Mark Errington			Akaroa
93.	34035	Yes	To the land	1	3	3	Yes	Yes	CCC has not done proper research and consultation with Goughs Bay/hickory and paua bay community. Please find the attached a research document for your reference. Final version with all residents and supporters signature has already been submitted to the working party.	Asif Hussain			Akaroa
94.	34034	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Akaroa Treated Waste Water Submission  Introduction:  This Submission is from Stephanie Connell and Monique Connell. We live at [REDACTED] Christchurch-Akaroa Road, Takamatua. We have been permanent residents since 2012. We are in full support of the FOBP submission. And reject the inner bays irrigation scheme for the for the following reasons:  • The Council should fix the broken pipes in Akaroa before deciding on what scheme to follow only then will they have an accurate reading on what land etc is required  • Since we learned about this scheme the last four years have been incredibly stressful. Two out of the three people who live here suffer from chronic illness. And the threat to our property has made it even more stressful for them which effects their health.  • It will/ and already has effected our property value  • It already has effected our ability to sell our property which has now been on the market for a year	Monique and Stephanie Connell			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that we will no longer be able to grow and eat vegetables and fruit from our own property is unacceptable and will have a huge economic impact on us</li> <li>• We are concerned about the environmental impact on the Valley. Drip irrigating on a known flood plain that washes into a creek. The creek has is a spawning ground for native whitebait. (A walkway and rest area have only recently been developed to view the spawning grounds).</li> <li>• Cultural impact: Our particular property is a property of 'special interest' due to it's use during the greenstone trails. So it is a property of cultural significance.</li> <li>• We are concerned about the smell, the midges, and the flies that this scheme will create.</li> <li>• We are concerned about the noise during the construction period from pumps, extra traffic etc</li> <li>• We are concerned about the threat of further land being purchased by CCC if required for further expansion</li> <li>• Economic impacts: Devaluation of property. Inability to sell due to the stigma surrounding the proposal and length of time involved for project completion. Council not prepared to compensate with devaluing property.</li> <li>• Land based options are unproven and experimental. This would result in overwatering natives on a known flood zone. Nutrient build up of heavy metals and pharmaceuticals and hormones in land based options.</li> <li>• It is not climate change resilient with rising sea levels.</li> <li>• There is no margin of error built into the inner bays scheme</li> <li>• Possible contamination of local bores and springs</li> <li>• The inevitable rate increases to pay for the scheme that we as non-residents of Akaroa will not even be using.</li> </ul>				
95.	34033	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	We reject the inner Bays Irrigation option because it has a high impact on our community and places our Robinsons Bay property at risk. Should the council need to purchase our property government valuation would not be acceptable owing to the number of improvements that have been made to the property. If living next to large water storage ponds proved to be unacceptable we would expect compensation from the council by the way of purchase of our property at its true value and relocation costs as being on the boundary of the proposal, the scheme would devalue our property and possibly inhibit our ability to sell. It cannot be guaranteed that the risks to the environment, our health and our personal living standard will not be impacted by this scheme.	Eric Ryder			Akaroa
96.	34032	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	What would the feasibility of supplying the waters to farmers in times of drought	Nico Wiremu			Otautahi

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
97.	34031	No					Yes	Yes	Potable treatment of water & recycle use. Friends of Banks Peninsula Wastewater submission.	Brian Eves	Trust spokesperson	Robinsons Bay Bach Trust	Christchurch
98.	34030	No	To the land	3	1	2	No	Yes		Anna Faau			Christchurch
99.	34029	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I do not support any land based options. The purple pipe system must be included. Also the maintenance and repair of the leaking storm water pipes, must be done, as that water currently gets into the pipeline and is treated; this is an added cost to the system.	Carolyn Turnbull			Akaroa
100.	34027	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		John Kelland			Akaroa
101.	34026	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I am totally opposed to seeing Robinsons Bay used as Akaroas toilet  To embark on a design scheme with proven issues in the Akaroa sewage pipe network is ridiculous. Up to 60% of the water in the system may not be grey water.  To devalue my property in Robinsons Bay with no hint compensation is an insult.  We will be expected to pay via our rates in Robinsons Bay for a system we are not even connect to is an insult.  The historic sites in Robinsons Bay are being disrespected  There is a mapped risk of flooding to porperties in Robinsons Bay if the storage pond failed.  Weather predictions are more and more unable to be forecast and flooding is highly likley  Why is it OK to soil the Robinsons Bay stream with the eventual run off that will build up over time.  To put a scheme of any type in the inner harbour area is ridiculous.  To water log clay based soils is unfathonable. This is not an area of alluvial gravels!!!!!!  Would want this installed next door to your property???? I think not.	Gavin Shepherd	Cashmere	Gavin Shepherd	ChCh
102.	34025	No	To the land	2	1	3	No	Yes		Mikayla Clapson			Christchurch
103.	34024	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	This is Akaroa's waste - it is their problem.  The soil type cannot cope with endless water in Robinsons Bay  It is unacceptable to the property owners in Robinsons Bay to see their properties be devalued  Puts some properties at risk of flooding in Robinsons Bay  Geese will end up living in the Robinsons Bay pond and defecate till their hearts content	Sonia Shepherd			ChCh

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									Midges and mosquitos will immediately be attracted to the inevitable stagnant water in the Robinsons Bay pond  The historic site in Robinsons Bay is being disrespected  Treated water in the Robinsons Bay inner harbour area is a ridiculous concept - the deterioration in water quality over time is inevitable				
104.	34021	No	To the harbour				No	No	Treated water to highest level used for drinking or discharged out past the heads from the harbour.	Gabrielle Menzies			Akaroa
105.	34020	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	No		Ben Hutchinson			Christchurch
106.	34019	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Morgan Hale			Christchurch
107.	34018	No	To the land						I think that following mana whenua guidance on this issue is very important.	Jamie Stevenson			Christchurch
108.	34017	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Please see my attached submission	John Curry			Akaroa
109.	34016	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Jeremy Moore			Christchurch
110.	34013	No	To the harbour							Philip Narbey			Ak6
111.	34011	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	Treating the water in Akaroa is a much more sound idea as Akaroa is nearly always on water restrictions during the summer when the water is really needed. Also that is where the majority of people / tourists go in summer not to Robinsons or Takamatua Bays. Why does the waste water have to be piped miles away from where it is really needed. In this day of sustainability it just does not make sense to pipe the water away from where it is really needed. The effect on the land adjoining the proposed ponds in Robinsons Bay would be disastrous as the property is Organic and any leakage / overflow / flooding would contaminate that land and all the land in it's path ruining any crops / buildings in its' way. Any stock could be harmed and rendered unsaleable therefore a huge cost to the owners. The financial cost of remediation to the land and any buildings would be huge let alone the emotional cost and well being of its' owners. As the land surrounding the ponds would no longer be grazed there is the threat of fire with the long dry grass in summer along with the ponds being an ideal possible breeding ground for mosquitoes. Even though the land is to be landscaped and planted it will be many years before the ponds and surrounding landscape would be able to look after itself. The new plantings would have to be watered weeded etc for many years until well established. The planting of fruit trees would only bring in more pests and as the peninsula is trying to eradicate pests ,this would not help, especially if fruit was left to rot bringing in more possums, rats and wasps etc. This would be especially worrying for the adjacent land owners.	Tessa Fenton			Christchurch
112.	34010	No	To the land		1		No	No	Alternative options such as MARRS do not appear to have been fully explored and I feel this would be a likely better option. Although I have given Goughs Bay as my option one - I would prefer to see the above further considered.  As an arboriculturalist I can see no reason why there is a need to irrigate native trees!!!  I feel that treatment plant will be visible and an unattractive feature particularly from the main wharf in Akaroa despite landscaping proposals put forward	Jill McChesney			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
113.	34008	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Disposal of Akaroa's treated wastewater in front of our home of 32yrs is culturally offensive to myself &amp; my family. It would have an immense impact on our environment &amp; lives.</p> <p>An adverse economic impact on our accommodation business</p> <p>Huge devaluation of our future investment. Loss of sea view &amp; sun due to planting of trees. Health issues with midges &amp; odour. Very productive farmland would be lost. The Anglican Church are unwilling sellers.</p> <p>This is an unexpected &amp; unplanned drastic interruption into our lives.</p> <p>Of all the valleys in the inner harbour, Takamatua is a beautiful, unique &amp; sheltered valley with various life style blocks, farms and residential residents. The landscape &amp; properties will be changed forever if the inner bays option goes ahead</p>	Sue Thurston			Akaroa
114.	34007	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Disposal of Akaroa's treated waste water in front of our home of 32 yrs is culturally offensive to myself &amp; my family. It would have an immense impact on our environment &amp; lives.</p> <p>An adverse economic impact on our accommodation business.</p> <p>Huge devaluation of our future investment. Loss of sea view &amp; sun due to planting of trees. Health issues with midges &amp; odour. Very productive farmland would be lost. The Anglican Church are unwilling sellers.</p> <p>This is an unexpected &amp; unplanned drastic interruption into our lives.</p> <p>Of all the valleys in the inner harbour, Takamatua is a beautiful, unique &amp; sheltered valley with various life style blocks, farms and residential residents.</p> <p>The landscape &amp; properties will be changed forever if the inner bays option goes ahead.</p>	David Thurston			Akaroa
115.	34006	No	To the harbour	3	3	3	Yes	No	<p>Question 1:</p> <p>To land - No not current suggestions, but more see below.</p> <p>To the harbour - Ocean Entrance - best. Akaroa, Wainui, French Farm, and Devauchelle, all tributaries to one pipe down centre of harbour.</p> <p>Question 2:</p> <p>Too complicated, offensive, expensive but:</p> <p>Stanley Park Reserve and Takapuneke Reserve are possible especially combined with modern organic, sustainable farm grazing (leased out?)</p>	Rod Naish	Previous BPDC Councillor	Akaroa Ltd	Akaroa



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Inners Bays - Best soil for agriculture - a No No</p> <p>Goughs Bay - Still ends up in the ocean - cost!</p> <p>Pompeys Pillar - Crazy</p> <p>Also we own 12 ha adjacent to Stanley Park reserve which could be included in the farming and irrigation. Very close to town boundary Centrally located.</p> <p>Rural. Could be a show place example (tourism).</p> <p>Land use could include native plants, animals, grapes, other horticulture, subdivision. With purple pipe included.</p> <p>Gravity feed to upper &amp; Lower township.</p> <p>Question 3:</p> <p>Yes - too much disease for sports players?</p> <p>No - but yes maybe</p> <p>Question 4:</p> <p>Yes - Too expensive for such</p> <p>No - Only a tiny population. Ok on new subdivisions</p>				
116.	34005	No					Yes	Yes	<p>If the practicalities can be worked out (and I sincerely hope they can) I am much in favour of the scenario spelt out in detail in the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission – which I have read in advanced draft form. I have not ticked unequivocal preferences for either land or harbour discharge, nor ranked the three land irrigation options offered, for reasons which I hope are made clear below.</p> <p>Although there aspects of the Inner Bays option that I like, I also see many negatives. Pumping the water up and over the crater rim to Goughs or Pompeys seems such a huge negative as to rule them both out, Pompeys especially so. The impact of both those options on the Wildride Project is also very relevant, although I admit to special interest as our Hinewai Reserve project is an integral part of the Wildside.</p> <p>I would like to emphasise the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I respect Ngai Tahu's concerns about a continuing harbour outfall. I dare to hope that water-treatment to drinkable standard, volume reduction through fixing pipes, through serious water-use conservation measures and re-use, and desirably through some sort of natural filtration through an appropriately sized and positioned wetland (perhaps at the suggested Old Coach Road stie) to restore "mauri" to any of the water that does end up in the sea, might gain Ngai Tahu acceptance for a rigorously designed harbour outfall, as far out down the harbour towards the heads as possible.</li> </ul>	Hugh D Wilson			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repairing the pipes to greatly reduce stormwater inflow and groundwater infiltration (and leakage?) seems to me to be the initial top priority</li> <li>• A design that allows for re-use in Akaroa of as much of the water as possible seems wholly desirable and sensible. Water is already a critically limited resource for the town, and climate change that is increasingly obviously already upon us is highly likely to make water an even more limited and precious resource.</li> <li>• The carbon-sequestration benefits of the land irrigation options are admirable, but are better served by natural regeneration of native forest on large and expanding reserves such as Hinewai and Misty Peaks.</li> <li>• I have some knowledge of local flora and eco-systems and would be very willing to offer freely further advice on any native plantings that do end up as part of the scheme.</li> <li>• I fully appreciate that this whole issue is complex, difficult and fraught, that whatever is finally decided will end up treading heavily on somebody's toes, and that some degree of compromise among conflicting viewpoints will surely be needed for the unavoidable needs of the whole community</li> </ul>				
117.	34003	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	The harbour outfall should be extended out to the harbour entrance, and the wastewater treated to a very high standard.	Richard Menzies	Mr	Mr	Akaroa
118.	34002	No	To the land	1	2	3	No	No		Theo Bunker			Christchurch
119.	34000	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes		Laurel Daikee	Owner	Another time antiques	Akaroa
120.	33999	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	<p>The disposal of treated wastewater to occupied valleys in the upper harbour is culturally offensive to the people who live there. The only people in favour are those who will benefit financially through the sale of their land.</p> <p>The water will mostly end up in the silted bays of the harbour during any significant rain events causing further excess of nutrients in those bays.</p> <p>It is disgraceful that Beca consider the inner harbour proposal to be fiscally neutral to the surrounding property owners.</p> <p>It will obviously devalue our properties permanently.</p> <p>The proposal also flies in the face of the Heritage Values expressed by the Council's own Heritage Team within your Heritage Unit. Our house is a listed Heritage dwelling on a listed Archeological site of significance as is the neighbouring "Pavitt Cottage" and most of the valley of Robinson's Bay is of archeological significance that Beca seems keen to ignore.</p>	Chris and Tracey Pottinger			Banks Peninsula
121.	33998	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	No		Laurel Daikee			Akaroa
122.	33996	No	To the harbour				Yes	No		W L & J M Wilson			Springfield
123.	33995	No	To the harbour				Yes	No		Kay Squires			Akaroa
124.	33994	No					Yes	Yes	<p>Question 1: Neither</p> <p>Question 2: None</p> <p>Comments:</p>	Richard Evans			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Firstly - fix all leaks in Akaroa system so we know what amount of waste water we have to deal with.</p> <p>Second - Treat it to a high enough standard for re-use in Akaroa, to relieve Akaroa's water shortage problem.</p>				
125.	33993	No					Yes	Yes	<p>Question 1: Neither option without first fixing the leaks</p> <p>Question 2: None</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>First, fix the leaks in the existing sewage / storm water drain system in Akaroa. Then treat our precious fresh water on Banks Peninsula as a resource and not as waste.</p> <p>Residents of Akaroa need to take responsibility for their sewage and water. They shouldn't expect Takamatua and Robinson's Bay residents to shoulder the wastewater options.</p> <p>Treat the sewage to the highest standards available in 2020 and return it to use again.</p>	Christine Aylesworth			Akaroa
126.	33991	No	To the harbour	3	3	1	Yes	Yes		Kevin Kerr			Akaroa
127.	33990	No	To the harbour					Yes	All submissions should be treated equally from the outset of this process	E Aitken			Akaroa
128.	33989	No					Yes	Yes	<p>We do not wish to choose from the two options that have been provided above; please see below;</p> <p>I chair the Robinsons' Bay Ratepayers and Residents' Association (Association).</p> <p>The Association has some 50+ members and is an active Community Organisation within Robinsons Bay and Akaroa Harbour.</p> <p>The Association was formed in 2014 after considerable community involvement over the preceding years in respect of a number of projects. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Repairing the T section of the Robinsons Bay wharf (originally built in 1914) in 2004. This project was led by Dame Ann Hercus, former Minister of the Crown, who was resident in the Bay;</li> <li>2. Undertaking several Working Bees to tidy the picnic area in the Bay, a very popular spot with tourists and visitors to the area;</li> <li>3. Several Working Bees tidying up the foreshore and jetty road area servicing the wharf.</li> </ol> <p>Subsequent to the earthquakes the wharf was closed and the Association was formed and approached the Council after 78 submitters in the Bay (all residents or families with holiday homes) urged the Council to look a re-opening the wharf damaged in the earthquake and by lack of repair.</p> <p>In 2018/19 the Association and other members of the Community attended</p>	Lee Robinson	Chair	Robinson's Bay Ratepayers and Residents Association	Akaroa Harbour

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>23 working bees in all, and worked with Council staff to repair the Robinsons Bay wharf. The Community itself provided \$20,000 of its own funds to replace the planking. The result is we now have a wharf that sits on the Councils maintenance schedule and is used daily by numerous people both from within and outside the Robinsons Bay Community. It is a magnificent community asset and represents a lot of the history of the Bay when the wharf was used to export coxford harvested from the Eastern Bays.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay itself is an historic and cultural centre that boasts one of the oldest sawmills in the country. It is incredulous to believe that the Council are prepared to advocate a wastewater storage pond, the size of four football fields, in the Bay immediately adjoining the historical sawmill site. Pavitt Cottage which sits on the site is recognised as a significant and cultural historical site and has considerably cultural and heritage significance.</p> <p>Much has been made over the years of the Council in the 1960s placing the sewage treatment plant in Akaroa on the Maori burial ground, Takapuneke. How insulting and irreverent was that. Yet here we have our modern Council providing a similar proposal on a cultural site that is significant to the area specifically and beyond.</p> <p>The proposal offends for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The provision of wastewater to Robinsons Bay and Takamatua does not in any way provide a beneficial use of the water for the area or the community.</li> <li>2. It is located very near residential houses and adjoining one of the nicest and cleanest streams in the Peninsula, well known for its whitebait and other aspects.</li> <li>3. It is at the head of the harbour where inevitably any major event will ensure that the wastewater ends up in the sea, and in the most tidal area of the harbour.</li> <li>4. The misleading costings for the Inner Harbour option (Robinsons Bay and Takamatua) do not take account of any cost in ensuring that the residents of those areas are reticulated into the proposed wastewater system. How unfair and misleading is this. The very people in the communities who are being asked to receive Akaroa's wastewater cannot themselves be part of the wastewater system that they have been requested to host.</li> <li>5. Specifically as far as the residents are concerned the proposal will have a significant influence on the amenity of the community and the residents property values.</li> <li>6. The Council has no intention of paying any compensation or insurance in relation to those residents affected by the proposed scheme.</li> <li>7. We have real concerns about the identified cost of each scheme and evidence will be produced at the Hearing to cast doubts on the Councils costings in respect of all proposed systems in particular.</li> <li>8. The Consultation document while purporting to be an objective</li> </ol>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>presentation to the community for it to consider all options is limited and directs people rather than allows all matters to be debated. For these reasons many submitters have chosen not to select the choice of Harbour Outfall or Land Based Options. There are other palatable alternatives which are being provided here and which many members of the Working Party endeavoured to explore with the Council during the Working Party process 2017 to 2020 but without success or meaningful response from the Council.</p> <p>Much has been made of wastewater being provided to the harbour. Untreated wastewater in that respect is also unacceptable.</p> <p>We know that the infiltration of stormwater and groundwater to the wastewater system currently comprises 60% of the wastewater. The Council therefore needs as a matter of priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To fix the l&amp;l within the pipes in Akaroa and thereby limit the size of the system proposed to be produced.</li> <li>2. Discharge the water to the sea or to Akaroa streams through a wetland or similar filtration process; and</li> <li>3. Provide water of a sufficient quality to enable garden water and supplementary use to take care of what is clearly going to be water shortages in the years to come.</li> </ol> <p>The approach to Akaroa's wastewater is as much about climate change and providing a long term vision and planning for the future as it is about providing a wastewater scheme for Akaroa.</p> <p>Akaroa has suffered water shortages for years during the summer months and climate change ensure that this is increased and exacerbated, why would our Council advocate removal of a potential water supply that would alleviate this issue.</p> <p>Compounded with that to set up a wastewater system, in an area where residential houses, culturally significant assets and streams are put at risk is non sensical and lacks vision.</p> <p>Our representatives should be looking to provide a grey water and/or potable water system from our wastewater for Akaroa that takes away all these risks and provides an asset for the future in one of the last picturesque and beautiful areas of our country.</p> <p>Water shortages will become a common theme and our Council needs to address this issue with a sensible and long term vision. In this regard the Association adopts the submission of the Friends of Banks Peninsula in response to the Councils wastewater proposal.</p> <p>The Association strongly resist and resent the Councils proposal to place wastewater in Takamatua and Robinsons Bay; it is short sighted, lacks vision, lacks beneficial use, lacks any long term planning for water shortages in our community and is simply being promoted as a dumping ground for wastewater without proper due diligence and infrastructural improvement that</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>demands the local authorities attention.</p> <p>The options are poor and are poorly researched and are totally rejected.</p> <p>In a Joint Statement produced dated 25 June 2020 all of these concerns and more were expressed in a letter signed by 227 members of the community. This letter is attached to this submission.</p> <p>Lee Robinson</p> <p>Chair Robinsons Bay Ratepayers and Residents Association</p>				
129.	33988	No	To the land	1					My preferred option is the Inner Bays Irrigation scheme. I believe this is the best long term option for our community and for mana whenua. Clean water and a harbour rich in mahinga kai is surely an aspiration we all share.	CHANTELLE TAINUI			CHRISTCHURCH
130.	33987	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Anna & Wim Sliep (& Trimpe Burger)		Anna & Wim Sliep (& Trimpe Burger)	RD 25 Temuka 7985
131.	33982	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	<p>Disposal into the harbour is not an option - we need to respect the (very sensible) view of Ngāi Tahu and uphold our treaty obligations.</p> <p>The inner harbour option is the most sensible land based option, when considering capital and operational expense, resilience and climate change mitigation. In addition, the positive benefits of having a new wetland and native plantings nearby outweigh the negative in my opinion.</p>	Arthur McGregor			Christchurch
132.	33979	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>The Christchurch City Council has been forced through a judgement of the Environment Court to carry out this expensive exercise to consider the options for land-based disposal of wastewater.</p> <p>None of the land-based options is acceptable to the residents of the Peninsula or practical to implement.</p> <p>Given the new treatment plant will process the wastewater to a standard high enough for it to be used in public domains and later possibly residential gardens, then it must be perfectly safe to discharge into the harbour.</p> <p>There is no record of detrimental impact of the existing outfall to commercial and recreational fishing/farming in the harbour, so the proposed highly treated wastewater from the new plant discharged further out into the harbour could not in any way be considered detrimental.</p> <p>The Council should take the only course open to it and re-submit the harbour outfall proposal to the Environment Court as the only acceptable option for the disposal of wastewater from the proposed new treatment plant.</p>	Christopher Grigg			Akaroa
133.	33976	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	The impact on the environment of building the new system, and also on the roads. Please make sure all roads are resealed properly which ever option is chosen.	Jenny Brady			Akaroa
134.	33971	Yes							Please see attached letter. My preferred option is volume reduction, and disposal of treated grey water, at least, to the sea out beyond The Heads.	Michael de Hamel			Canterbury
135.	33968	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Emma Derrick			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
136.	33965	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	To think longer term than just 35 years lets create something that lasts for the future.	Adam Pollard			Christchurch
137.	33963	Yes							Please refer to attached submission	Jon Trewin	Planning Advisor	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Christchurch
138.	33961	No	To the land		1		No	Yes		Reiana Tainui	Catering Manager	Onuku	Christchurch
139.	33960	No							<p>First I wish to acknowledge the opportunity of expressing views on the above from Paul and Dawn Haglund in relation to our affected property at [REDACTED], Duvauchelle.</p> <p>Summary: I trust I can cover our views and no doubt those of family members who would have resided on this property since the late 1930's, under the following headings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Past and what worked effectively</li> <li>2. The Present and issues experienced and</li> <li>3. The Future with concerns for future generations</li> </ol> <p>1) The Past (History)</p> <p>This property was the location of the [REDACTED] which was built in 1873 and the [REDACTED] rooms were utilized through to 1929 when the current school was erected. The old school property was bought by my Grandfather (Peter Haglund). Then in the late 1930's by my Father (Harold Haglund), who in 1950 built a new home which is on the property today.</p> <p>Water to these buildings was provided from a spring up a gully across Pawsons Valley Road with the collection from a creek into 2 square tanks, to ensure both a supply and reduce any sediment following torrential downpours.</p> <p>Latter water supplies, were provided from rain water off the roof of the house, plus pumping from a well on the property.</p> <p>Although retaining a plentiful supply of water would have been a challenge at times, the introduction of a "town supply" assured property owners that water issues would be resolved.</p> <p>The sewerage system utilized septic tanks which were effective on this three quarter acre property, with some assistance through the occasional pumping and cleaning of the tank compartments.</p> <p>Introduction of a new water and sewerage system for the Bay appeared to be the answer, with directives that no longer would the septic tank system be required or holding tanks for the "town supply" of water, which not only would be supplied but filtered.</p> <p>The Levy, (as Council will appreciate) was that every property owner connecting to both the "Town water" supply and sewerage system would make a contribution of \$6,000. A considerable amount to pay but considered</p>	Paul & Dawn Haglund			Duvauchelle

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
140.	33958	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	<p>worthwhile over time for services that would meet the current and future needs from those resources. (That documentation makes interesting reading today).</p> <p>2) The Present:</p> <p>Our forebears would wonder if the current "Planners" even consider resources prior to approving sub-divisions or buildings on vacant sections. Typical development with lack of resources is the recent growth up this Valley Road. We would have thought that one would plan what resources are required and ensure they are in place before approving subdivisions or sections to be built on. We can only imagine this is due to greater income through rates, which doesn't alleviate the regular water restrictions opposed on us or the necessity of recently transporting water in, to meet the summer demand.</p> <p>In addition: why didn't the Council continue to charge those property owners who came onto the local water and sewerage schemes, a levy of at least \$6,000, which would seem an equitable way of dealing with resources that would have proved sustainable, without seeking further monetary input from the original property contributors?</p> <p>We also wonder about other locations within the harbour and their requirements; being Wainui, French Farm and Barrys Bay.</p> <p>3) The Future:</p> <p>Our understanding is that the waste water is, or can be treated to a very high standard and Duvauchelle shouldn't have any storm water encroaching into the sewer system. It seems only a few years ago that we were warned about "Global Warming" and in 50 years' time that the sea would be encroaching on our property. If the "Predictors" and Council believe this is still the situation, then we would suggest, that many of the properties close to the foreshore, won't need to worry about these services; especially the sewer, as their discharge will be directly into the Harbour.</p> <p>4) Conclusion:</p> <p>Our preference and in our minds, the only solution would be to discharge highly treated wastewater into the Harbour. We believe that the various sprays used for killing noxious weeds and that run off into the sea would be doing far greater harm.</p> <p>No way would we support any possibility of utilizing the local Show Grounds at Duvauchelle for a settling pond.</p> <p>The only alternative, would be to use tankers and transport the local effluent (wastewater) to the Bromley Treatment Plant, which could prove more cost effective.</p> <p>I trust our documented thoughts add some value to the disturbing and difficult issues facing Council and local residents on the Peninsula.</p>	Tessa Fee			Porirua



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
141.	33957	No					Yes	Yes	<p>This is my submission:</p> <p>Please fix the Akaroa Town Problem</p> <p>Use Purple Pipe</p> <p>Reuse Water</p> <p>Fix broken pipes</p> <p>Only then will I accept the inner harbour scheme which will be much reduced.</p> <p>Yes , I would like to be heard.</p>	Paddy Stronach			Duvauchelle
142.	33955	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Please see attached document	Craig Church			Banks Peninsula
143.	33939	Yes	To the harbour	1			Yes	Yes		John, Carol, George & Emma Masefield			Akaroa
144.	33937	No	To the harbour				Yes		<p>The extent of possible heavy metals has been underestimated. To eliminate such will require settling ponds (oxidation ponds) even after high standard of treatment. The volumns of treated waste water is extremely likely to exceed the evaporation and ground soakage of plantings therefore the required discharge to a creek will still occur.</p> <p>even with adequate settling ponds discharge to creeks or the inner harbour will still have minor contaminants which will kill shellfish.</p> <p>Therefore the discharge to the outer harbour or off the coast line needs serious consideration.</p> <p>I also consider that the proposed initial screening plant at the reclaimed area (boat ramp) will have excessive smell, especially when removing screened solids which will prematate over the Akaroa township. The Rec ground will need to be renamed "Purfume Park". Such smells have been a problem at Bromley which the experts claimed should not be happening, Therefore further consideration as to the location of the initial plant is diffinately required</p>	Ian Le Page			Akaroa
145.	33936	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Storm and groundwater infiltrating through old and broken pipes in Akaroa requires upgrading to reduce the amount going through the treatment plant.</p> <p>Akaroa has water restrictions most summers. Reuse some of the highly treated water through a purple pipe system for public toilets, parks and gardens.</p> <p>Inner Bays option - the waste water is from Akaroa, and Robinsons Bay or Takamatua. In fact these communities have to deal with their own wastewater.</p> <p>The land required for ponds and the irrigation of native trees should be used for more productive purposes.</p>	Rodney & Janice Innes	Members	Takamatua Ratepayers	Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>The ponds would be an eye sore spoiling the beauty of the Peninsula. We do not know enough about whether the native trees will survive with too much nitrogen. The steeper land, if continually irrigated will encourage erosion, hat is before any rain!</p> <p>If the ponds become full, and have to be released, it ends up in the harbour anyway or worse still, along the shores of the Inner Bays.</p> <p>Constant irrigation would eventually end up in the groundwater polluting existing wells and becoming a health risk. It would also become a breeding ground for unwanted insects and smells.</p> <p>The issue seems to be dividing the community. Ngai Tahu find the discharge of human sewage, even as highly treated wastewater, as being highly offensive.</p> <p>What about the views of other cultures? Were they considered?</p> <p>We find it offensive that you can take the wastewater from one community and virtually dump it on another. Putting the highly treated wastewater into outer harbour seems to be the only option. It would solve any future growth in population and it is the cheapest option.</p>				
146.	33935	No	To the harbour	1			Yes	Yes	Extending outfall pipe further towards the Heads	Diana Stronach			Akaroa
147.	33934	No	To the harbour	1			Yes	Yes	Extending the outfall pipe further towards the heads	Wendy Murray			Pigeon Bay
148.	33933	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	The inner bays scheme is offensive to the local residents of the bays. It is not practical and will result in many side effects. Why are the majority of nz residents subject to the wishes of the few ie ngai tahu tribe .this is also becoming a cultural issue. I strongly endorse the submission of the friends of banks Peninsula	Doig Smith			Akaroa
149.	33932	Yes					Yes	Yes	<p>Please see attached document.</p> <p>To reiterate our main thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider communities wellbeing, cultural and social values of the inner bays residents</li> <li>- Fix the pipe: 20% is not ambitious and sustainable, fixing 100% of the system should be aimed at.</li> <li>- Treat the water to drinkable quality</li> <li>- Reuse the water in Akaroa where it is the most needed.</li> <li>- Follow a stage approach as suggested by the Friends of Banks Peninsula.</li> </ul>	Kevin and Averil Parthonnaud			Akaroa
150.	33931	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	1. My preferred option is the Inner Bays Irrigation scheme. I believe this is the best long term option for our community and for mana whenua. Clean water and a harbour rich in mahinga kai is surely an aspiration we all share.	Kaye Gray			Christchurch
151.	33930	No	To the land						If trees on Hammond Point are kept saturated on Hammond Point which is open to all wind exposures they will not put down roots + topple over easily	Richard Florance			Akaroa
152.	33929	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes	Restoring the mauri of the water and health and wellbeing of the community and whenua if of the highest importance to me and my whanau. I Support the Inner Bays Irrigation option as it achieves this the best.	Rochelle Tainui	Active member	Ōnuku Rūnanga	Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
153.	33928	No	To the harbour						Owing to composition of unstable peninsula land based options are unsuitable especially when sited in bottoms of gullies causing seepage etc very unfair to force this on other bays + Communities considering the odours + midges etc which will entail as time goes by there will be more requirements for more land a need grows	Pamela Florance			Akaroa
154.	33927	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	The Akaroa waste water pipes need repairing so that a lot less water will be used.  Put in purple pipe systems for the future	Christine Bray			Takamatua
155.	33926	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	Yes. Need to focus on storm water getting into waste water, this would cut down huge volume of waste.  Treat the waste water to a plus high standard and put to harbour outfall.  The option to land would have so many people affected for many future generations!! And to cost is billions on the rate payer	Neil Barnett	Owner	Kingfisher Smoke House	Akaroa
156.	33925	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	Leave our Inner Bays alone.  The Council have an amazing opportunity to set an example & pave the way for the rest of the small communities in NZ grappling with these same issues & sustainability.  Set up a "Gold Standard" water treatment system & plan. Don't waste this opportunity. Fix the storm water issues first.  An put the "drinking quality H2O" way out towards the heads! We have no plan for this - has it even been considered?	Rebecca Barnett			Akaroa
157.	33923	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I would prefer an option of fixing the infrastructure in the township (broken water pipes etc.) & using wet lands as well before discharging into the harbour	Sue Johns			Akaroa
158.	33920	Yes					Yes	Yes	Please read our attached submission	Page Lawson and Stuart Jeffrey			Akaroa
159.	33919	No	To the land	1	2	3		No	Akaroa harbour is such a pristine environment where we have a protected species of dolphin, aqua culture and marine farming and a marine reserve, but we continue to pollute the harbour and contaminate it for future generations. The harbour is also a Statutory Acknowledgement area where the Crown acknowledges the harbour's significance to Ngāi Tahu but successive local governments have tried to erode this significance, furthermore this harbour is a Mahingakai for Ngāi Tarewa/Ngāti Irakehu which was the 9th article of the Ngāi Tahu claim. I would argue that under Te Tiriti o Waitangi this council has a duty to protect and enhance this for now, and for future generations. I am strongly opposed to discharge to the harbour and do not believe this to be inline with Manawhenua values or in the spirit of Kaitiakitanga or "stewardship. The discharge of wastewater into the harbour is culturally offensive and incompatible with the harbour as mahinga kai.	Keefe Robinson-Gore	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Keefe Robinson-Gore	Christchurch
160.	33917	No	To the land	1	3	3	Yes	Yes	Restoring the mauri of the water and health and wellbeing of the community and whenua if of the highest importance to me and my whanau. I Support the Inner Bays Irrigation option as it achieves this the best.	Hemi Innes	My Runanga	Ōnuku	Christchurch
161.	33916	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes	Definitely against discharge into harvour in any form.	Aroha Rawson	Marketing Manager	Akaroa On The Beach	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
162.	33911	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Fix the pipes and stop inflow and infiltration. Recycle the water to Akaroa where it is needed most . The proposed system has a huge environmental risk Dr Mike Joy is a New Zealand freshwater ecologist employed at University of Wellington, " sending clean water flushing down sewage pipes is an archaic Victorian idea, there are N.Z designed award wining systems that are sound and very cost effective"where individuals or small groups have the ability to run their own environmentally friendly septic systems within Akaroa.	G David & Nicola Shanks			Christchurch
163.	33908	No	To the harbour				No	No		Patricia Little			Akaroa
164.	33906	No	To the harbour				No	No		Brian Little			Akaroa
165.	33904	No	To the land	1	2		No	No	Once you enter the purple pipeline arena,, you are advocating putting sewer into the harbor food basket, and we need to end this distasteful behaviour! No to shitting on our food!!!	John Morgan	Commitee Member	Onuku Marae	Waipukurau
166.	33902	No							This submission is made on behalf of the Pavitt Family Trust (the Trust), the owner of the historic cottage known as the Pavitt Cottage (the cottage) situated at ■ Sawmill Road, Robinsons Bay, Banks Peninsula.  Background  John and Elizabeth, together with most of their children, arrived in Akaroa from England on 2 April 1850 on the Monarch. The family had intended to settle in Auckland but, because of adverse weather and shipboard discomfort experienced during the voyage, they decided to settle in Akaroa and later Christchurch.  Johns and Elizabeth's daughter, Mary Ann, married Samuel Charles Farr in Akaroa after their arrival and it was the first recorded wedding in Canterbury.  John and Elizabeth Pavitt's four elder sons (Frederick, Henry, Alfred and Francis) purchased a block of land, RD579, in Robinsons Bay from Charles Barrington Robinson in 1854 but it was not formally legalised until 1856. A sawmill and cottage were built in 184 but both were destroyed by a fierce fire in 1856. A new mill and cottage were built, as too was a waterwheel, the remains of which can still be seen today close to where the second cottage now stands, sometime between 1856 and 1860. The cottage, mill, water wheel and water flume were designed by Samuel Farr who had at that time entered into a formal partnership with his brothers-in-law.  At the time of a Pavitt Family reunion, held in Christchurch and Akaroa on 31 March and 1 April 1990, the land on which the Pavitt Cottage (the cottage) stood was owned by the late Murray Thacker. Colin John Fernyhough attended the reunion and it was at the time he became aware of its existence and of its historical significance. John approached Mr Thacker and offered to buy the cottage and the land upon which it sat. John's offer was initially declined but some years later Mr Thacker offered to sell the land and to have it formally surveyed and registered as a separate title. Settlement took place on 14 July 2000.  Shortly after acquisition, John engaged a local builder, Kevin Templeton, to	Nancy Tichborne	Chairperson	Pavitt Family Trust	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>restore the cottage to as close to its original state as was reasonably possible. This proved to be a major project with the rebuilding programme extending over a nine-month period. He also engaged other tradespeople and with the help of his wife (Christine) furnished the cottage, as close to its original form as was possible. Unfortunately, John's health was deteriorating at the time the property was purchased. He had had a stroke prior to July 2000 and at the same time he had been diagnosed with terminal cancer. As a consequence, his record keeping was less than perfect, but from what records existed at the time of his death (12 February 2003) it has been ascertained the cost of the land was \$135,000 and renovation costs and furnishings are estimated to have cost approximately \$250,000.</p> <p>John's intention was transfer to the property and chattels into a charitable trust where it would remain in perpetuity. At the time of his death, he thought he had achieved that objective but it was subsequently determined the trust he, as settlor, had created (the Pavitt Cottage Trust (PCT) was deemed to be a "resultant" trust and, as a consequence, not eligible for charitable status under the Charities Act 2005. The sole beneficiary of the PCT was the John Fernyhough Family Trust. The sole beneficiary of the John Fernyhough Family Trust acknowledged John's wishes had not been met and offered to rectify the situation by resettling the trust into a new trust, the Pavitt Family Trust. The offer was accepted and the PFT was settled on 3 December 2017.</p> <p>The principal outcomes sought by the PFT are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Preserve the restored Robinsons Bay cottage as an example of colonial architecture from the mid-19th century and to acknowledge its historical significance.</li> <li>* Encourage, promote, foster and support Pavitt family descendants to take an interest in their history and heritage and</li> <li>* Provide Pavitt descendants the opportunity to use and enjoy the cottage for recreational and family purposes.</li> </ul> <p>The PFT has a vesting date of 23 October 2082, being 80 years from the date of the settlement of the PCT, or such earlier date as the trustees may appoint.</p> <p>The financial viability of the PFT is dependent on receipts from members and friends of the Pavitt family, donations and, as from 1st 2019, net receipts from Bachcare Limited through which the public may use the property when not required by family members. The PFT's financial statements for the period ended 30 September 2019 are available if required.</p> <p>John's intention from the time he acquired the 5 Sawmill Road property until the date of his death (12 February 2003) was to preserve it in perpetuity for the benefit of Pavitt descendants and the wider community.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>The Trust's objections to the Christchurch City Council's (the Council)</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>proposal to build two storage ponds each with a capacity of 9,500 cubic metres to be built on the irrigation site of Sawmill Road in Robinsons Bay, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An archaeological assessment of Lot 1, DP 82749, Robinsons Bay Canterbury, commissioned by the PFT, (the archaeological assessment) describes the cottage as an "excellent example of an early settler's dwelling and its archaeological value is assessed as high".</li> <li>2. On page 57 of the archaeological assessment it states: "in the 1980's, Robinsons Bay valley was referred to by a historian as a very well-preserved landscape: "Few communities have such a range of pioneer cottages, dairies, cheese rooms, stables and outhouses in such original condition." (Ogilvie 1990:172). The CCC District Plan has identified two built structures in the valley as being of historical significance: the mill cottage at 5 Sawmill Road, and the schoolmaster's house at 99 Robinsons Bay Road. In addition, in a 2007 Banks Peninsula landscape study (Miskel, 2007) prepared for the CCC described Robinsons, Bay, along with Takamatua, as having "important cultural and heritage values", and Environmental Canterbury has identified both bays as significant natural areas."</li> <li>3. On page 59 of the archaeological assessment under the heading Assessment of Effects of Archaeological Features, it says "Any ground-disturbing work in this area is likely to uncover remnants of the old mill, flume, tramway, blacksmith's workshop, and other outbuildings. Earth-moving projects that would modify this landscape will also compromise what remains of the engineering footprint of the water-driven mill operation, including the spillway, dam and ponds. These features are readily visible on the ground, and in aerial and satellite photographs".</li> <li>4. Professor Emeritus Helen Leach a (Pavitt descendant) notes "the transfer of the cottage and land from Murray Thacker to John Fernyhough to be especially significant. Murray's record of preserving the heritage of Banks Peninsula is unparalleled, and it is clear that he recognised the same determination in John Fernyhough and subsequently the Pavitt Cottage Trust. If her were alive today, he would remind us that the cottage was just one segment of a large archaeological site - the first sawmill in Canterbury. Aerial photographs show that the surviving archaeological features extend on to land that would be modified during pond construction, and potentially swept away in flood events. The new 2020 survey of the sawmill complex revealed archaeological evidence that has recently been ignored but was well know to Murray Thacker and local members of the Historic Places Trust in the 1990s. There can be no excuse for allowing damage or destruction to archaeological features by ignoring or denying their existence".</li> <li>5. It is noteworthy to observe, the Council makes no mention of the archaeological assessment in its "Akaroa treated wastewater option" document, notwithstanding it was fully aware of its existence on 20 July 2020. Which begs the question, why does the Council consider it not important for the Akaroa and Banks Peninsula residents, and all Cantabrians, to be aware of its existence and its findings i.e. the site is both historically and archaeologically significant?</li> <li>6. The erection of two ponds above the cottage will be unsightly and ruin the</li> </ol>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>ambiance and beauty of the valley, particularly as viewed from the cottage. The Council's "Akaroa treated wastewater option" document, dated 20 July 2020, gives no detail as to the height of the bunds.</p> <p>7. Our understanding is the construction time to build the two ponds will be somewhere between 6 and 12 months. It is unlikely anyone will want to use the cottage during this time and, consequently, the PFT's income will be reduced to zero or, at best, a trickle. The PFT has no cash reserves and its ongoing financial viability will cease during the construction period. The PFT will become insolvent within a short period of time (and certainly within the construction period) without financial assistance from the Council.</p> <p>8. In the event of a major earthquake, the cottage will be at risk from a bund breach and/or will be adversely affected from slop coming over a bund. The cottage is situated directly below the two ponds and any run-off could destroy or seriously damage the cottage.</p>				
167.	33898	No	To the harbour		1	2	Yes	Yes	<p>We feel very strongly that the inner harbor land disposal, is so disruptive, and has several risks for the environment as we move into wetter and stormier weather patterns. Global warming is also going to bring hotter, drier summers to the east coast of the South Island, resulting in drought.</p> <p>It appears as though the Council is being pressured into land disposal, because effluent disposal into water is culturally insensitive to Ngai Tahu. However at the consultation meetings you have indicated that it is the kai gathering they are concerned about. I am sure that modern treatment can eliminate the risk to sea food. The Harbour discharge is far cheaper so additional funds being spent on treatment surely can eliminate any risk to seafood gathering. The land based disposal scheme has discharged through the wetland at times of high flow. Surely a controlled discharge, well down the harbour is less risky for the seafood than the uncontrolled discharge through a wetland on to the shore at Childrens Bay.</p> <p>Thirty years ago I was involved with the schemes in Akaroa and Lyttelton Harbours, and the accepted practice at that time was to put the effluent into the deep water of the harbours where there was adequate dilution. With technical advances, I am sure the treatment will have improved in thirty years, and will continue to improve. Also public and Govt Authorities' acceptance, is changing, and what is not acceptable now, will be acceptable in another thirty years. In large cities in Europe and Britain low quality water is treated for public consumption. This will occur in NZ, so in the future the effluent must be in a position for reuse as weather gets hotter, and water gets scarcer.</p> <p>We favour pushing the Govt authorities to accept the purple pipe system, using the effluent initially for public use, but then making it available for non potable water uses. With max. reuse, the discharge to the harbour would gradually reduce over the years. Putting it into the harbour while reuse options are fully explored gives the most flexibility.</p> <p>If you need to go to a land based system, we would favour pumping it over to Goughs Bay initially. This would leave the option in the future to reticulate it</p>	Ken & Fiona Paulin			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
168.	33895	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>around the contour in the Curry reserve above the Grehan valley water intake, and/or into the upper Takamatua valley.</p> <p>Akaroa has a small resident population, a dry climate and frequent water shortages in the summer. The harbour has a small amount of flat land, often with great historic significance.</p> <p>To invest vast sums of money in schemes which will have a limited ability to expand in the future is not acceptable water treatment techniques are all the time being developed so that in the not too distant future it may be feasible for all water to be potable.</p> <p>I therefore think water treated to a high standard should be returned to the harbour in a long, outfall pipe which will be able to cope with increased capacity in the future.</p> <p>Maybe the pipe could flow at times of the outgoing tide.</p> <p>With the shortage of water at busy times in the summer, to pipe all the wastewater over great distances to create native forest, which grows readily in this climate if fenced off without grazing, and has no need of irrigation makes no sense.</p> <p>To move the existing treatment plant from one historic site, Green Point, to another, Robinsons Bay, means repeating mistakes of the past. With modern techniques available we must move into a future where we can safely and permanently cope with our waste water. The first thing to do would be to fix the broken pipes from storm and run off and therefore greatly reduce water that needs to be treated to such a high level.</p> <p>I am very supportive of the idea of a purple pipe scheme to be used in public parks, public lavatories and by locals for garden watering.</p> <p>This submission, dated 15th August 2020 overrides any future submissions I have made.</p>	Patricia Dart			Akaroa
169.	33894	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	<p>It is premature to select any option until the leaking drainage infrastructure is repaired. Otherwise excessive ponds will be built to cope with largely non-sewage water - an unnecessary expense and unwelcome oversized treatment ponds.</p> <p>My preference is for highly treated water to be discharged to the harbour - several kms down harbour which can be linked to tidal flows.</p>	Michael Norris			Akaroa
170.	33893	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		M V Osborne			Akaroa
171.	33892	Yes					Yes	Yes	<p>I have submitted a separate submission.</p> <p>Question 2: I can't rank the preferences as do not believe that the waste water should be discharged onto land.</p> <p>Question 1: Akaroa should look after its own wastewater and aggressively repair the storm water system.</p> <p>Second Submission:</p>	Mary Browne			Christchurch



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Akaroa and the surrounding bays are well known as a destination with a great deal of historic interest.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay in particular was the site of the first water -powered sawmill in Canterbury. Four Pavitt brothers set up a mill in 1855 and supplied timber for many Christchurch buildings and churches, such as St Andrews, now located at Rangī Ruru Girls' school. Timber was also supplied to Wellington.</p> <p>The first house built by the Pavitts was burnt down. A subsequent one (built circa 1857) is still standing at Sawmill Road, Robinsons Bay. The Pavitt Cottage, as it is known today, is just one feature of a large archaeological site, including the old mill, flume, tramway, blacksmith's workshop and other buildings. The attached photograph of a painting owned by Wyn Williams (1191) shows many of these features, as the looked about 1870.</p> <p>Today the remains of these structures are readily visible on the ground and in aerial and satellite photographs. Many of features appear to be very close to and even under the proposed four metre high bund and the massive holding pond.</p> <p>The Council, so far, has failed to recognise the importance of historical and cultural tourism. Heritage New Zealand has installed signposts directing visitors to Sawmill Road to view the site of the first working sawmill in Canterbury. The attached photograph shows the explanatory noticeboard situated near the Pavitt Cottage.</p> <p>An archaeological assessment has been submitted to Heritage New Zealand. In addition to the Pavitt Cottage the whole site is now registered as an archaeological site.</p> <p>I urge the Council to think very carefully about the consequences of destroying such an important historic site and the precedent set in doing so.</p>				
172.	33891	No	To the harbour	3	3	3	Yes	Yes		Janice & Denis Stoddart			Akaroa
173.	33887	No	To the harbour					Yes		Joanna Hase			Christchurch
174.	33886	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>As a matter of extreme urgency the CCC should press for standards for treatment of waste water reuse.</p> <p>Waste water should be treated to a potable standard and reused in Akaroa from where it originates.</p> <p>Akaroa resident should be charged for water usage over a basic daily requirement to reduce amount of wastewater</p>	Georgiana Osborne			Akaroa
175.	33885	No	To the harbour	3	3	3	No			Clive Weir			Akaroa
176.	33883	Yes	To the land							Rachel Brown	Team Lead RMA Planning	Department of Conservation	Christchurch
177.	33882	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>My name is Dianne Carson and I am an affected party in the Robinsons Bay Inner Bays Irrigation proposed scheme. My home is in the middle of the valley floor beside the Robinsons Bay River and 550 meters below the 2.8 hectare dam site on maps. I am a retired permanent resident and my lifestyle block has sheep and walnut trees as well as various species of trees for fruit</p>	Dianne Carson			Banks Peninsula

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>and shelter. My family and I have lived on this property for 40 years and 2 generations have grown up here and call 'Woodlands' home. For 4 years the proposed dam and scheme have been a worry to our community. Original plans had the pond, trees and irrigation beside SH75 and 100 meters from my property boundary.</p> <p>I consider the public consultation document is biased with CCC clearly favouring and expressing their preference for the Inner Bays Irrigation option, stating no negative effects apart from relating to costings, with imagined artist impressions from high above on Okains Bay Road of what it might look like in years ahead and the dam (the size of 4 rugby fields) a mere slit in the distance.</p> <p>Scant recognition of the social aspects and mental health effects of this proposal on residents has been made - nothing in the C.C.C. consultation booklet - but the Working Party Joint Statement reads '...it has been the social and cultural wellbeing of the communities who live in Robinsons Bay, Takamatua, Hickory and Gough Bay and Pompeys Pillar who have been most negatively impacted by this protracted process. Many residents in these communities have significant concerns and worries...'</p> <p>On page 4 of the consultation document the overview mentions 'slip prone hills and soils with poor drainage.' We know this for a fact as in times of flooding the stream flows down Robinsons Bay Valley Road to State Highway 75 and there is no access. Increased flooding from the stream, dam break, loss of access if dam breaks, concern for livestock and human lives are all risks for my property and family. This is a populated valley and a community of older residents who could face many years - up to eight - of pipes laid, large earthworks construction (over a heritage listed site), industrialisation of a rural valley and heavy machinery on a rural road with inadequate infrastructure. This community provides its own water supplies, septic tanks and takes rubbish to a skip.</p> <p>The economic impact is huge with the inability to sell properties for the last 4 years and the bleak outlook of that continuing for many years if this scheme goes ahead with the stigma of wastewater and construction works. No compensation is contemplated but property valuations and rates increase. This valley could be condemned to stagnation when the Inner Harbour should be looking at embracing some of the increased N.Z. population returning during the Covid 19 pandemic. With huge budget blowouts and costing irregularities this scheme is a misuse of public funds.</p> <p>Environmental impacts of land based options are unproven and experimental and assumptions of the scheme needing to last at least 40 years and trees watered continuously for that length of time is appalling. Because of I &amp; I issues not being sufficiently addressed in Akaroa the whole scheme is oversized and there will be no margins for error. In Robinsons Bay the effect on land, streams and harbour mudflats from nitrogen, heavy metals, pharmaceuticals and hormones built up would be of huge concern. This valley has a very large catchment area with high rainfall and to irrigate up to 50mm during rainfall periods is a recipe for the disastrous prospect of slips - many can be observed - flooding river and dam break in emergency. As the valley floor is a flood plain residents have been shown frightening</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>scenarios of possible dam break analysis and there are 8 pages in the Beca report on this. Earthquakes and 500 year floods have to be factored in so why would any plan be contemplated that would endanger people, homes and stock in an emergency???</p> <p>My comments and solutions start off with FIX AKAROA'S PIPES so less water to be dealt with. REUSE where possible with Purple Pipe system and new technologies and then to Harbour Outfall. With 2 Wastewater schemes being planned - Akaroa and Duvauchelle - it would be sensible to work these as one. Allow Duvauchelle to keep their Golf Course and Show Grounds and pump their wastewater (after initial treatment) 10 kilometers along State Highway 75 to the new Akaroa Treatment Plant for further treatment. While laying all pipes for sewerage the Purple Pipe could be laid as well enabling highly treated water to be returned to Duvauchelle for use there as well as in Akaroa and along SH75. Residue water to Harbour Outfall until new technology enabling drinkable standard is considered.</p> <p>Inner Harbour Settlements are attractive places for future population growth and land needs to be available with safe water infrastructure and sewerage disposal absolutely essential. The world is in CRISIS. These projects should be dealt with as quickly and economically as possible without extra burden on future ratepayers. I support the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission.</p> <p>Endorsed by Jeremy Carson, Craig Church and Fiona Turner.</p>				
178.	33881	No	To the land				Yes	Yes	<p>I do not agree to any of the land based options for the disposal of Akaroa's waste water.</p> <p>I am apposed to the inner bays option. This is prime agriculture or horticulture land and should not be used for the dispersal of Akaroa's treated wastewater.</p> <p>It also affects a lot of neighbouring land owners which I believe the council have not considered .</p> <p>I do not agree with the Goughs Bay option. It is against the principle of the the Wildside group who I agree with. The fact there is an unwilling seller and a great cost of construction and running make this option unsuitable.</p> <p>I do not agree with the Pompey's Pillar option. This is prime land which has been developed into a very successful farm and has an unwilling seller as well.</p> <p>I totally agree with Ngai Tahu and do not support a Harbour outfall.</p> <p>I think the council model for the area of trees to be planted should be re looked at and modified.</p> <p>There is more suitable land available which could be used.</p> <p>The Misty Peak land which the council owns could be utilised. It could be planted and irrigated at a lesser amount with potable treated waste water,</p>	Trevor Bedford			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>which would also help replenish the Akaroa water catchment.</p> <p>There are also areas of Takamatua Peninsula between Takamatua and Akaroa which could be used.</p> <p>There are areas of gorse which could be planted and irrigated which I believe would help stabilise and improve the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>I think wetlands are an important part of the solution for a portion of the treated wastewater disposal and fit within Ngai Tahu's principles.</p> <p>A purple pipe installation is essential as part of the solution to Akaroa's treated wastewater.</p> <p>The treated wastewater must be of potable standard and reutilised within Akaroa to reduce water shortages, which will only get worse with climate change.</p>				
179.	33880	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	Extend the harbour pipe further out to the ocean	Jan Wallace			Akaroa
180.	33878	No		1			No	Yes		Simon Leslie			Christchurch
181.	33877	No					Yes	Yes	<p>I strongly oppose the treated wastewater being discharged into the harbour, and I do not support any of your irrigation to land options, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ngai Tahu views have to be respected</li> <li>2) There are too many residents in all the three proposed areas who do not want it, for a very diverse range of reasons, and their views have to be respected</li> <li>3) Akaroa already experiences water shortages and leaking pipe problems. With continual growth and climate change factors, these issues will continue to exasperate, so the principles of reduce, reuse and recycle have to applied</li> </ol> <p>I suggest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Forget any of the current land-based options and the exorbitant cost of land purchases, earthworks and planting projects - and their on going maintenance costs, including pumping expenses. Use these savings to invest in the best possible wastewater treatment plant to produce potable water, which would provide for a wider range of recycling / reuse options in the future.</li> <li>2) Install purple pipes in Akaroa, ready for when NZ government standards apply. CCC could gain prestige by leading by example.</li> </ol> <p>Develop wetlands and install trickle irrigation to existing bush, close to Akaroa, which can be regulated dependent on weather factors etc, to restore the mauri of the water</p>	Gill Bedford			Banks Peninsula
182.	33873	Yes	To the harbour		2	1	No	No	The attached doc.1 was sent with our original submission in 2016. It may be worthy of consideration now that most of the other ideas have been	Ken and Carol Reese			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									exhausted. doc.2 is a relevant paragraph from my second submission in 2017				
183.	33869	Yes	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	See attached submission	Penny Carnaby			Christchurch
184.	33865	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	As part of the Johns Family who own and farm Pompeys Pillar please read and consider our submission carefully.  Regards Will	Will Johns		Johns Family, Land owners of Pompeys Pillar	Christchurch
185.	33863	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Hanna Johns			Akaroa
186.	33862	No						Yes	I do not support any of the options offered by the council. The impact upon communities has not been considered nor has the impact upon the land, sea and upon our supplies of fresh drinking water. Nowhere else in the world would be placing treatment plants so close to people's homes and livelihoods. I am disgusted to think that the Council would consider this as a feasible option.  The council has failed to address or fix the issue of leaking water pipes and storm water drains in Akaroa and has failed to consider the type of land which they are proposing to irrigate onto. This leads to zero faith in the councils abilities to operate and maintain the proposed irrigation systems without causing major ecological disasters with flooding and over flow leaching into our waterways.  All of the councils options are short term and non sustainable. Options for recycling our precious water supplies should be being considered and we should be thinking long term (I do not consider "up to 50 years" to be long term).  There are far better and more sustainable options available to us here in New Zealand which should be being investigated , as proposed by Friends of Banks Peninsula, rather than simply trying to push through the cheapest options	Robyn Walker			Akaroa
187.	33860	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes		Larissa Cox-Winiata	Operation Manager	Matapopore Charitable Trust	Hoon Hay
188.	33859	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	I am and my clan will not consider any option that involves discharge to the harbour via an outfall.	Clayton Tikao			Christchurch
189.	33857	No					Yes	Yes	My name is Fiona Turner – Sawmill Road. I have been a permanent resident of Robinsons Bay for 31 years – a retired landowner. I run a flock of sheep and two donkeys on 7 hectares. The tranquillity of the property is enjoyed by many native birds. With the very large storage dam being not much more than 100 meters from my house midges and unwanted insects will be a continual problem. Also the noise, inconvenience, dust etc during the year of construction will be incredibly stressful. If the dam breaks and the access bridges are washed away we will be totally cut off. The effects downstream would be devastating including the risk to our treasured historic Pavitt Cottage.  The Valley is home to a number of senior citizens, possibly with the thought of selling in mind long term. The economic impact will devalue our properties,	Fiona Turner			Banks Peninsula

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>and my life savings have been spent on improving my property and the Council is not prepared to compensate me.</p> <p>The wastewater scheme is entirely experimental and heavily irrigating native trees for 40 years is unheard of. The effects on our rural water supplies with heavy metals, pharmaceuticals, nitrogen leaching etc will have huge side effects. Council has informed me one of my water sources will be contaminated which is of great concern as it will no longer be useable and need to be replaced.</p> <p>The Thacker land is prime grazing land with a generous stream and of heritage value. Why would you destroy it with an unproven expensive scheme endangering our beautiful valley and many residents' lifestyles?</p> <p>I would like the Council to explore the feasibility of a purple pipe scheme for Akaroa where the need is so great.</p> <p>I support the long term re-use proposal stated in the Friends of Banks Peninsula submission.</p> <p>This submission is also endorsed by Dianne Carson, Robinsons Bay, Trevor and Gillian Bedford of Takamatua.</p>				
190.	33856	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	No	Yes	I am greatly concerned that the council is preferring to irrigate in the inner bays. The impact on residents is huge. I also am very concerned that the council has consent ( non notified) to treat sewage by the boat park and also a big pond on Old Coach Road. The council are showing an arrogance to residents on the peninsula in their approach to the waste discharge. The councils complete disregard to residents in Robinsons Bay and Takamatua is abhorrent. The council should seriously be considering fixing and repairing stormwater discharge, a grey water system for watering gardens etc before they contemplate what to do with sewage	Gail Woods		Gail Woods	AKAROA
191.	33854	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	No	strongly disagree with harbour outfall as this is not inline with Manawhenua values.	Awhina McGlinchey			Christchurch
192.	33853	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	<p>Our (my) preferred option is the Inner Bays Irrigation scheme. I believe this is the best long term option for our community and for mana whenua. Clean water and a harbour rich in mahinga kai is surely an aspiration we all share.</p> <p>I believe the Inner Bays Irrigation scheme is the best option as it is the most resilient, most future proofed and offers the greatest level of ecological and cultural outcomes.</p> <p>Restoring the mauri of the water and health and wellbeing of the community and whenua if of the highest importance to me and my whanau. I Support the Inner Bays Irrigation option as it achieves this the best.</p>	Kelly Tikao			Christchurch
193.	33852	No					Yes	Yes	<p>I have lived and worked in the Akaroa area for 24 years.</p> <p>Four years ago the public indicated overwhelmingly that they preferred the treated wastewater to be used beneficially in Akaroa.</p> <p>The first most obvious and necessary step in all this is to repair and replace damaged and broken sewer and stormwater pipes in Akaroa to prevent infiltration. The idea that the proposed schemes will need to process and</p>	Shaun Huddleston			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									disperse up to 60% more wastewater than is necessary seems ludicrous, not to mention a waste of ratepayers money. This will also give the perfect opportunity to install a purple pipe network so the treated wastewater can be used beneficially in Akaroa, the place that created it and where it is needed most.				
194.	33851	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Charlotte Osborne			Akaroa
195.	33847	Yes					Yes	Yes		Murray Johns			Akaroa
196.	33846	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Sue Johns			Akaroa
197.	33845	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	The discharge of effluent, treated or otherwise into our harbors is a violation of the mauri of that ecosystem. The land based option is the only one that utilises natural processes to restore the mauri of the water and the created wetland will help to return some diversity to the harbors ecosystem.	Peter Sciascia			Christchurch
198.	33844	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	My preferred option is the Inner Bays Irrigation scheme. I believe this is the best long term option for our community and for mana whenua. Clean water and a harbour rich in mahinga kai is surely an aspiration we all share.	Debbie Tikao			Christchurch
199.	33843	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	See my submission	Stewart Sinclair			Christchurch
200.	33841	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	It seems very unusual that we will be the only Country in the world to pump our waste uphill seems to me that if it was an easy option other countries would have done it so that concerns me greatly. A with running costs and B the impact to people who live around this area. To say there is going to be no smell I think is dishonest when we have all seen the impact of Bromley. I find it incredible that we can't have a waste system that can be recycled to a degree that it can be drunken as in England when water is going to become an issue for us in the future and when discussed at the meeting I was told it is not culturally sensitive which I find incredible when we are trying to preserve our environment.	Sarah Pollard			Banks Peninsula
201.	33840	No	To the harbour				Yes	No	I have a number of points to be considered- a) The main consideration for any project be it local body, community or private that it is fit for purpose with minimal environmental impact that it is financially viable for the area that it serves currently and in this case for the next 50 years. b) Akaroa has a permanent population base of approximately 600, at peak holiday periods possibly 2500, and on a busy Cruise Ship day 4000 people, therefore the fiscal aspect has to be considered, can the expected cost of any of the four projects warrant \$45m to \$76 million being spent for a population of this size? c) My preferred option is "The Harbour Outfall" and I do not support any of the land-based options hence having not provided a preferred option. Many cities and seaside towns throughout New Zealand have Harbour Outfall Schemes many of which were constructed before consideration to the effect on the sea life and environment was considered as it is today and this currently includes Akaroa. Some have over recent years been reconstructed and meet the discharge requirement of the interested parties. With today's technology and science's, harbour outfall schemes can be constructed meeting the requirements of all interested parties in this case the Local Government Act, Regional Council and the four Maori iwi. I note in the "Have your Say Booklet" page 4 - Ngai Tahu Perspective", that they want the discharge of wastewater into Akaroa Harbour to stop, well I think the majority of people would agree with this statement, however if a processing plant design of the 21st century is constructed it would no longer	JOHN PETRIE			AKAROA

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>be "Wastewater" as we know it being discharged to the harbour but clean almost potable water.</p> <p>d] Where should a wastewater processing plant be constructed? The options booklet indicates the Harbour Outfall processing plant will be constructed above Children's Bay be it for Harbour outfall or any of the other three land-based schemes.</p> <p>When the Harbour Outfall Scheme is confirmed consideration should be made to build it in the vicinity of the current facility at the South Eastern area currently used.</p> <p>Why should this be considered?</p> <p>A] Firstly the current underground services within the Akaroa town are already piped to this area so a major cost of pipe work will be saved.</p> <p>B] The land must already be in CCC ownership, again a cost saving to the project, or if they need additional land it would be nothing like the cost of land-based scheme acquisition.</p> <p>C] The outlet pipe work is currently in place, it will need to be extended none the less there has to be some saving here.</p> <p>E] The effect on the eye; Where it currently is situated the majority of visitors will not see it and it will not have any effect on those that use the Children's Bay beach and water area. Bathing in an area directly below a "Wastewater Processing Facility" will have an effect on many people, where if it is reconstructed in the area of the current plant on a day to day basis no one will think about it.</p> <p>In summary, I think that a fit for purpose [and population] processing plant should be built at the existing site and the clean water discharged to the harbour.</p> <p>I am aware that this design and consultation process has been ongoing for approximately eight years at a major cost to CCC and subsequently rate payers, it is time the Harbour Outfall Scheme design at the existing site is designed to meet the specifications of the above interested parties is completed and the construction commenced immediately.</p> <p>John Petrie [REDACTED]</p>				
202.	33838	Yes	To the harbour				No	No	<p>YES,</p> <p>please refer to additional supplied , in regards to the concerns we have in relation to this proposal.</p>	Donna and David Kingan	Company Directors	Kingan Transport Ltd	Akaroa
203.	33837	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes		Amy Stronach			Akaroa
204.	33836	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Diane Kay	Partner	Farming	Duvauchelle
205.	33810	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	<p>We have a family Bach on our property between Robinsons Bay and Takamatua. We are aware that an area of our land is earmarked for the reticulation of the Inner Harbour waste water system. I am only speaking on the positive aspects of this option. We would be more than happy to have areas of native bush planted to be irrigated by the waste water system. The Akaroa Highschool has already introduced a school project to plant out the Reserve area of Hammonds Point. Looking further forward there could be an opportunity to create walkways down through the bush to enable others to be able to enjoy the beautiful foreshore. So would support the Inner Harbour Scheme for the above reasons</p>	Jenny Studholme			Darfield
206.	33805	Yes	To the harbour						<p>Please see attached comments - thank you</p>	David & Wendy Fleming			Akaroa



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
207.	33802	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Richard (Dick) Fernyhough			Whitby
208.	33783	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Denise Wren			Takamatua
209.	33782	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Mark Wren			Akaroa
210.	33781	Yes					Yes	Yes	As per attached document	Sylvia McAslan			Akaroa
211.	33780	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Tony Hay			Christchurch
212.	33779	No	To the land	3	1	2	No	No		Rob Scoringe	Mrs	Mrs	French Farm
213.	33778	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Sue Scoringe	Mrs	Mrs	French Farm
214.	33777	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Yes. These are listed within the attached submission response.	Brent George			Christchurch
215.	33775	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Submission for Akaroa Wastewater</p> <p>I strongly disagree with all current land based options and urge the council to reassess the use of potable reusable water for the future. Whilst the technology or the law may be restricting the reuse to date that doesn't mean it wouldn't be viable in the future and to spend the extreme amount suggested to water native plants that don't require water 24 hours a day is irresponsible for our future generations.</p> <p>Surely the first most obvious option is to sort out the storm water infiltration before anything else is considered then you would know the quantities of actual waste water that you are dealing with.</p> <p>Water shortages are a common occurrence in Akaroa as is an abundance of rainfall in the winter. Watering to natives is purely a theoretical model so adverse effects to soil have not been tabled. The trial in Duvauchelle is flawed to varying degrees, the obvious one being that the land is relatively flat and very sheltered. Growing natives in exposed areas with high wind on slopes that have been watered constantly over years is just ludicrous and a total waste of future resources. Hinewai has proven that natives can grow happily in their natural habitat without continual watering.</p> <p>Furthermore the land in the inner bays option including Robinsons bay and Takamatua are currently good agricultural productive blocks and may well be the last areas of flat land that could be used for further housing should that ever be needed.</p> <p>I therefore conclude that I and give my full endorsement to the Friends of Banks Peninsula with their suggestion of reduce and recycle and if that is not an option the obvious choice would back to the Sea</p> <p>I wish to speak to my submission</p>	Christine Shearer			Banks Peninsula
216.	33771	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I think this option will have the least impact on the community short term, and the transition period from the existing plant will be lesser, plus the future technology to improve the quality of the water further down the track will make this more viable. The initially high carbon credit to set it up will be reduced once in place, and it will make economic sense.	Tony Bird			Akaroa
217.	33770	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I don't believe it's fair to select a land based site and devalue those properties. I don't like the harbour based option either, but it is the cheapest, and I hope there will be a better option in the next decade which will replace	Fi Smith			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									all these options. I don't want to spend unnecessarily on an option that will probably be redundant in the not so distant future.				
218.	33768	No	To the land	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	Please don't put it back into the harbour, there is enough pollution going in there now. The sooner we get rid of the present treatment plant the better. It's not working very well at the moment.	Kyra Tainui			Akaroa
219.	33762	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	Vehemently opposed to the proposed sewage ponds in Takamatua and Robinsons Bay which will have a negative effect on our land value and will create an environmental disaster to historic Pavitts Cottage if the ponds are breached.	Stephany Anderson			Akaroa
220.	33761	No	To the harbour			3	Yes	Yes	Please rethink the solids collection tank near the recreation ground. This will be an enormous concrete facility out of keeping with the historic nature of Akaroa. It will also have to be emptied regularly and offensively smelly!	Chris Muirhead			Akaroa
221.	33760	No	To the harbour							Lucy Porteous			Akaroa
222.	33755	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	Nai Tahu should pay for everything as they did all the damage to the harbor 150 years ago	Clive Barrington			Akaroa
223.	33754	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Actually think about the impact that putting your "preferred" option will have on the residents who live in Takamatua and Robinsons Valleys, there will be no benefits to them, the risks that you would impose on them including it might smell, it may encourage midges and other biting insects, it might not work as your staff have said it will, you don't know and you certainly cannot guarantee that it will still work when we have a real wet winter. Your staff have said when this occurs they can store the treated waste and put it back into harbour via Children's Bay, if they can do this then, why can't they do this all the time via a pipe out and down the harbour. The leaking sewer pipes within Akaroa should also be repaired to stop inflow into the system, this is Akaroa's problem and as much of the remedy as possible should be done before you start to pipe it anywhere else.</p> <p>The "harbour outfall" is the only logical 'option', this is how it's done in other area's including Napier and your own Christchurch city.</p> <p>Thankyou</p>	Alan Bradford			Akaroa
224.	33751	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	No	As the owner of a property in Akaroa that has belonged to my family since 1960, my views are aligned with those from Council staff. In addition I consider creating new accessible wetland and native tree areas close to Akaroa would be a recreational benefit to the community. The options in Goughs Bay or Pompeys Pillar would be of little recreational benefit in comparison and would add little if anything to that offered by the nearby Hinewai Reserve.	Mike Day			Christchurch
225.	33744	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>I am a bach owner in Robinsons Bay I am retired and have a great affinity for Robinsons Bay and its fragile marine ecology which is just hanging on after years of degradation .</p> <p>Im sure our mutual aspiration is to have a cleaner harbour .</p> <p>I have considered at length the various propositions on the table .</p> <p>I have approached a consultant for preliminary discussion and to give me perspective . He has worked for many years on wastewater projects of all sizes internationally . He mentioned the systems in place in Long Island Sound and Chesapeake Bay to deal with nitrification. We discussed in</p>	Ross Blanks			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>particular the inner bays proposal . He noted that the treatment plant proposed would do a creditable job of removing solids and aspired to getting coliforms down to low levels . He discussed the cost implications of getting the nitrate levels to more rigorous standards . TO my mind he was the voice of reason . He said the take home messages for this sort of project are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. beggars cant be choosers</li> <li>b. the less moving parts the less risk of catastrophic failure ( Storm events and seismic events both in mind)</li> <li>c. minimise pinch points and bottlenecks</li> <li>d. wastewater reticulation and collection tends to be overlooked in NZ as there has to date been little regulatory outcome</li> <li>e the infiltration inflow( by accident or design has to be addressed somehow</li> <li>f. There is more risk to the harbour ( in his view) of raw sewage overwhelming a complex system with leaking reticulation than from a harbour outfall from a robust reticulation network where the solids are removed and the resultant greywater has been processed through what could be described as a membrane wetland</li> <li>g. Nitrification is probably more of a risk to the harbour through the inner harbour proposal as the effects are likely to be more significant in the shallow poorly flushing inner bays and the likely hood of runoff during heavy rain events is high</li> </ul> <p>there are cheaper small pipe options for wastewater reticulation in small communities and this can involve tanks on private property or servicing a cluster of properties . His view was that the cost to get the wastewater to potable standard was probably a bridge to far cost wise but to get it clean to the point where it has been passed through a series of membranes approximating a wetland is achievable and at that stage discharge to harbour is the option least likely to ever be overwhelmed by storm or seismic events resulting in raw sewage discharge to harbour</p> <p>My Conclusion .</p> <p>Fix the reticulation from every property that is to be connected to a new reticulating network . Use small pipe (cheaper and a number of small pumping stations where required . (possible ask individual property owners to have their own storage tanks on site as part of the network. Could even pass the cost of solid removal on to individual residents as is the case with septic tanks anyway ( those owners could get rate rebate) . Where properties cant do that clusters of properties could reticulate to cluster tanks and obviously some to the planned treatment station . My point is the network fix will have to start at the house .</p> <p>Thinking outside the Box</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>I have an OASIS system on a steepish 1000m section . It has required purple pipe for the resultant processed water over a 350 sm area ( 1/3 of the section ) We have no problem living with this except we have to be more circumpect with spadework in the garden . IF this is acceptable for us why is it not acceptable for public forest or park in Akaroa . say roughly 1000 households in Akaroa and say \$15000 as a round figure for install ( could be less ) gives a figure of 15 million dollars . Doesnt address nitrification but there would be a lot of plants and trees over a wide area using the nitrogen . In conclusion 1. purple pipe options should be explored . There is potential to do this much more cheaply. It would require new ways of monitoring and mantaining</p> <p>2. Akaroa residents will need to be convinced that the responsibility for the solution lies with each and every household and that the concept of flush and forget is no longer ok and no their rates have not paid for a new wastewater reticulation system and the time has come .. Council could pay for the installs , make a purple pipe plan for clusters or regions of Akaroa and get on with it</p> <p>CONCLUSION .</p> <p>Using the consultants "least moving parts is safest for the environment "</p> <p>A. best option build best treatment plan we can afford and use harbour outfall gurantees what goes in to the harbour is as clean as it can be and in future add ons might get the water to potable</p> <p>B. Oasis purple pipe options could spread the flow to ground area over a much bigger area across Akaroa green spaces than putting the whole of Akaroas wastewater and stormwater infiltration through big pipes and thence to a pond and a small forest area in Robinsons Bay through a network with pinch points suceptible to being overwhelmed in a storm event placing the most sensitive and least resilient parts of the harbour at risk</p>				
226.	33738	No			1		Yes	Yes	<p>The options offered are extremely limited and lack long term vision, much in the way that the working parties have been driven by council staff.</p> <p>The option to place waste water in a semi residential community with its beautiful steams and at the head of the harbour lacks foresight, wisdom and intelligence. Either potable or high quality treated wastewater should go to the sea or in some circumstances the Outer Harbour OR to a land based system that is rural in nature and provides beneficial use.</p> <p>Wastewater and a large storage pond to an area of land adjoining an significant historical site near houses and a beautiful stream sitting above the head of the harbour has no beneficial aspect whatsoever; it is nothing less than using the land as a dumping ground for wastewater.</p> <p>In a climate where water conservation over the next 50 years is going to be paramount, proper consideration to a long term plan should be provided which includes;</p> <p>(a) fixing the infiltration of up to 60% of storm water and groundwater into the wastewater system, thereby lessening the size and scale of any wastewater</p>	Lee Robinson			Akaroa Harbour

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>process and system; and</p> <p>(b) treating the wastewater to an acceptable standard to discharge to land and sea; and</p> <p>(c) providing beneficial use of the water for either rural benefit or a purple pipe water system for utilising the water for gardens and similar activities in Akaroa itself.</p> <p>The government's new Three Water policy will throw many more options available to communities over the next few years, so any proposal such as the inner harbour proposal is short sighted and lacks vision.</p> <p>It will compromise the community in the interim, it is totally inappropriate in terms of location and lacks any long term vision or planning.</p> <p>The costs produced by council are misleading and lack fairness and equity; the cheapest option promoted by the council, the inner harbour option including Robinsons Bay and Takamatua, does not include any costs in enabling residents of those communities to reticulate to the system being provided to those communities; how unfair and misleading is that. In other words the households in these communities are being asked to receive a waste water system for Akaroa cannot join the system that has been placed in their own back yard, while at the same time being required to maintain a septic tank or alternative system at their own cost. The council needs to front up, be honest and disclose properly the true costs of the alternatives. On this basis, the cheapest land based option is Goughs Bay.</p> <p>Time should be utilised now to get the infrastructure right and the treatment quality right as a priority before the implementation of any long term system, particularly in the inner harbour., that may, in time, be a very regrettable and environmentally poor decision.</p>				
227.	33733	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	<p>Not in my bay (Takamatua)</p> <p>Okay in Robinsons Bay, but not in Takamatua</p> <p>Okay in Pompeys Pillar, but not in Takamatua</p> <p>Okay in Goughs Bay, but not in Takamatua</p> <p>My strong suggestion is that residents of the above bays would share the same opinion anyware but not in my bay and I don't blame them.</p> <p>The only positive action is to the harbour but well out close to the heads.</p> <p>This decision must not be based on the opinions of a minority but reflect the opinions of the mojority of residents.</p> <p>Please let common sense prevail.</p>	Bernard Rennell	Member (Financial)	Takamatua Ratepayers Association	Akaroa
228.	33732	No							<p>First and foremost we feel that the Council has to fix the infrastructure in Akaroa.</p> <p>Secondly we totally oppose the Inner Bays option.</p>	Raymond & Susan Bruce			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>It is grossly unfair on our communities and feel that any system that doesn't involve re-use is not acceptable.</p> <p>Given Akaroa's summer water shortages, their wastewater should and must be treated as a resource and not a problem.</p> <p>This wastewater should be treated to a fully potable standard and then either reused or pumped into the harbour.</p> <p>Thirdly we feel that given the continued escalating cost of this scheme that it has to be better future proofed. The fact that the Council are telling us that it is only designed to last til about 2050 is in our opinion fiscally grossly irresponsible.</p>				
229.	33730	No					Yes	Yes	<p>Treat the waste water to potable stage, for use at times of water shortage drought, and allow for irrigation to parks &amp; gardens</p> <p>The most usefull use of waste water</p>	Gary Knight			Akaroa
230.	33729	No	To the land	1	2		Yes	Yes	<p>We support Option 1, the Inner Bays Scheme</p> <p>We reside at ■ Sawmill Road, Robinsons Bay, and we own the property of 34ha on the western side of the 'Thacker land' which is earmarked for the Inner Bays Wastewater Scheme.</p> <p>As more land may be required for the Inner Bays Option to proceed we are prepared to consider a boundary change to accommodate the scheme. This will provide more land with the desirable slope for irrigation to be included and will enable the Thacker land area to be more resilient and future-proofed.</p> <p>A native tree planting plan for the Thacker land has been prepared by Hugh Wilson, Botanist of Hinewai. Hugh's advice is to plant damp or wet tolerant varieties, of which there are many. It is expected that rushes will quickly colonise areas between the plantings. As the trees will not be subject to drought they will thrive with the continuous slow drip of water.</p> <p>This new corridor of bush would sit alongside that part of our property which is closed off to grazing to allow the native forest recover in its own time. A native forest has benefits for the native birds, insects and wildlife.</p> <p>If some land on the lower slopes of the Thacker land could be made available for a community garden, beehives, orchard or food forest then this would be a wonderful community asset especially as we are all being encouraged to be more self-sufficient on these Covid-19 times. We have a thriving orchard on our property and we believe an orchard on the Thacker land would be similarly productive.</p> <p>Currently the Thacker land access from Sawmill Road is neglected and scruffy, with an abandoned building rotting into the ground, broken fences and generally an unkempt appearance as seen from Sawmill Road. If Council were to take control of this site there would be an opportunity to tidy it up, mow the berm, improve the existing parking and build a gated access to any walking tracks through the native tress. Historic information could be displayed explaining the Pavitt Mill history. This would pair well with the</p>	Brian & Kathleen Reid			Robinsons Bay

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>historic Robinsons Bay School Reserve which is a popular attraction for school trips and visitors and would complement the restored Pavitt Cottage.</p> <p>We would like the old cottage (on the Thacker land) to remain even though unfortunately its origins are unknown. The cattle yards at the entrance could be demolished and the remains of the old fallen-over woolshed also cleaned up.</p> <p>Robinsons Bay was one of the earliest bays to be de-forested in the 1800s and a new native forest would restore a wonderful backdrop to the Pavitt Mill site.</p> <p>We are of the view that in supporting Robinsons Bay receiving the wastewater we are supporting the town of Akaroa on which we rely for retail, emergency sport and entertainment services. We see ourselves as part of the wider Akaroa community and do not share the view that the wastewater is Akaroa's problem for Akaroa to solve.</p> <p>Council has adopted a Climate Change Programme with the aim of net zero greenhouse emissions by 2045 and we are pleased to support the Council in its efforts to plant native trees to support this aim.</p>				
231.	33719	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	What if the pumping system fails, how is the sewage going to get to the waste treatment plant?	Helen Moody			Akaroa
232.	33714	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Karen Devereux			Duvauchelles
233.	33711	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	don't put it in the harbour please	Miriam Lowe			Akaroa
234.	33709	No	To the land						<p>The submitter is responsible for promoting the reduction of adverse environmental effects on the health of people and communities and to improve, promote and protect their health pursuant to the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956. These statutory obligations are the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and, in the Canterbury District, are carried out under contract by Community and Public Health under Crown funding agreements on behalf of the Canterbury District Health Board.</p> <p>The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by such means as submissions to ensure the public health significance of potential adverse effects are adequately considered during policy development.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Options July 2020.</p> <p>CDHB supported the granting of the Akaroa wastewater consents in our submission dated 11th December 2014, provided conditions were adequate to protect the health of people and communities. We also noted that the new treatment plant would be designed to produce a high quality wastewater suitable for land application and that this disposal method is preferred by the local rūnanga who felt that discharge into the Akaroa Harbour was culturally unacceptable. There are also very good reasons why a land-based option could be a preferred option purely from a public health perspective.</p>	Angela Sheat	Community & Public Health	Canterbury District Health Board	Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>Health and wellbeing (overall quality of life) is influenced by a wide range of factors. These influences can be described as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, and are impacted by environmental, social and behavioural factors. They are often referred to as the 'social determinants of health', the various influences on health are complex and interlinked. Respect for, and adherence to, a community's cultural values are an important determinant of health.</p> <p>As a division of CDHB, Community and Public Health (CPH) is committed to ensuring positive Māori health outcomes and reducing inequalities.</p> <p>The CDHB supports the proposal to irrigate the reclaimed treated wastewater to native trees. The stated reclaimed water quality will not pose a risk to the health of the public. CDHB has no preferred site (Options 1-3) and recognise that the Christchurch City Council has carefully considered the advantages and disadvantages of each in terms of the social determinants of health.</p> <p>The CDHB supports the concept of non-potable reuse of treated wastewater however due to the current lack of regulatory framework around the public health risks we do not support this proposal at this stage, particularly in respect of private household use in Akaroa.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Options July 2020.</p> <p>The submitter does not wish to be heard in support of this submission</p>				
235.	33708	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	<p>1. the planting of native tree. Are they the best trees to plant for water uptake.</p> <p>2. Can the Council guarantee that the water being discharged into the harbour will not affect Ngai Tahu "food bucket" in any way. It is not just Ngai Tahu food bucket but a food bucket for all who live in the Peninsula.</p> <p>A recycle water pipe for Akaroa so that locals could use this water to water their gardens in the dry years</p>	B J Turner			Christchurch
236.	33707	No	To the land		1		Yes	Yes	<p>No, but I do have concerns about new builds not being required to include rainwater collection. Everyone should be doing this.</p> <p>I live in Christchurch, but own a holiday home in Duvauchelle.</p>	Pauline Grassam			Christchurch
237.	33706	No	To the harbour				No	No	Preferably leave the plant where it is and upgrade.	Richard Haley			Akaroa
238.	33705	No	To the land		1	2	Yes	Yes	<p>I am very concerned about smell and midgies from pond site 10. I'm not convinced that there will be no issues around this. I am also concerned that there will be smells when the pumping station in Akaroa has the solids removed.</p> <p>I believe the Council should fix the stormwater that is mixing with the sewerage and redesign a system that is sized for the sewerage only. It seems strange to be treating contaminated sewerage with a system that's much larger than is needed and could be reduced significantly if the stormwater was removed.</p>	Mark Herring			Akaroa



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
239.	33702	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	No	Yes	<p>It is my belief that the only practical solution to be implemented in disposing of the treated wastewater within the Akaroa crater rim, is to build a plant that either recycles and purifies the wastewater to a potable standard (this has been achieved in some countries overseas) or to a standard where it could be recycled within the community (purple pipe) with any oversupply disposed of within the harbour.</p> <p>Irrigation of any land within the harbour catchment will have long term negative impacts on not only the natural flora and fauna, but also on the quality of the surrounding properties. The use of oxidation ponds will do nothing to enhance the surrounding land they will be sited on and given the pessimistic long term effects of climate change, the once in a 100 year weather events that will cause these to fail will eventually become normal events. Any such failure would have consequences to the water quality in the harbour far greater than a controlled discharge of properly treated wastewater.</p> <p>It is clearly evident when one takes in the visual natural erosion that forms the natural landscape of the inner harbour catchment, that the soils within this area are not able to absorb any additional moisture during the winter months. No scheme that involves pumping more water into these soils during these times of the year should be regarded as practical or reasonable.</p>	Tony Mason			Akaroa
240.	33699	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	The Christchurch City Council should choose the best twenty-first century science based solution and this would be the discharging treated waste out to sea. The treated waste could be treated to a very high standard using UV filtration, which would remove all bacteria and viruses. It could be discharged further out to sea beyond the Heads, if this was considered appropriate for cultural reasons. This system could cope if there was further development in Akaroa, and further demand was placed on the system. Any land based disposal of treated water would lead to a permanent non-productive use of the land. Such a system would detract from the surrounding properties in a very tangible manner. It would diminish the value of nearby properties, and could rightly lead to neighbouring property owners seeking compensation from the council for their financial loss. The detrimental effects on the local environment would be very real.	Peter Smart			Akaroa
241.	33698	No	To the harbour		1		Yes	Yes	<p>1. The "cultural" issue regarding the harbour outlet relates to a bygone era when effluent was not treated and is not relevant to this issue with "highly treated water".</p> <p>2. The planting and establishing of native plants on the Peninsula is naturally difficult and not really the best plants for water uptake. This policy could extend any land based solution several years with huge extra costs.</p> <p>3. Land based options have greater disruption and all risks are as higher compared to a harbor outlet.</p> <p>4. The extra costs above the harbor outlets are not justifiable.</p>	Alex Eason		Mt Pleasant International Trust	Christchurch
242.	33697	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	<p>Pollution-free harbour</p> <p>Wasteland filtration</p>	Barbara Waghorn			Akaroa
243.	33696	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes	Pollution-free harbour	Mark Waghorn			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									Wasteland filtration				
244.	33695	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes		Manea Tainui		Onuku Marae	Christchurch
245.	33694	No	To the land	1			Yes	Yes		Nareta Robinson		Onuku Marae	Christchurch
246.	33693	No	To the land	1			No	Yes	Pollution free harbour  Wetland process preferred	Angela Tainui	Runanga member	Onuku Marae	Christchurch
247.	33692	No	To the land	1			No	Yes	Would you expect to drink from your toilet  We don't want to swim in our beautiful Harbour	Ngaio Tuari	Cultural Portfolio Holder	Onuku Marae	Christchurch
248.	33691	No	To the land	1			No	Yes	Irrigation to land has most benefit to community better in terms of biodiversity more effective.  Support wet land system where the mauri of the water is naturally cleansed	Taryn Tuari	Secretary	Onuku	Christchurch
249.	33690	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	I was on the Banks Peninsula Community Board, when this board asked for a working party be established for the issues relating to the Akaroa Waste Water. I was then also on the joint working party board from its initiation, and even though I did not stand for re-election in 2019, I asked that I continue with the working party as a representative for Goughs Bay, as I am a property owner in that area.  I have found that towards the end of the working parties commitments, I became very disappointed and upset with the overall outcome. I felt that the best solutions were not achieved, and that too many of our communities effected with land options, were exposed to huge upsets and impositions/uncertainties over this whole situation.  The costs involved in any of the land based options, will be a very big imposition on the rate paying base.  Therefore, I chose the harbour option because, the plant system does need to be re-located, but in the meantime while further options/costings/and realistic systems and outcomes are investigated, then we have a system in place that will allow the time to achieve this.	Janis Haley			Akaroa, Akaroa
250.	33689	No	To the harbour	3	3	2	Yes	Yes	The Harbour Outfall Scheme is not listed as an option and I would prefer to support this option	Margaret Errington			Akaroa
251.	33682	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Vicky Harris			Vancouver
252.	33680	No	To the harbour					No		Sidney Ashton			christchurch
253.	33679	No	To the harbour				No	No		Jane Ashton			christchurch
254.	33672	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Of all the benefits/issues raised locally, the one that seems to have had the least 'airtime' is also the most important to me - namely the long term environmental benefits of a land based solution, particularly the uptake of carbon by irrigated trees and the development of wetland as part of the land based solutions. The idea of pumping treated water over the hill (land based options 2 and 3) do not make sense when a local solution is available.  I understand the short term view of Takamatua residents that the inner bays option works against their interests, but longer term, as native plantings and wetlands develop, these will be assets to their environment.	Ray Burhill			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									I also fully support the idea of a 'purple pipe' to mitigate future water shortages in Akaroa.				
255.	33666	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Document attached	Laurice Bradford			Akaroa
256.	33665	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Involving kids from Chch schools and Canty uni/Ara in the planting out/propagating and planning when it comes to creating and restoring a landscape. Opportunity for a lot of learning there, also empowerment around the environmental issues these kids are facing. Maybe see if there are questions around landscape restoration that could involve some scientific type testing along with the general planting? I'm not sure how it could work, school camps, day trips.. I'm sure you have lots of good people and event organisers that could think of good ways to get everyone involved.	Simone Quentin de Manson			Christchurch
257.	33664	No	To the harbour				No	Yes	I believe that the harbour outfall option should be extended further out to sea. The pipe should be laid so that the waste water can be dispersed well outside the harbour when the tide is going out. The present harbour outfall option has already been shown to have the least carbon impact of all the options over 35 years and has the least capital and running costs. The idea of the extended pipe out past the heads that I have suggested will incur more expense but might still come out cheaper than all the inner harbour options. I have not filled in question 2 with my preference for the inner bays options because I do not think any of them would be suitable. Dispersing treated waste water out to sea has proven to be very successful in many countries around the world for many years so the research on the best and long lasting solution has already been done. We must recognise the science.	Jacqueline Smart			Akaroa
258.	33654	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Hanne LeLievre			Banks Peninsula
259.	33652	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Garth Tiffen			Akaroa
260.	33651	No	To the harbour	3			No	No	<p>Stop Wasting Money. By now you could have had a Pipe Line out into the Harbour and a lot of People would not have been Mentally drained by what you propose to do, so close to where people live( they have brought their own land to live happily until this was suggested.) Shame on you for even suggesting having storage ponds right next door to where people live, this is so wrong, especially on this soil type which is clay not to mention the smell and insects this generates, would any of you live next door to this, we think not.</p> <p>Firstly you say discharge to Hammond Point this is land you do not own so a further cost involved of at least \$2 Million Dollars</p> <p>Secondly you don't own the land in Takamatua so another Million Dollars needed at least</p> <p>Thirdly do you even own land in Robinsons Bay well then another Million Dollars at least</p> <p>is all of the above even taken into account in your costing (are the Rate Payers going to support this we think not.)</p> <p>SO A BIG FAT NO FROM US ON LAND USE == Be it a Storage Pond or Irrigation to land of any kind.</p>	Barbara and Michael Harrington			AKAROA
261.	33648	No	To the land	3	2	1	No	No		Nigel Allred			Christchurch
262.	33638	No	To the harbour					Yes	I don't understand why the Council should consider anything other than the harbour option.	Heather Scott			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
263.	33632	No	To the land				Yes	Yes	Before getting on with a new system, the existing treatment plant should be upgraded to be more efficient.  The systems pipes should be fixed and storm and infiltration waters shouldn't enter the system.  That will save a lot of money and put less pressure on the plant.  Then the treated water should be re used for gardens, toilets, commercial cleaning, etc....	Renan Cataliotti	Director	Cataliotti wines	Akaroa
264.	33628	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	No	Repairing/have repaired all storm water infiltrations	Brendon Woods			Christchurch
265.	33627	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	No	Yes	I would like all the pipes in Akaroa upgraded so that there is not leakage into the pipes from naturally occurring rainwater and soil water - only waste water.	Linda Sunderland			Akaroa
266.	33626	No	To the land	3	2	1	No	Yes	The council made Tikao bay with only 38 baches take it's highly treated wastewater go to land dispersal on a forestry block. The highly treated wastewater previously was piped out into the harbour. The wastewater was tested and was twice as clean as the water going into the bay from the Tikao Bay stream. The Tikao Bay residents had to pay \$4000 plus for their sewer and wastewater system over 30 years ago and if the akaroa residents paid \$10000 towards their scheme it would go towards a land based dispersal. I have a boat and it is obvious when Duvauchelles or Akaroa are dumping there waste in the harbour by the foul smelling brown scum floating in the harbour and entering all the inner bays on incoming tides	Bruce Taylor			Christchurch
267.	33625	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	No	ocean outfall on east coast	John Somerville			Banks Peninsula
268.	33624	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	No		Edith Jones			Invercargill
269.	33622	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	All treated waste water from the inner bays should be collected used on the the Golf course land in Pawsons valley and / or Kaituna golf course near Birdlings flat the latter course is ideal for irrigation all year regardless of local rain events. Logistics of shipping the waste water to the Kaituna golf course needs to be resolved, could be held in ponds at Duvauchelle. Happy to provide more detail to this proposal	John Higgins			Banks Peninsula
270.	33621	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	There are concerns over the land based option particularly during the winter months or periods of high rainfall: Discharging during very wet weather when there is existing run off/Land instability/Fire risk destroying native trees planned for irrigation/Proximity to surrounding properties/Potential for wastewater to enter streams and bays affecting ecosystems/Insufficient capacity for proposed storage tanks.  Consideration for discharge beyond the harbour to address cultural concerns?	Lorraine Owen			Christchurch
271.	33620	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		John Macdonald			Christchurch
272.	33618	No	To the harbour	1	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	Ross Julian			Christchurch
273.	33617	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Carolyn Eyre-Walker			Christchurch
274.	33616	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Liz Parker			Christchurch
275.	33615	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	SEND THE WATER INTO THE HARBOUR AFTER BEING HIGHLY TREATED	Tony Walls			Akaroa
276.	33614	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Before any proposal is accepted, there needs to be a separation of storm water from waste water.	Robin McCarthy			New Zealand
277.	33611	No	To the harbour	1	3	2	Yes	Yes		Kristin Savage	Director	Hickory Bay Farm Ltd	Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
278.	33610	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Simon and Carolyn Lints			Akaroa
279.	33609	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Sophie Hartnell			Lyttelton
280.	33608	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	KEEP IT IN THE HARBOUR....	Jenny Walls			Akaroa
281.	33607	No	To the land	3	2	1	No	No		Peter Young			Akaroa
282.	33605	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes	There should be a broader move by council to incentivise grey water use - perhaps simplify consenting + reduce/ remove council charges for constening process	Matt Parkes			Christchurch
283.	33604	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Jayne Perrin			Christchurch
284.	33603	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes		Georgia Glass			Christchurch
285.	33601	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Re-use of highly treated wastewater within Akaroa (parks, public toilets, residential non-potable use) represents the most equitable and forward thinking option. This option would help to address water shortage concerns, would pose the lowest risk to the environment and would assist in reaching carbon neutral goals.  Re-use in Akaroa should be combined with harbour outfall for wet periods when re-use is not possible.  Re-use in Akaroa, combined with occasional harbour outfall will be lower cost to install and maintain.	Richard Troughton			Christchurch
286.	33598	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	No	Yes		Christine McEntee			Christchurch
287.	33596	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Helena Ruffell			Christchurch
288.	33594	No	To the harbour				No	Yes		Kath J Morton			Akaroa
289.	33593	No	To the harbour				No			Bruce J Morton	Life member	Takamatua Residents Association	Akaroa
290.	33591	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	I believe a new longer pipe discharging highly treated wastewater as far out into the harbour is the best and cheapest option.  I believe in 10 years time we will be looking as a country to recycle most of our water so why spend huge money on irrigating trees on the land when it will probably all have to be redone 10 yrs down the track.	Jude O'connor			Akaroa
291.	33590	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes	Factors in my ranking are around carbon storage and recycling of water with oncoming climate change issues. I'm aware Singapore struggled to sell their recycled water idea to the population, hopefully you guys can do a better job.	Toby Burrows			Banks Peninsula
292.	33589	No	To the harbour				Yes	No		Mary Noonan			Christchurch
293.	33588	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	I fully support increasing areas of native planting around the Inner Bays using treated wastewater. The other options are too costly and prone to high maintenance due to pumping uphill and piping the wastewater for many kilometres.  Planting that will create more habitat for our native fauna and flora is welcomed. My request for consideration: that a budget be provided to ensure that these areas are kept free of possums, rats, mustelids, goats, pigs and other pests so enhancing biodiversity is achieved rather than they become a breeding area for pests that affects adjoining areas. Creating walkways through these plantings will encourage public appreciation of the scheme as they get to enjoy nature close up.	Cynthia Roberts			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
294.	33587	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Let farmers pump water from storage ponds for irrigation of grapes, olives etc.  Would water be clean enough for boat washing?	Tom McGlinchy			Akaroa
295.	33586	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Ian Woodill			Akaroa
296.	33585	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Phill McEntee			Christchurch
297.	33580	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Philip & Jocelyn Bones			Christchurch
298.	33578	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	The Inner Bays options ticks all the boxes as far I'm concerned - it stores the most carbon, offers educational and recreational opportunities, and provides a great opportunity to increase the ecological diversity of the area.	Isabel Carlyon			Christchurch
299.	33577	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	Will the integrity of the SS system be improved as part of these works (ref to the 50% contribution that SW makes annually to the SS volumes).  Does Council know where the SW enters the SS system? Is it possible to totally treat the purple water so that it is potable; and if so what is the cost of that proposal?  Are storage volumes at the treatment facility a risk; ie is it possible that, during a breakdown or power outage, that waste water could collect and overwhelm the storage capability of the system?  Is the "cleansing" rate of the ground at the discharge sites measurable; ie is it possible that purple water could cross a boundary and enter a waterway before it has been totally cleansed?  What is the contingency plan if the discharge sites become saturated (specifically the risk to saturated underlying loess and organic soils)	Nicholas Tyler			Akaroa
300.	33576	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	Either Akaroa township should deal with its own waste or it should go out to the harbour. A longer pipeline may be more appropriate. The treated wastewater should not be dumped in the inner bays, this is not acceptable.	Garth Carnaby			Akaroa
301.	33573	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Wendy Stolzenberger			Christchurch
302.	33572	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Adam Liao			Christchurch
303.	33571	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes		Julie Swan			Christchurch
304.	33570	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Kelly Swan			Chch
305.	33569	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Cameron Pluck			Chch
306.	33566	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Kelly Pluck			Christchurch
307.	33565	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	Please consider extending the scheme from Robinsons Bay through to Duvauchelle to join up with their waste-water scheme to discharge over the current golf course area. This extended area could be used instead of Robinsons Bay. There must be economies of scale to combine the two schemes into one	Peter Steel			Robinson Bay
308.	33564	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Jennifer Share			Christchurch
309.	33560	No	To the harbour	3	1	2	No	No		Paul Burrowes	Director	Burrowes Holdings Limited	Christchurch
310.	33559	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	I like the idea of waste water being reused for irrigation of native plants & native trees. I think we should choose the least expensive and most affordable option. It would also be good to have the least disruptive option for farmers & local land owners. I like the idea of planting native trees &	Philippa Watson			Christchurch

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									wonder if there be opportunities for the public to help with native plantings & if so, when will that be?				
311.	33558	No	To the land	1	3	2	Yes	Yes	Provide a scheme for the other owners of properties around the peninsula to encourage them to upgrade their grey water system (old schemes deversing directly into the harbour). For the moment we are going through a painful process with the council when we have employed engineers to develop a solution suitable for our land. The consent process should trust proper certified engineers report. We want the harbour water to be safe and you need to consider everthing outside of akaroa.... why do we pay rates, we get just the road maintenance. .. not worth it really	Nathalie Giraudon			Akaroa
312.	33557	No	To the land			1	Yes	Yes	Just letting you know, as a Wainui resident, that I do not want to see even treated waste water discharged into our lovely harbour. I would much prefer the option of discharging on land to irrigate native trees.	Linda Hennessy			
313.	33556	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes	As a rate payer at █ Takamatua Beach Road, I think it is great that the CCC is making progress with providing a reticulated water treatment option.	Blair Gray			Christchurch
314.	33555	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	No	No	As a wastewater engineer involved with other wastewater schemes irrigated to land I believe irrigation of wastewater to land is not a sustainable use.  To prevent landslides land must be relatively flat. This means prime productive land is typically made useless by irrigation.  Fonterra, orchards, etc. will not take products produced on land irrigated by wastewater so the only remaining land use is forestry. Trees grown in wastewater irrigated areas grow fast and lack density in the wood meaning they are not suitable as a building material and only good as firewood.  Bacteria and viruses must be inactivated in the treated effluent otherwise the irrigation creates a health hazard. This is completed through high intensity UV light creating a ongoing operational electricity cost, an environmental issue from disposal of mercury in UV lamps and requires high levels of treatment to make the wastewater clear enough for the light to pass. Higher levels of treatment mean more treatment byproducts and more toxic byproducts.  As an industry professional I believe discharge via an ocean outfall where bacteria and viruses are inactivated by salinity is the best option.	Michael Galambos			Christchurch
315.	33554	No	To the harbour	3	3	3	Yes	Yes	We own a house on █ Walnut Ave Akaroa, but don't live there all year round and from what I've read and the people of spoken to, it seems pretty obvious that the waste water should continue to put into the harbor because it just makes economic sense and we all must take into account our Carbon Foot print.	David Molloy			Methven
316.	33551	No	To the land	3	1	2	No	Yes		Brad Hitchins			Banks Peninsula
317.	33550	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Fiona Wykes			Oxford
318.	33549	No	To the harbour	1	3	3	No	Yes	Impact on countryside and people's homes and farms.  Informed decisions based on better knowledge of local geology	Hilary Hancock			Akaroa
319.	33548	No	To the land	1	3	3	Yes	Yes	Having experienced the terrible smell from Bromley holding ponds as a child living nearby in the 1960's I would seek assurance that no such odour would be released from the proposed holding ponds	Kenneth Gamblin			Christchurch
320.	33547	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Before doing anything you must fix the pipes in Akaroa that result in contamination of the sewage water by storm water.	Jack Gibbs			Akaroa RD1

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									Then, please think long term, especially when you are going to spend so much of taxpayers money.  Akaroa has a water shortage every summer , this will get worse. The treated water from sewage is therefore an asset in the long term ,not a 'problem ' to be disposed of.				
321.	33546	No	To the land	2	1	3	Yes	Yes		Amber Brierly			Auckland
322.	33545	No	To the land	3	1	2	Yes	Yes		Bruce Sinclair	Director	Tresta Holdings Ltd	Christchurch
323.	33543	No	To the harbour				No	No	no	Richard Butcher			Wellington
324.	33542	No	To the harbour	1	2	3	Yes	No		Stuart Mclean			Christchurch
325.	33541	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Donna Koot			Banks pensinsula
326.	33540	No	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	Fix the storm water pipes and any other pipes allowing flow into the wastewater system.	Rosie Davidson			Akaroa
327.	33538	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Miranda Beuzenberg			Banks Peninsula
328.	33537	Yes	To the harbour		2	1	No	No	My attached submission was written in 2016 and addressed the proposed irrigation to land on the Takamatua headland and valley.  The same concerns are relevant for the proposal on Hammond point.  We strongly oppose the the construction of large ponds or attempts to irrigate land in the Robinsons bay or Takamatua valleys or anywhere else on land in the harbour basin. There are no areas of a suitable size, topography or soil type to cope with the proposed volumes. The threat of adverse effects on the environment and the near by communities is too great. The adverse effects which cannot be completely prevented include - Contamination of soils, ground water, creeks and the foreshore with micro pharmaceuticals etc which pass through the treatment process. - midges, mosquitoes - geese, - unpleasant odours - Broken pipes, pumps etc - leaching, erosion, formation of stagnant swamps.  The sheltered situations of the proposed sites exacerbates most of the above problems.  It will be impossible to mitigate all of these problems to a point where they could be considered less than minor.  Therefore these options should not be considered.  The highly treated wastewater should be pumped to Pompey's pillar where there is a more than adequate amount of suitable land and not many people to adversely effect. If this option isn't feasible a long deep harbour outlet is the only other option available.	Ken Reese			Christchurch
329.	33533	No	To the harbour				Yes	No	Too much money gas already been wasted on "Consultation". All that money could have been spent on further upgrading the actual treatment plant to further purify the water prior to ocean /harbour outfall discharge	Andrew Everist			RD1
330.	33532	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes		Simon Hadfield			Christchurch
331.	33531	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes	The Mayor and Councilors should not consider discharge to the harbour regardless of the level of treatment of the waste water	Duncan Bates	Managing Director	Akaroa Salmon NZ Limited	Christchurch
332.	33530	No	To the land	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	OASIS plants. The same as all of Takamatua uses as well as many communities around the country including the whole of Waiheke Island. Over	Mark Milligan			Takamatua



No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									all far cheaper with minimal operating costs. Fix the storm water going into the waste water system and require at least 50% of residents to install OASIS and your problem is solved.				
333.	33528	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Hadley McLachlan			Akaroa
334.	33527	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	No		Garry Moore			Christchurch
335.	33526	No	To the land	1	2		Yes	Yes		Joanna Nimmo			otago
336.	33525	No	To the harbour	2	3		Yes	Yes		Brian Nimmo			Wanaka
337.	33524	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	No	No	Robinson's Bay is an authorised archaeological site and area of historic importance. To substitute one set of historic beliefs and cultural imperatives for another is an insult to both. Either the council respects historical perspectives or it does not.	Jennifer Maxwell			Banks peninsula
338.	33523	No	To the harbour	3	2	1	Yes	Yes	The land at Takamatua must be retained for future bus and car parking. It is the only flat land still available.  To even consider Robinsons Bay is outrageous. It is a significant heritage area.	Geoff Maxwell			Akaroa
339.	33522	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	Yes		Warren Walker			Christchurch
340.	33521	Yes	To the harbour				Yes	Yes	See attached	Robin Tiffen			Akaroa
341.	33520	No	To the land	1	2	3	Yes	No		Dylan Bryan			Duvauchelle

Additional submissions, not included in the staff report analysis (both submissions will be provided to the Hearing Panel for consideration):

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
1.	34779	No							<p>Akaroa Wastewater Submission</p> <p>I strongly oppose the option of the inner harbour bay option</p> <p>The council choosing this option will have the following domino effects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Negative visual impact to the approach to Akaora beginning at Robinsons bay and Takamatua along highway 75</li> <li>2. Potential offensive odour this system may produce.</li> <li>3. Flies and midges that populate especially over the summer months</li> <li>4. Effects of land values of all properties within the vicinity of the proposed project</li> <li>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</li> </ol> <p>An email to Georgina [REDACTED] on the 27th July is as followsHere are the responses to your questions from the project team.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ol> <p>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.</p> <p>Then an article in the Akaroa mail dated 14th August bought my attention to the following</p> <p>"Sir, I would like to correct a statement made by Council staff at the wastewater information session on</p> <p>August 2 that only City and peninsula properties that receive sewer service would be paying for a new wastewater scheme</p> <p>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.</p>	Brent Schulz			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<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 [REDACTED]"</p> <p>Subsiquently a further email from Georgina [REDACTED] was sent to Tara King on the 14th of August quoting Jan [REDACTED] 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.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
2.	34782	No	To the harbour					Yes	<p>Fundamentally, what environment would you prefer Akaroa wastewater is discharged into?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Irrigation of reclaimed water to trees or pasture for non-potable reuse and/or irrigation to land</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disposal via a new outfall pipeline to the mid-harbour</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)</p> <p>Please state your reasons why:</p> <p>I fully endorse the submission made by the Friends of Banks Peninsula.</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>"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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Ad Sintenie			Akaroa

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>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.</p> <p>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. "</p> <p>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).</p> <p>5 Option 1 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Robinsons Bay</p> <p>4 Option 2 – Irrigation of trees or pasture at Pompeys Pillar</p> <p>4 Option 3 – Irrigation of trees or pasture in Takamātua Valley, in combination with another area</p> <p>1 Option 4 – Non-potable re-use in Akaroa, in combination with another option</p> <p>1 Option 5 – Disposal via a new outfall pipeline to the mid-harbour.</p> <p>Choose an item. Other (please describe)</p> <p>Please state your reasons for this ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High risks, high costs, impact on communities, cultural concerns.</li> <li>• 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 boundarys (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 Pondsité 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.</li> </ul>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>o Cultural impact: effect on local heritage site</li> <li>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&amp;I issue not addressed sufficiently, scheme grossly oversized due to I&amp;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.</li> </ul> <p>Would you be more supportive of spray irrigation of treated wastewater to pasture or drip irrigation to trees? Please state your reasons why:</p> <p>No view other than what is the best scientific option with the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.</p> <p>Do you have a preference for the location of a reclaimed water storage pond(s)? Please state your reasons why:</p> <p>Preferably Akaroa but where it has the least impact on the surrounding environment and community.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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</p>				

No.	Sub ID	Attach	1 Discharge to harbour or land?	Inner Bays	Goughs Bay	Pompeys Pillar	3 irrigate public parks in Akaroa?	4 purple pipe?	Is there anything else you'd like us to consider?	Name	Role	Organisation	Town / City
									<p>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.</p> <p>Do you have any other comments? (Please use additional paper if required):</p> <p>As a rate payer I am deeply concerned about the ever escalating costs and uncertainties of the land based options.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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!</p>				