

Lyttelton, Governors Bay and Diamond Harbour wastewater project - submissions and project team responses

Submarine option - support

There were 39 submitters who indicated they support the submarine option

Number	Submission ID #	Name	Company	Address 1	Address 2	City	Postcode	I/We generally support the submarine option	I/We generally support the road option	Full Comments	Project Team Responses
1.	1	Paul St John		6 Mariners Cove	Cass Bay	Lyttelton	8082	Y	N	I would only support the road option if it was combined with a full reconstruction of Goves Bay to Lytt Road, which we all know is in a bad state of repair.	Thanks for your submission. At this stage a decision on the route has not been made. A full road reconstruction of Governors Bay to Lyttelton is outside the scope of this project as the primary aim of this project is to remove wastewater from Lyttelton Harbour.
2.	2	Marie E Green		187 Main Road	Governors Bay, RD1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	NR	The submarine option sounds the most cost effective at this stage. I would like to be kept updated on progress and support the final decisions if they prove to be reliable and long term.	Thanks for your submission. Regular updates on the project will be available on the project web page at http://www.ccc.govt.nz/services/wastewater/wastewater-projects/lyttelton-harbour-wastewater-project/
3.	3	Mark Murphy & Helen Ridley		195 Main Road, RD 1	Ohinetahi Valley	Governors Bay	8971	Y	NR	The submarine option seems the most straight-forward, cost effective & least environmentally impacting option. Our preference for this option is conditional on Rapaki Maori being consulted on how the submarine option affects the cultural values connected with the harbour/seabed.	Thanks for your submission. The project team can confirm that we are holding regular meetings with the iwi representatives, and they are very well informed about this project.
4.	4	M&A Horgan		1071 Dyers Pass Road		Governors Bay	8971	Y	NR	Our only concern with the harbour option is potential pollution of raw sewage into the Harbour in the event of a breakage.	Thanks for your submission. If this project proceeded with the submarine option, then the design for this option would be a very robust and resilient solution.
5.	5	Paul Rogers		3 Buxtons Road	Corsair Bay	Lyttelton	8082	Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
6.	6	Neroli & Ray Williams		52A Lakewood Drive	Burwood	Christchurch	8083	Y	N	The submarine option appears to be the most practical and cost effective of the choices offered. Thank you.	Thanks for your submission.
7.	7	R Gilbertson		17 Brittan Terrace		Lyttelton	8082	Y	N	Submarine: Less corners, less cost? Less disruptions. Road: too much disruption, more safety issues.	Thanks for your submission.
8.	8	R Vemooy		70 Main Road		Governors Bay	8971	Y	NR	The submarine option makes more sense, as road option will be more disruption, and we have enough heavy traffic as it is.	Thanks for your submission.
9.	9	David Tie						Y	N	The road option would involve significant and unnecessary traffic management issues for an extended time period. The submarine option is simple, direct and common sense.	Thanks for your submission.
10.	10	Angela & Graeme McCall		56 Koromiko Crescent	Church Bay, RD1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
11.	11	Philip & Robin Manger		32 James Drive	Church Bay, RD1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	N	Reason: Option supported coz it seems reasonable; more efficient and much cheaper.	Thanks for your submission.
12.	12	Anonymous						Y	N	Some years ago, when the high pressure water supply and sewage system was installed these were major problems, unforeseen, with the terrain. The problems continued for many months after the scheme was completed. On a matter of cost, I suspect the submarine option would be more realistic.	Thanks for your submission.
13.	13	Philippa Staples		894 Governors Bay Road	RD1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	N	Road option covers a larger distance, which would possibly be more costly & disruptive to road users. Would like reassurance that submarine option will not have any adverse effects on marine life-habitat.	Thanks for your submission. If this project proceeded with the submarine option, a study of the sea bed will be included during the detailed design phase of this project. This assessment (benthic) has been completed, and will assist in selecting detail on the most appropriate route for the pipeline to reduce any potential effects on the seabed and marine life.
14.	14	Anonymous						Y	N		Thanks for your submission.
15.	15	Anonymous						Y	NR	Most cost effective. Less disruption to Communities. Quicker timeline to complete.	Thanks for your submission.
16.	16	Hamish Fraser		3 Mariners Cove		Cass Bay	8082	Y	N	The road option would cause chaos outing narrow, busy road which is already hazardous with over size traffic using it til 2018 (at least!). The under pinnings of the road are already very poor quality and the road surface breaks up regularly. To add a drain to this poor quality road will further compromise its current poor condition.	Thanks for your submission.
17.	17	Anonymous						Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.

18.	18							Y	NR	Cost, easier option to install & time	Thanks for your submission.
19.	19	S & J Patterson	34 James Drive	Church Bay, RD 1	Lyttelton	8971		Y	NR		
20.	21	W.G. Bromley	30 Cunningham Terrace	Lyttelton	Christchurch	8082		Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
21.	22	Malcolm T. & Helen Howell	24 Harbour View Terrace	Cass Bay	Christchurch	8082		Y	NR	Having been involved in the LP6 pipeline from Corsair Bay to Rapaki, carrying out all the "underwater work". Burial of a pipeline is the best option. *Chose a mud seabed route to cut sown on any rock removal-and to assist dredging operations of putting the pipeline below the seabed. There is no great depth of water involved. Once the pipeline is buried-it is virtually maintenance free. Except for anchors-it will be virtually unnoticable.	Thanks for your submission.
22.	23	Anonymous						Y	N		Thanks for your submission.
23.	24	Morrin	149A Main Road	Governors Bay		8971		Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
24.	25	Ernesto	PO Box 25008	Auckland		7140		Y	N	The Diamond Harbour Submarine pipeline is already in existence and seems to be working well Road pipeline are very disruptive and expensive to construct.	Thanks for your submission.
25.	26	Olga	897 Governors Bay Road	R.D.1	Lyttelton	8971		Y	N	I have supported the submarine option on the assumption that it will be the least costly. However I strongly recommend that the work be delayed if possible. Escalating Council expenses need to be reined in. After a disaster on the scale that we have experienced, we cannot be expected to pay to repair infrastructure in such a short period of time and pay for further developments.	Thanks for your submission. The timing of this project is dictated by the expiry of the existing consents. We are not repairing an existing pipeline, but meeting legal obligations to cease discharging into the harbour. If this project proceeded with the submarine option, a study of the sea bed will be included during the detailed design phase of this project. This assessment (benthic) has been completed, and will assist in selecting detail on the most appropriate route for the pipeline to reduce any potential effects on the seabed and marine life. In order to avoid risk of any rupture of a pipeline the project will have in place regular pressure testing to expose any defective joints, the pipeline will consist of HDPE pipe (flexible and strong), the pipeline is proposed to be buried to provide physical protection, regular maintenance will be in place, spare parts will be kept in storage, a generator would be available in case of loss of power, buffer storage would also be in place, installation of non-return valves at landfalls to reduce wastewater volume would be installed for if the pipe fails and primary treatment of any overflows would also be in place.
26.	27	Coughlin M and G	14 Emerson Crescent	Diamond Harbour		8971		Y	NR	Common sense	Thanks for your submission.
27.	29	K & K Ralcena	PO BOX 65		Lyttelton	8841		Y	N	Prefer submarine because of the disturbance to road access that the road option may cause during works. Only concern is the planning for the possibility of a rupture of the marine line which could pollute our precious water way. What plan is in place to avoid this happening?	Thanks for your submission. If this project proceeded with the submarine option, then the design for this option would be a very robust and resilient solution.
28.	30	Mr & Mrs AD & DM Olson	35 Harbour View Terrace	Cass Bay	Lyttelton	8082		Y	N	Submarine option is logical, less disturbance and noise via road option. Also shorter distance less cost involved. The pipe being placed 1 metre under the sea as Diamond Harbour is clearly the best and cleanest option.	Thanks for your submission.
29.	31	Anonymous						Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
30.	32	Anonymous						Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
31.	33	Simon Nibolott	20 James Drive		Church Bay			Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
32.	34	George Taylor	12 Melville Crescent	Rolleston		7614		Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.
33.	35	Stuart Hodge	117 Melwood Avenue	Killamey Heights	Sydeny, Australia	NSW 2087		Y	NR	We are for the submarine option as long as there are no medium to long term environmental impacts.	Thanks for your submission. If this project proceeded with the submarine option, then the construction methodology and the operational and management plan for the project, along with appropriate resource consent conditions would be in place to ensure that there are mitigations measures in place for any risk of environmental impacts.
34.	36	Bruce Glennie	45 Koromiko Crescent	Church Bay, RD 1	Lyttelton	8971		Y	NR	The submarine pipelines provide the shortest most direct route for the pipelines and will cause the least disruption to traffic & should be a cheaper option given the amount of rock excavation that would be needed for a road option, not having to pay ridiculous cost of traffic management that has become a part of road works should provide a significant benefit to the submarine option.	Thanks for your submission.
35.	37	Mr & Mrs Elliott	1 Cass Bay Place		Cass Bay	8082		Y	N		Thanks for your submission.
36.	38	Mark & Rosie Bello	10 Sandy Beach Road	Governors Bay	Lyttelton	8971		Y	N	The submarine option is a more direct route, and the marine sediments are soft and relatively inexpensive to bury a pipeline within. Furthermore once buried, the marine	Thanks for your submission.

										option will not cause or be affected by erosion. The road option is considerably longer, more difficult and expensive to lay, and will destabilise road fill material and cause instability and be at risk from erosion slips and subsidence.	
37.	39	K and C Davey		132 Main Road	RD 1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	NR	We have chosen this option because it most possibly is the most cost effective	Thanks for your submission.
38.	40	Thomas & Shelley Kuenning		30 James Drive	RD 1	Lyttelton	8971	Y	NR	Lower long term cost & most environmentally sound approach	Thanks for your submission.
39.	41	John Howie		5 Simon Quay		Lyttelton	8082	Y	NR		Thanks for your submission.

Road option - support

There were no submitters who indicated that they support the road option.

Submarine option or road option - not indicated

There were 5 submitters who did not indicate whether they supported either option.

Number	Submitter ID #	First name	Company	Address 1	Address 2	City	Postcode	I/We generally support the submarine option	I/We generally support the road option	Full Comments	Project Team Responses
1.	20	Stuart Bould		122 Main Road		Governors Bay		NR	NR	This consultation about an undefined scheme seems to be arranged in great haste. The DH scheme is a year or more away. The Lyttelton town scheme is also a late starter. The GB scheme is first up, and no local consultation or detail has been offered about the design of the system, the performance metrics, the change over works, or the route mechanics. Why would anyone in this community endorse either transfer route in complete ignorance of the system propositions ?? Given the scale of large vehicle movement around the harbour basin roads it would surely be of interest to a number of communities as to how these road works might be managed. There are up to 300 tonnes of timber being delivered to the Port each day, numerous 12m container movements and lately giant over-size cranes and excavators coming and going. Some of these Gebbies Pass to Lytt loads take up both carriage ways. The Lytt transfer pumping station is assumed to be at the Rec ground and the performance of the onwards link to Bromley is of equal interest and importance to this community. This isn't the level of patronising "consultation" that we expected from the CCC after the effort that has preceded this work. Please visit this community to discuss the scheme proposition(s) in more detail. I would be interested in knowing about the issues of end to end system resilience, fall back options, system redundancies, spillage and clean up options, power failure, MTBF for system failure locally and at a distance, storage calculations, etc, just so we know what we are being provided with. Stuart Bould 021 351 749	Thanks for your submission. The project team has a meeting organised with the Governors Bay Community Association. There will also be further opportunity for feedback when the consents are lodged, and the timings around providing feedback will be in accordance with the public notification of these consents.
2.	28	Eddie Owen		7 Buxtons Road	Corsair Bay	Lyttelton	8082	NR	NR	Looking at it practically I suggest the pipe be lai across the harbour rather than having to dig a deep trench along the bay road, which will no doubt cause disruption & be more expensive, which will in no doubt hurt the rate payer. The bay which is not used by large deep hulled vessels would I feel be less expensive & disruption, making ure sour marine experts no hoe deep int he seabed to lay it. I think it would be less risk of severe damage if we had another 7-8 EQ.	Thanks for your submission. You have made a really good observations which will be considered through the design process.
3.	42	Phil Jackson	Governors Bay Jetty Restoration Trust					NR	NR	This submission is on behalf of the Governors Bay Jetty Restoration Trust. We are partnering with CCC to restore the jetty at Governors Bay and work is likely to begin in 2016 or 2017. There are potential conflicts and synergies with your proposals and we are keen to work with you to identify and resolve them. Project delivery	Thanks for your submission. We are more than happy to coordinate our project works with the jetty works programme. We would be happy to meet with the appropriate representatives of the Trust during the detailed design phase, prior to any physical construction works. In regard to the road option there is no intention to truck wastewater along the road. The road option is in reference to a pipeline to carry the wastewater which is constructed below ground. The coastal reserve around Governors Bay will have no permanent structures placed on it and will be remain as a reserve.

									<p>In terms of project delivery, the following aspects required during pipeline construction are likely to require collaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of temporary pontoons or jetties at the landfall of the pipelines • Restricted construction zones when pipelines are being placed – would this apply to the Governors Bay end? • Traffic management – there may be construction traffic for both projects in a very limited amount of space • Establishment of a contractors' work area and storage facility – our project is also likely to require this. <p>Ongoing amenity Your proposals include consideration of road transportation (instead of a pipeline) from the sewage treatment plant to Lyttelton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the jetty is restored, it will be a public amenity that would be affected by regular traffic from trucks carrying sewage. • We therefore support the plan to pipe the sewerage under the harbour to Lyttelton. <p>Foot and vehicle traffic around the bottom of Jetty Road and the area adjacent to the jetty will dramatically increase once the jetty is restored and open to the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We therefore request that you minimise any infrastructure in this area and do not increase your footprint. <p>We're confident that both projects can be completed successfully through collaboration and any potential conflicts can be managed through communication.</p>		
4.	43	Rebecca Beals	KiwiRail	P O Box 593		Wellington	6140	NR	NR	<p>Feedback from KiwiRail for Christchurch City Council's Lyttelton, Governors Bay and Diamond Head wastewater project</p> <p>KiwiRail has received the Christchurch City Council consultation document in relation to the upgrade of the wastewater treatment system in Lyttelton, Governors Bay and Diamond Head areas. In relation to the rail network, there are potential rail corridor crossings by the proposed infrastructure at the Lyttelton side of the road tunnel near Sutton / Norwich Quays, and as Tunnel Road / SH74 passes over the rail corridor.</p> <p>KiwiRail have no particular comments in relation to the options proposed, other than to advise Council that in relation to works within the rail corridor separate approvals and permissions will be required from KiwiRail prior to physical works occurring. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A separate Grant of Right for any temporary occupation areas for construction and the permanent occupation area by any infrastructure are required to be obtained prior to works commencing. More information on grants, and to obtain one when required, email grants@kiwirail.co.nz • That the necessary permit to enter for the works is sought at least 15 days prior to physical works commencing, noting that this will require that the final construction plans and methodology be supplied and approved by KiwiRail in relation to works within the KiwiRail corridor. These permits enable access to the corridor. A permit will also be required if geotechnical investigations are proposed in the corridor. Further information on the permit to enter process, including application forms can be found here:http://www.kiwirail.co.nz/infrastructure/accessing-the-corridor.html <p>If you have any queries on the content of this letter or wish to discuss the project further once the final route is confirmed and the design complete, please feel free to contact me. Also if RMA approvals are required for the project once the consenting stage is reached, please let me know.</p>	Thanks for your submission. The project team have met with Kiwi Rail staff and are aware that we will need separate approvals, these will be addressed in the detailed design phase of this project.
5.	44	Alizon Paterson	Canterbury District Health Board	PO Box 1475		Christchurch	8140	NR	NR	<p>SUBMISSION ON LYTTELTON, GOVERNORS BAY AND DIAMOND HARBOUR WASTEWATER PROJECT CONSULTATION</p> <p>Details of submitter</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB). 2. The CDHB could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission <p>Details of submission</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 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. 4. The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by such 	Thanks for your submission. The project team agree that the primary objective of the project to remove the discharge of wastewater from Lyttelton Harbour.

