

Evidence on Central Plains Water Trust: Resource Consent Application proposed conditions

A:

Submission of: Christchurch City Council

Address: P O Box 237
Christchurch

Attention: Peter Kingsbury

Telephone: 03 941 8487 or 027 599 4615

Email: peter.kingsbury@ccc.govt.nz

Signature:



ds A J Marrayatt, Chief Executive Officer, Christchurch City Council

Date:

12 March 2010

B:

Christchurch City Council **does** wish to be heard in support of this submission

IN THE MATTER OF The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Resource Consent Applications by Central
Plains Water Trust to take and use water
and undertake other activities for the
construction and operation of the Central
Plains Water Enhancement Scheme

**EVIDENCE OF PETER FRANCIS CALLANDER FOR CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
(CCC) REGARDING PROPOSED CONSENT CONDITIONS FOR CENTRAL PLAINS
WATER LTD (CPW)**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Peter Francis Callander.
- 1.2. My qualifications and experience have been set out in my previous statement of evidence to this hearing panel.
- 1.3. I confirm that I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for expert witnesses and this evidence is prepared in accordance with that code. I agree to comply with the code's terms. In that regard, I confirm that the statements made in this evidence are within my area of expertise and I confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts which might alter the opinions stated in this evidence.
- 1.4. This brief of evidence relates to the comments on the proposed consent conditions for the Central Plains Water scheme that are of concern to Christchurch City Council.

2. ISSUES OF CONCERN TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

- 2.1. It is acknowledged and appreciated that many of the comments and concerns raised by CCC in my earlier evidence have been incorporated into the draft conditions prepared by ECan and CPW. Therefore the remaining comments are relatively few.
- 2.2. CCC is interested in maintaining as much flow as possible in the Waimakariri River for recreational and aesthetic purposes, particularly given the proximity of Christchurch,

Kaiapoi and Rangiora. To this end, they would like to see a new condition added to consent CRC061972 which states that:

“The abstraction of water from the Waimakariri River must only occur when the water requirements for the CPW scheme cannot reasonably be met by abstraction of water from the Rakaia River.”

- 2.3. CCC appreciate and support the recognition given to the role the Waimakariri River has in recharging the Christchurch-West Melton and Kaiapoi aquifer systems, and the inclusion of that role in administration Condition 25(a) regarding the identification of mitigation measures and 29(f) as one of the reasons to review the consent conditions.
- 2.4. With regard to the Administrative conditions CCC is concerned that monitoring and effective mitigation is required to be implemented. At the present time the area over which this mitigation will be applied with regard to groundwater level and groundwater quality issues is not defined. Reference is made in administration Condition 25(i)(v) to plan CRC061973 which defines the area of monitoring and mitigation for groundwater quality effects on water supply bores, but that plan is not available. CCC would like a broad area defined, which should include the entire central plains extending from the CPW scheme area to the coastline and from the Waimakariri River to the Rakaia River.
- 2.5. Administrative condition 20 refers to the Groundwater Technical Review Panel being appointed by the consent holder. It may be more appropriate for the GTRP to be jointly appointed by both the consent holder and the Canterbury Regional Council.
- 2.6. Administrative condition 21 refers to the Groundwater Technical Review Panel. To ensure that the panel can reach a majority decision it is suggested that, *“The GTRP shall comprise of five or seven people”* – to ensure a majority decision can be reached.
- 2.7. Administrative condition 25(g) refers to trigger levels that will be used to interpret monitoring data. It is worth mentioning that these trigger levels may need to be defined both in terms of a particular maximum level and the length of time the water level is raised above some lower level, recognising that some undesirable effects can occur within the current range of water level fluctuations, and if these were prolonged, that would represent an adverse effect that should be mitigated.
- 2.8. Administrative condition 25(i)(v) refers to the provision of alternative water supplies to bores supplying infants who might be at risk from elevated nitrates that could have arisen from the CPW scheme. However there are other potential groundwater quality effects related to effects on waste water disposal systems and old landfills. Therefore it

would be prudent to have a wider mitigation requirement than just nitrates, which could be inserted as a new clause in condition 25(i) and could be worded as follows:

- (vi) *The CPWT/CPWL shall provide an alternative water supply for any abstraction bore that fails to comply with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) where the consent holders activities can be demonstrated to have contributed to the occurrence of the poor quality groundwater.*

