

Te Anau Sewerage – Kepler Block Development Meeting Minutes

Meeting Venue	Te Anau Service Centre		
Date Of Meeting	27 February 2008	Time Of Meeting	1.00 pm
Chairperson		Recorder	Murray Sorrell

Attendees	Company/Role	Initials	Absentees
Frank Cabbit	Adjacent Landowner	FC	
Cameron McDonald	Adjacent Landowner	CM	
Hanns Kraak	Adjacent Landowner	HK	
Justin Reid	SDC Wastewater Manager	JR	
Kevin McNaught	SDC Property Officer	KM	
Murray Sorrell	MWH Wastewater Engineer	MS	

Minutes	Action
1. Following initial contact with the adjacent landowners, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss matters more fully and understand any concerns.	
2. MS outlined the proposed concept, stating primary treatment would be at the existing Te Anau treatment site, with secondary treatment by way of facultative ponds and then irrigation by centre pivot irrigators undertaken on the Kepler Block.	
3. There was discussion regarding the site selection process. MS stated many options with sites up to 15-20 km radius from Te Anau being considered. The evaluation showed the Kepler Block to be best, with lesser scoring options being the Freestone Block and land adjacent to the Te Anau airport. CM suggested land in the Rainbow Ridge area could be suitable. While the suggested site would be considered, it was generally understood how and why the Kepler Block was preferred (by SDC).	SDC
4. FC and CM wanted assurance that there would be no problems (odour in particular). MS indicated components of the treatment system that had odour potential, noting that many are at the existing Te Anau site. He noted odour control depends on aerobic operation and notes operations are aerobic. Odours are not expected from either the facultative ponds or irrigation. There is an odour risk from abnormal pond operation (there would have to be a failure of the Te Anau treatment system) and the intermittent desludging of the bottom layer built up in the ponds. Details of the desludging had not been finalised, however MS indicated this could be at a 3-5 year interval, and could involve either liquid sludge sprayed on the land or temporarily stored in Geotubes and dewatered prior to disposal either on site or off site. MS indicated overall the odour risk was low and that further detailing could further reduce risks. JR stated that a three layer shelter belt was expected to be installed around much of the site and this would meet Department of Health aerosol guidelines and also provide a visual barrier.	

<p>5. FC and CM indicated an option for them regarding performance assurance, could be an agreement with compensation if problems occur. MS indicated that such an approach was not usual, as the consenting process required effects to be “less than minor” and conditions placed on the operation to ensure compliance. JR further pointed out that such an agreement could be too open ended and provide future financial uncertainties. FC and CM noted these concerns, suggesting they could review their situation, with any issues being dealt with now rather than at some unknown future date.</p>	FC / CM
<p>6. HK commented that his situation was different and more immediate, in that he proposed to develop a new home and supporting operation at this 50 ha lifestyle block. He stated that he had building plans and builders in hand and that the news of a sewerage plant neighbour was completely unexpected and from his viewpoint now a fatal flaw in his development plans. He made it clear that he didn't want to undertake his new development next to the proposed operation.</p> <p>There was an understanding of his position, with KM concluding HK submit his concerns in writing, together with any supporting information.</p>	HK
<p>7. In discussions, it was scoped that should there be no sewage development adjacent to HR's block (essentially no development west of the south runway) that this would go a long way to meeting his concerns. JR noted all the land is ultimately needed for irrigation, however this would be considered further.</p> <p>It was further discussed, the adjacent landowners preference to substitute land adjacent to their blocks with Landcorp, north of the present proposal. JR indicated the background and difficulty in getting the present 105 ha block north of the main runway, but undertook to write to Landcorp requesting a further 70 ha in the north.</p>	JR
<p>8. The meeting closed at 3.30 pm, with all parties having a better understanding of the proposal and concerns. While it was understood that a more formal debate would occur at the time of the consent application, parties undertook to review their position, update information where appropriate and present written submissions where necessary.</p>	All