

QLDC Council  
30 June 2016

**Report for Agenda Item: 7**

**Department: Property & Infrastructure**

**Supply Boundary Adjustment – Arrowtown Retirement Village**

**Purpose**

To seek Council approval to extend the water supply and wastewater service boundaries for the proposed Arrowtown Retirement Village along McDonnell Road.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **Note** the contents of this report;
2. **Agree** that the water supply and wastewater service boundaries be extended to cover the proposed Arrowtown Retirement Village along McDonnell Road.

Prepared by:



Ulrich Glasner  
Chief Engineer

8/06/2016

Reviewed and Authorised by:



Peter Hansby  
General Manager, Property  
and Infrastructure

9/06/2016

**Background**

- 1 The proposed site for the retirement village is located along McDonnell Road, to the south of Arrowtown between The Hills golf course and the Mt Soho winery. This location is a significant distance from the existing water and wastewater infrastructure and is midway between the Arrowtown and Lake Hayes Schemes, giving potential options to connect to either scheme.
- 2 A report from Anita Vanstone (Senior Planner) assessed the measures taken in response to the Council's resolution of 26 November 2015. Council supports in principle the proposed SHA for the proposed Arrowtown Retirement Village but subject to conditions. A resolution from Council's meeting of 1 March 2016 confirms that the Council agrees in principle with the contents of the (draft) deed.

## **Comment**

### Infrastructure reviews

- 3 The past resolution required further assessment of infrastructure requirements by the Chief Financial Officer, Chief Engineer, and a suitably qualified independent professional. Accordingly, a peer review of Three Waters assessments has been undertaken by Holmes Consulting Group (Refer Attachment B). This was resolved by Council at the meeting of 1 March 2016.
- 4 The arrangements for any necessary upgrades (and funding responsibilities) are detailed within the Draft Deed. These include the developer agreeing to pay for the sole cost of the design, obtain all the necessary consents and the construction of the water supply, wastewater, transport and storm water systems. The following has been included in the Draft Deed:
  - Water Supply – Rationale assessed two water supply options for the site. The recommendation includes connection to the Arrowtown Scheme, via a 200mm extension, however this is subject to resolving water storage shortfall in the scheme;
  - Stormwater – developer proposes to address this onsite;
  - Wastewater – Rationale assessed 5 different options for the discharge of wastewater from the site. This includes a rising main injecting 300 mm main on Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road at the junction with Hogans Gully Road to convey wastewater to the Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road (Bendemeer) pump station via a 300 mm diameter main. Modelling work is currently underway to assess the use of the Arrowtown network and the Norfolk Street Pump Station.

### **Options**

- 5 Option 1 Not accepting the water supply and wastewater service boundaries adjustment.

#### *Advantages:*

- 6 No increase of operational and maintenance budgets for additional infrastructure.

#### *Disadvantages:*

- 7 Breach of deed conditions.
- 8 Applicants losing trust in Council's decision-making processes.
- 9 Possible further private supply schemes run by private entities.
- 10 Option 2 Accepting the water supply and wastewater service boundaries adjustment.

*Advantages:*

11 Control over supply schemes.

12 Reduced health risk compared to a privately maintained and operated scheme.

*Disadvantages:*

13 Increased demand on existing infrastructure.

14 This report recommends **Option 2** for addressing the matter. Council will operate and own the infrastructure to the boundary of the private development based on Council standards. Based on the advantages and disadvantages this option will provide the best service to the development.

***Significance and Engagement***

15 This matter is of low significance, as determined by reference to the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy because the decision has nearly no impact to the existing ratepayers.

***Risk***

16 This matter relates to the strategic risk SR1, as documented in the Council's risk register. The risk is classed as high. This is because of economic, social, environmental and reputational risks.

17 A key element of this risk is meeting the current and future development needs of the community. Whilst there is an element of environmental protection to this risk, the risk relates more to the economic and social consequences of not meeting development needs. The matter therefore can be considered to terminate the risk by providing the service.

**Financial Implications**

18 There are no budgets or cost implications resulting from the decision.

19 The developer will be responsible for infrastructure connections and the provision of appropriate infrastructure to support the development.

20 It is acknowledged that there will be some ongoing infrastructure maintenance costs, but these are likely to be minor.

**Council Policies, Strategies and Bylaws**

21 The following Council policies, strategies and bylaws were considered:

- Water Supply Bylaw 2008

22 This matter is not included in the 10-Year Plan/Annual Plan

- No budget necessary.

## **Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions**

23 The recommended option:

- Will help meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses by providing infrastructure to an agreed level of service which is safe to use and affordable.
- Can be implemented through current funding under the 10-Year Plan and Annual Plan;
- Is consistent with the Council's plans and policies; and
- Would not alter significantly the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the Council, or transfer the ownership or control of a strategic asset to or from the Council.

## **Consultation: Community Views and Preferences**

24 No further consultation has been undertaken in association with this request.


25 Council has provided for a community feedback process during the SHA proposal. This feedback was provided at the 26 November 2015 meeting and was made public, which helped inform Council's decision-making. Speakers also spoke in support of the proposal at the 26 November meeting, with no one speaking in opposition.

## **Attachments**

A Outline Plan

B Holmes Consulting – Arrowtown SHA Infrastructure Assessment



01 | Site: Landscape Master Plan   
 Scale: 1 :2500 @ A3