

Page 1: Have your say - draft Revenue and Financing Policy - Methven-Springfield Water

Q1

Do you agree with adding Methven-Springfield to the District Water Group?

No, I prefer something else (comment below),

Other (please specify):

1. Re the Springfield water scheme. There is financial information missing. That is the cost of the capital investment and running costs of the filtration etc being installed. It can be concluded that this is going to significantly increase the annual costs and the whole exercise is to spread this over all district water users. 2. As one who has been involved in the Springfield scheme from the time it was installed, a number of attempts have been made by ADC to add treatment facilities to meet standards imposed by outside agencies. (Each time the governments imposed standards have been blamed)) Each attempt was "consulted" on and although pretty much all those on the scheme were not in favour, the change was implemented by the council. This is the latest move and at least the ADC did not insult us this time by going through the charade of first asking (and risking the certainty of being asked to leave us alone) and then proceeding anyway in the face of a negative response. 3. Therefore we are left as somewhat powerless pawns in the rules based system where national standards that don't fit a mainly stock water supply require a cobbled together solution to pacify those on the scheme and somehow preserve equity with those paying for a non livestock water supply. 4. One presumes the other options of delivering potable drinking water have not been explored. Such as fitting household level equipment that will meet current standards. Or delivering to all households bottled water for human consumption. We can assume these solutions would have been vastly cheaper but would no doubt fail bureaucratic approval because, heavens above, it requires people to take responsibility for their own welfare. People it would appear are unable to be trusted. 5. As the original funders and current users, we have been given no say about the costs of the current work, nor have we been asked to suggest cheaper options, but we are now being asked how we might like to pay. After all the scheme would not even exist if it were not for the initiative of this group of rural people in building it. 6. Therefore whatever cost increase that is to be charged should be minimal and do no more than reflect the utility value of a safe water supply. Any increase should bear in mind that alternatives may well have been available at a much smaller cost than joining the Methven project but nobody in the council appears to have even considered that possibility let alone consult with us about it. That the result of the council decision is that livestock are to be given water of human potable standards is not of our doing and should not be at our cost. 7. Living in a community confers a shared cost on us all. But there is also a duty on the council to be fair. This is a tough one for council but the issue is not of our making and could have been resolved more cleanly

have been received more cheaply.

Page 2

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

If you agree with adding Methven-Springfield to the District Water Group, what is your preferred policy setting in regards to allocation?

Page 3

Q3 Methven-Springfield

I get my drinking water from:

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any other comments?

Page 4

Q5
Contact Details

Name

Organisation (If applicable)

Address

Email Address

Phone Number

Page 5

Q6 Yes: The hearing is expected to be held in the Council Chamber on Wednesday 31 May 2023. Please note that hearings are live-streamed to our online channels.

Do you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing?

Page 6

Q7 In Person

Would you like to present: