

#2

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 02, 2017 4:21:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 02, 2017 4:34:53 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:43  
**IP Address:** 122.56.235.90

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Neil Harrison

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Part 4 section 26.1 Whitewater Boarding. I agree in essence with the changes. However, there appears to be confusion between whitewater rafting and whitewater Boarding. Whitewater Boarding is swimming rivers on boards and is not regulated by MNZ or covered by rule 81. Whitewater Rafting is regulated by MNZ under rule 81, but does not seem to be included in the new proposed bylaw.

---

# #3

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 06, 2017 10:12:34 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 06, 2017 10:23:16 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:10:41  
**IP Address:** 101.98.248.93

---

## Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

## Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

## Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Tim Sikma

## Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I oppose the proposed changes to clause 18.1 The proper speed of vessels must not exceed 5 knots on the Clutha River between the outlet camping ground (marked by a five knot buoy) and the five knot buoy positioned downstream at -44.668044, 169.1616.

This area is a family area with a great variety of watercraft and levels of ability. Any proposed increase in speed in this area will only increase the safety risk for all users. Increase speed of powered craft will also cause increased motor noise which will degrade natural quiet serenity of the Lake Wanaka outlet area section of the Clutha River.

## #4

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 10:12:57 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 10:20:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:52  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

### Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

### Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

### Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anna van Riel

### Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We are so incredibly lucky to have such a fantastic environment to raise our children and enjoy all the year round. I have been enjoying our waterways for white water kayaking, swimming, fishing and paddle boarding since I was a child. I want the same for my children.

Increasing the speed allowance for motor boats in popular swimming areas is risky, as well as incredibly stressful for families trying to enjoy the water ways. Albertain offers numerous popular swimming areas, therefore increasing the risk by inviting faster speeds from boats doesn't seem smart or thoughtful.

I am opposed to this proposed.

---

#5

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 10:48:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 10:54:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:17  
**IP Address:** 203.173.140.64

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Mark watson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river around town needs to have restrictions around speed to allow swimmers kayakers paddle boards pets all to be safe. Below the cardrona confluence boats and crafts can speed up

#6

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 4:52:20 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 5:15:30 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:23:09  
**IP Address:** 86.168.130.118

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ali Hanan

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This part of the river is quiet, beautiful and peaceful where many families play swim and relax. Kids jump off the bridge, there is a campsite and many of us revere the eco-system here. Children swim here and float down it on rafts, etc in the summer.

Speed kills and this will put lives in danger. Letting boat owners (those in positions of privilege to own and run boats) charge up and down the river in their jetboats (day and night) is dangerous, ill-considered and damaging to the environment.

Interestingly, in Arrowtown, motorbikes were once allowed to tear up the river beds. Luckily, this is no longer the case.

This gives the needs of those who have privileges (can afford a noisy, fast, speedboat) over those of local people who live day in and day out along the river.

No doubt if it comes into play this will become commercially exploited.

Like many 'development plans' in this area, we suspect this is money talking (who is gaining here?).

At best, this is simply ill-considered, at worst, an indicator of a lack of a sustainable foresight for the area, with long-term implications for locals and our precious eco-systems.

The questions we have to ask ourselves is who will actually benefit from this change? Not the locals, not the children, not the river.

---

#7

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 8:10:20 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 8:16:38 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:17  
**IP Address:** 115.189.86.225

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lyn Williamson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This stretch of the Clutha is enjoyed by many for swimming, paddling , floating on tyres etc.  
Allowing jetboats etc to go at higher speeds would make it too dangerous for these past times.  
Albert town is a village with many young families and visitors who enjoy the quieter life.  
The change would be detrimental to one of our best public fishing stretches



#8

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 9:24:47 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 9:40:24 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:37  
**IP Address:** 122.57.119.253

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Florence Micoud

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Jet boats on the lake and river are a nuisance in terms of noise, disturbance they create for wildlife with their waves and of course in terms of safety, not to mention the pollution and the greenhouse gas emissions such an activity creates.

We often drift down with the kids and it is an enjoyable and harmless activity. In the last two years we have been surprised by these river users and once brushed against putting our safety seriously at risk.

With the current regulation these boats are already a risk and the reasonable move the council could take it to ban them. So I am more than surprised to see that they ask to go faster!

I understand they make money with their business hence their want to be free to go as fast as they want but the council must ensure the health and safety of people and nature. The lake and river are for everyone to share and protect and I respectfully ask the council to preserve that.

---

#9

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 9:45:32 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 9:50:18 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:45  
**IP Address:** 125.237.165.229

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Stephen Edward Waddington

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am opposed to one section of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017: The uplifting of the current speed restrictions on the Clutha River between the outlet and Albertown Bridge. My family float this stretch of water often in the summer on a number of different craft, as do many others. I fear that unrestricted speed on this stretch of river will greatly increase the risk of powered craft colliding with the many passive drifters.

Sincerely,  
Ed Waddington  
Albertown

---

# #10

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 10:33:52 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 10:43:04 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:11  
**IP Address:** 121.72.242.58

---

## Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

## Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

## Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Deborah Anne Richards

## Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We have hugely enjoyed swimming, floating down river and picnicking beside the river in the area to be affected by this bylaw. It would sadly spoil these activities for so many who love this area with speedboats already polluting the sound, as well as this space. It would become too dangerous for people to be safe here with the increased speed of boats. Some of our happiest memories are of a flotilla of adults and kids going down the river during summer. Please do not go ahead with a change to this bylaw.

# #11

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 12:02:47 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 12:44:31 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:41:44  
**IP Address:** 125.237.161.70

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Paul Johnson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I wish to strongly oppose the changes proposed in the Speed Uplifting section in Schedule 2 - Clutha River from Lake Wanaka downstream the Albert Town bridge that remove the 5 knot speed restriction during the day.

It directly contravenes Item 51.2.f in Part 10 Administrative Provisions which states that :

"uplifting the speed limit will not unacceptably increase the risk to navigation safety or endanger persons using the waters ..."

Given the proximity to two camp grounds, the popularity of this stretch of water for unpowered craft and swimmers, the lack of maneuverability of these craft, the blind spots and narrows that reduce the maneuverability of powered craft, and the ludicrous implication that the aforementioned families only use the river early in the morning or late in the evening, this change can only "endanger persons" - leading to injury and death.

---

# #12

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 12:32:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 12:46:58 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:27  
**IP Address:** 203.167.238.58

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Natalie Norman

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

The top of the Clutha River from the outlet to the Albert Town bridge, is heavily used by non-motorised transport and swimmers over the summer months. The current speed restrictions, work well to ensure everyone is safe and able to enjoy the natural environment.

Most river users understand the safety issues around boats and speed, so share the top section of the river really well by respecting the speed limits. The section below the Albert Town bridge is a more appropriate place to lift speed restrictions without increasing the risk of accidents or detracting from what is a unique and truly Kiwi experience of floating down the river.

I would encourage those river users wanting a high speed experience to launch their boats at the Albert Town bridge and head down stream.

---

# #13

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 12:55:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 1:15:47 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:20:41  
**IP Address:** 122.57.76.74

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sophie Ward

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am submitted in opposition to the proposed speed uplifting on the Clutha River from the Lake Wanaka Outlet to the Albert Town bridge as detailed in Schedule 2 of the Bylaw.

I strongly assert that the existing speed restrictions remain in place for this section of the river to protect the safety of recreational river users especially swimmers, kayakers and paddleboarders and to protect the amenity of this incredible natural resource for the benefit of our whole community and visitors to the area.

I have floated this river many times on a hot summer's day and consider it to be one of the best experiences our region has to offer. I have seen kayaking groups training and learning on the gentle rapids in this section of the river, paddleboarders and kayakers navigating the easy rapids enjoying the float downstream, tourists and locals jumping off the bridge into the water and campers enjoying the beautiful swimming holes and gentle current of the river. There are always fisherman casting their lines and enjoying the relative quietness of this easily accessible section of our beautiful river. All of these activities will come into conflict and have their safety compromised by the proposed increase in the speed limit.

I do not agree with the Harbourmaster's assertions that the speed restrictions should be lifted as they are hard to enforce and boats do not adhere to them. This is not a good reason to put at risk the lives and safety of those people that use the river year round.

This section of the river is easily accessible for locals with many entry points into the waterway for those on foot or carrying small non motorised craft. The safety of these users needs to be protected by increasing the levels of enforcement of the speed limit and not compromised by taking the easy option of lifting it.

I strongly urge the council to take on board the views of our community and to not proceed with lifting of the speed limit on this section of the river. There are so many other places that boats can travel at higher speeds but there are not many other stretches of the river that offer so many opportunities for non-motorised recreation.

Please protect that for the benefit of our communities.

Thank you for hearing my submission

---

# #14

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 1:41:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 1:49:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:35  
**IP Address:** 122.56.209.184

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Richard Vorstermans

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Object to lifting speed limit on Clutha River from Outlet camp ground to Albert Town Bridge.

# #15

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 3:19:45 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 3:27:30 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:44  
**IP Address:** 203.217.142.241

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

sharon beattie

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This part of the river is used by all kind of recreation water users, particularly families and young children. We and our friends and families take great pleasure in floating down the river on boogie boards and inner tubes, perhaps also in kayaks sometimes. This is a wonderful, safe and sustainable activity. It would not be with boats speeding past. In fact it would be incredibly dangerous. I don't let my children play on the road because cars are legally allowed to drive 50 km and above on them, so why would I let my family play on the river if the rules were the same? If this goes ahead, someone will be killed or badly injured.

One of the reasons given for this proposed change is that the current restrictions are difficult to enforce. By this rationale, we should also stop all restrictions on speed or dangerous behavior. This should NOT be a reason for lifting the restrictions. Rather, increase fines, put more resource into enforcement, and enlist the public to assist.

Our town is growing very quickly, with development, business and money seeming to dictate the terms more and more. Please don't let this happen to our river.

---

# #16

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 09, 2017 2:29:08 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 09, 2017 3:35:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:06:28  
**IP Address:** 202.36.47.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Marianna Brook

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I oppose the uplifting of speed restrictions for the Clutha River set out in Schedule 2 of the proposed bylaw. My young family and I frequently swim in the Clutha River, most often in the area beside Albert Town known as Anglers' Access/Fisherman's Access. As the children get older, I look forward to floating down the river with them from the Outlet to Albert Town, as I have done since I was a child.

Jet boats are sufficiently hazardous in this area that I would be reluctant to allow the children to swim/float in the area if the proposed bylaw goes ahead. We have, on occasion, experienced (sometimes commercial) jet boats speeding in the area. The wash and noise are both dangerous and unpleasant. The hours the speed limit is proposed to be lifted are exactly those hours we would want to be swimming.

If it is difficult to enforce the current restrictions, surely greater investment in enforcement is a better way forward. This could include better signage (including a phone number for members of the public to report non-compliance), more frequent patrols, and, if necessary, a complete ban on jet boats in the area during peak summer months. I hope the Council process will explore these alternatives, and agree to retain and strengthen the current speed restrictions.

---



# #17

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 10:57:17 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 11:11:10 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:53  
**IP Address:** 121.75.212.67

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Allen

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I find that this part of the Clutha river is a safe and fun section that allows many opportunities of recreational fun in the especially the spring and summer months.

I am sure you are aware of the sorts of activities that people use this part of the river for but for me personally I use it for fishing and paddle boarding. If boats are allowed to go down or up the river at any given speed I would say many lives would be at risk and if I was out on my paddle board that could be very dangerous as there are lots of hidden tree trunks and rocks under the water that I could fall off and hit if a boat came fly by at great speed.

I also think that boats have enough other spaces that allow them to go at greater speeds including the lower half of the river and other rivers in the Wanaka and Hawea area as well as the two very large lakes.

For these reasons and others I have not listed I feel that it would very detrimental to lives if the speed was changed as we already have enough boating accidents in this country.

---

# #18

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 11:19:38 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 11:28:48 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:09  
**IP Address:** 219.88.78.52

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Ann Millwater

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have had the privilege of traveling along this stretch of river with friends and family in kayaks and feel this will not longer be an option if the speed limit is increased. I understand that tourism is growing beyond any long term plans that may/may not have been put in place years ago, but there comes a point where we have to consider our local populations. Living in this area is expensive. Many people like us forego holidays because we cannot afford them. Fortunately we have an amazing choice of outdoor activities that we can do for free. Floating down the river is one example of them. Please let's be smart and considerate to all and keep speed limits low and safe.

---

# #19

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 12:02:27 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 12:06:22 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:55  
**IP Address:** 60.234.33.170

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Raewyn Calhaem

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a passive user of this stretch of the Clutha River I object to this proposal on the grounds of safety for kayakers, paddle boarders, float/swimmers, fishermen.

At the current limit boat users should have sufficient time to spot and avoid passive river users, if they do not and are exceeding the current limit then they are at fault. Increasing the speed limit reduces the opportunities for the boat user to both spot other users and taken appropriate action making this stretch of river more dangerous for everyone.

#20

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 1:08:11 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 1:10:38 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:27  
**IP Address:** 49.224.98.191

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Joel thomas hanlon

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Please up lift the 5 knt speed limit

# #21

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 2:50:11 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 2:54:15 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:04  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.33

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Linda Holland

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Having experienced floating down the river for the first time last summer with my family, I think about the experience and try to picture boats traveling at high speed past us. This makes me feel very unsafe, I would not like to be on the river with my young children. Such a beautiful spot to stop and take note of your surroundings, Please leave a speed limit in place between outlet and Albert Town bridge so everyone can enjoy the surroundings.

---

#22

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 2:42:27 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 2:56:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:25  
**IP Address:** 125.236.198.167

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Morgan Varaine

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The upper reaches of the Clutha River are a quiet heaven away from the auditory pollution that happens on the Lake Wanaka and past the Albert Town bridge. It is enjoyed by walkers, bikers, fishermen/women, families and turning the river into a highway for jetskies and jetboats would wreck the tranquility. The comments from the Harbour master are highly unhelpful, and the council should look at improving their enforcement capability instead of just putting it in the too hard basket.

---

#23

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 3:08:54 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 3:13:57 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:02  
**IP Address:** 203.100.213.92

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Naomi carleton

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

That section of river does not need the boat speed increased. There are always families, paddle boarders, kayaks etc in that part of the river and it would not be safe for them. There is plenty of other not so much used parts of the Clutha for boats to go faster in. This will be very dangerous and block of the ability for all to benefit from this section of the river.

---



#24

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:18:23 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:20:53 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:30  
**IP Address:** 122.57.105.168

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

raewyn helen paterson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Increasing the speed limit for boats on the stretch of river between the outlet motor camp and the albert town bridge will make it dangerous for non motorised recreational users of this stretch of the river

#25

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:30:18 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:42:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:17  
**IP Address:** 141.136.221.75

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anna Simmonds

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My main concerns are;

Disruption to Grebe nesting sites and other birdlife with boat wakes. Last season there were at least one pair of these very precious and rare birds nested in the willows near Deans Bank and possibly others as many more were seen along the river but nests were not located.

Other concerns are dangers for swimming and noise pollution. These concerns affect many many more residents and tourists than are involved in the business of boating in the Clutha.

Economic resources must not be considered above that of natural resources. Indeed the financial economy is entirely a subsidiary of our natural resources and should be given that weight in the equation.

---

#26

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 10:48:36 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 10:53:24 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:48  
**IP Address:** 122.57.185.95

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Carol Sawyer

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river has other users who will be adversely affected. Speed limits must stay. Along this stretch of water are children, swimmers, picnickers, fishermen, and people who just want to be peaceful by a river. Boat-owners are a minority group.

---

#27

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 6:11:10 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 6:16:17 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:06  
**IP Address:** 122.56.206.143

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Stephen Wallace

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Do not revoke the speed limit on the Clutha river between Albertown and the lake outlet. It would make this area unsafe for other river users and ruin the natural beauty.

#28

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:49:31 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:51:37 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:05  
**IP Address:** 121.75.212.253

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Chris Hadfield

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It's a stretch of river with many recreational users and the current system works well

#29

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:57:23 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:17:06 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:43  
**IP Address:** 139.130.10.106

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Doug Hall

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I use the the upper clutha river area for recreational fishing and have found that the compliance by boaties to the current speed restrictions quite acceptable On most occasions, even during the holiday periods of the year, there has been minimal impact to fishing conditions caused by boaties not adhering to the current regulations. Deans back in particular is a renowned fishing area and to have boats disturbing the area at speed would take away the very fabric of what draws anglers to this spot. Removing the speed restrictions would, in my view, not only be detrimental to those of us that use the area for fishing but also greatly increase the risk of a boat to boat or boat to person accident. The upper Clutha river has many bends around which it is difficult to see oncoming traffic and if the level of boat driving proficiency is similar that you can see on the Lakes then more signage and policing of poor driving will need to take place. There are many other users of the upper clutha river for example, kayakers, body boarders, swimmers etc. This introduces many more potential situations where a speeding boat could cause serious harm to a person. The HSWA Act 2015 details that the best level of control for risk is elimination. In my view the proposed speed change increases the risk to all other users on the upper Clutha river.

---



#30

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 2:51:24 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 2:54:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:53  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Tanja Schwindt

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Lots of people swimming, SUP paddling, riverfloating, fishing, etc along the stretch.

Too dangerous

Noise pollution

# #31

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:16:18 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:24:48 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:29  
**IP Address:** 121.75.84.45

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Doug Peddle

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers St the Doc camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks,  
Doug Peddle

---

#32

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:38:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:39:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:00:35  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.7

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jen Corish

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

---

#33

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:55:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:00:57 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:57  
**IP Address:** 101.98.36.65

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Shane Woonton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet will have a negative impact on many users, myself and my family included. We use this stretch of the river regularly for walking, kayaking and mountain biking. Its appeal lies in its natural beauty and in the peace and quiet you can experience there.

Removing the speed limit will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

The proposed changes will increase noise pollution from faster boats, this will negatively impact local residents, campers at the Albert town camp-site and the many recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Regards,

Shane Woonton

---

#34

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:58:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:00:59 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:27  
**IP Address:** 121.75.86.251

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Julie Lott

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No



**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks,  
Julie

---

#35

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:00:46 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:02:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:39  
**IP Address:** 203.118.175.55

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lee Rowley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks

---

#36

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:00:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:05:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:09  
**IP Address:** 122.57.190.221

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Fiona Waite

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a young family with 2 young children living in Albert town, so close to the river it is our daily watering hole throughout the summer. The amount of jet boats now using the clutha is making it an unsafe area for us to swim and cool off in. I walk the track daily and a few times now I have seen the jet boat zoom straight into the banks as some kind of adrenaline blast for the punters...no fun! Imagine if a family was picnicing on the shores or children were floating and swimming...they would be gone. Imagine the speed they would reach with no boundaries....makes my skin crawl to think that river is off limits for swimming and full of ego driven jet boats...where is the serenity in that?

---

#37

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:37:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:40:21 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:40  
**IP Address:** 103.233.21.234

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nick Davison

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a river user it makes sense to left the speed restriction as it will actually reduce noise by allowing boats to pass through quicker.

---

#38

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:43:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:46:12 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:41  
**IP Address:** 101.98.198.66

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kelly Graham

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

To whom it may concern,

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks,  
NAME

---

#39

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:55:46 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:56:58 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:12  
**IP Address:** 203.173.149.206

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Evelyn Vallillee

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No



**Q12** Please explain your decision

Here's text you can copy and paste and amend as you wish to make the submission easier and quicker, takes just 1 minute with this;

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks,  
Evelyn Vallillee

---

#40

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:49:38 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:57:59 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:21  
**IP Address:** 121.99.235.77

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Phil greeks

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Over the summer there are significant numbers of non powered craft and swimmers floating down the river. Removing the speed limit would increase the risk of accidents and have an adverse effect on the enjoyment of these activities.

The peace of the outlet track will also be impacted by increased speeds of boats on this stretch of water.

#41

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:33:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:38:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:26  
**IP Address:** 118.149.183.26

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lorraine Mary Knowles

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There is plenty of other rivers boats can speed down. This section of River needs to be kept available for a wider variety of users eg swimmers, fishermen, kayaker, paddle boards, divers etc) NOT fast boats. If they want to use this section they can adhere to the restricted limit already in place.

#42

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:35:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:41:01 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:06  
**IP Address:** 125.239.54.1

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Clare Mitchell

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This is a much loved recreational area for swimmers and kayakers alike, not to mention dogs. The safety of the river would be greatly compromised for everyone (boaties included). In addition, the affect of the noise produced as potentially higher numbers of boats travel at higher speeds would spoil the serenity of the area.

#43

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:12:19 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:15:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:48  
**IP Address:** 219.88.76.29

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Melanie Cusens

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

People and children's safety who are swimming in the area is more of priority than boats being able to go really fast.

---

#44

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:32:51 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:34:20 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:28  
**IP Address:** 122.56.197.156

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Renae Lee Brunton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks,  
Renaë

---

#45

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:42:48 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:46:04 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:15  
**IP Address:** 125.237.167.140

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Aimee smith

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river is used by a lot of novice users with packrafts or floatation devices. Removing speed limits will increase the amount of larger boats on this stretch of water and, I think, increase the level of danger for less experienced users.

---



#46

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 9:00:23 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 9:07:26 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:02  
**IP Address:** 210.54.153.192

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ansley Easterlin

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Removal of the speed limits in sections of the river utilized by floaters, paddlers, snorkelers is the wrong move for Wanaka and sends the wrong message. Wanaka is about the community enjoying and respecting the natural environment. To create a law (or a lack of one) that uses public land and natural resources to the benefit of corporate entities is a decidedly American attribute. I am American and am pleading with Wanaka: please do not take this step towards being America.

---

#47

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 10:30:54 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 10:34:52 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:57  
**IP Address:** 210.54.153.173

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian Gosling

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Whilst there may be some positive changes theres is some serious safety implications. There is already a large number of boats paying little care to other lake or river users, removal of any speed limits is just insanity, and a liability on any council that may approve it.

#48

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 11:20:11 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 11:24:51 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:39  
**IP Address:** 121.75.85.157

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Thomas Schattovits

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The speed uplift on the Clutha River between the outlet and Albert Town will make it a lot less safe and enjoyable for recreational non-motorized users to enjoy the river. This has been a favourite pastime of many locals and visitors alike, low environmental impact, low cost but great fun, also good to teach children river safety practices.

This is the last stretch of Clutha River that doesn't have the uplift and it should be kept that way.

For motorized users this is a short stretch to navigate and a small inconvenience towards a big gain in community enjoyment.

#49

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 3:34:41 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 3:43:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:44  
**IP Address:** 203.173.149.200

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

lucy robins

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am slightly confused by the guidelines referring to 'uplifting' the speed limit on the Clutha River between the Outlet and Albert Town, but I wish to state that I believe that it should be kept at 5 knots for the safety of all river users, and for the serenity of those who live nearby the river.

I do not believe the raising the speed limit would be safe for those who chose to swim, float, paddle or fish along this stretch of the river OR either jet boat users. As a resident of this area I can also confirm that jet boat noise is a pollutant for our otherwise peaceful river. Aside from tourist boats/rescue boats I question whether any Jet boats should be using this stretch at all. Please keep this river safe for everyone that chooses to enjoy it.

#50

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 4:50:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 4:55:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:22  
**IP Address:** 125.236.198.167

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Linda Jane Montgomery

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Lifting the Speed Boat restrictions would endanger existing river users. There quite a lot of recreational users of this area of the river, from people swimming in the river to people on paddleboards and kayaks. We have frequently used this part of the river - from the outlet to the Albert Town bridge to float down. Allowing an increase in speed boat limits would jeopardise the safety of existing users.

---

#51

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 4:55:34 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:15:16 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:41  
**IP Address:** 118.93.142.53

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Mount Aspiring College

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

David Cassaidy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am the HOD of Outdoor Education at Mount Aspiring College, a position I have held since 2002. We have 8 senior Outdoor Education classes, a weekend Outdoor programme for the school hostel, as well as junior camps, all of which will use the section of the Clutha River from the Outlet to Albert Town. The river section in question is one of our most often used waterways. We use the venue for teaching kayaking, rafting, canoeing and paddleboarding. It is a perfect venue with its combination of gentle flow and long calm reaches, enabling us to manage large groups of students in relative safety. The section currently bounded by the 5 knot speed restriction is very good for teaching. Downstream of that section the flow increases and there are fewer eddies so group management for teaching skills is less viable. But that stretch through to where we typically exit the river (at the Hikuwai reserve) is also long and straight, so it is easy to see and hear approaching powered boats.

A concern with uplifting the 5 knot limit during the proposed hours is that it will diminish safety, especially at the first right hand bend in the river which is where we often have groups practising. Even though the river is wide, the bend of the river will reduce visibility of approaching boats. If they are travelling at speed it makes it dangerous.

We would petition that this part of the Clutha remain subject to the speed restrictions. There is more than enough river downstream for speedboats to use without restriction.

---

#52

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:17:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:31:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:38  
**IP Address:** 118.93.142.53

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

David Cassaidy

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No



**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have lived in Wanaka since 2002. During that time I have raised 2 children, and as a family we have spent many hours recreating on the Clutha River, especially the section from the Outlet to Albert Town. As residents of Albert Town the Clutha is part of our backyard and a very special place to all of us.

We use that stretch of river for kayaking, canoeing, rafting, paddleboarding, drift diving, swimming, and boogieboard float trips. I have been comfortable taking my children down that part of the river since they were only a few months old, mostly because the river is not only extremely beautiful, but it is also relatively benign and safe. I see uplifting of the speed restrictions on that part of the river to be a threat to the recreational values of young families like my own. It will make on-water activities more dangerous. And if the uplifting facilitated an increase in high speed powered boat traffic on that reach then it will further reinforce the negative aspects that come with powered boat use (speed hazards, wake damage/disruption, noise pollution).

The Clutha is a very special river, and especially special in the stretch currently bound by the 5 knot speed restriction. For the sake of all the future generations of young residents and visitors to Wanaka, there must not be any uplifting of the current speed limits.

---

#53

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:46:17 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 5:51:39 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:22  
**IP Address:** 109.79.19.114

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rory Sweetman

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like the speed restriction to remain unchanged. In the summer I sometimes go on a river drift with my family, around 7 individuals (including 4 children) and the prospect of fast boats appals me. Given the recent tragic death at St Bathans I feel that no such change should be made, in the interest of public safety.

---

#54

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:19:50 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:23:14 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:23  
**IP Address:** 182.16.170.58

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rebecca McGoun

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It would be such a shame to not be able to float down the river, we have been doing it since we were kids and such an amazing thing for our children to do. The only place they can do this safely! Please don't remove speed limits!!!

---

#55

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 7:32:57 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 7:37:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:10  
**IP Address:** 203.100.212.1

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Shannon van walt

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Cause we float down there all the time with the kids and it's scary enough. We sometimes go in big groups and by myself which is harder to see . Boats go down fast enough ! And get right in close and it has made us flip many a times .

---

#56

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:21:56 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:27:02 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:06  
**IP Address:** 121.73.12.144

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Iris Ursula Abaecherli

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Keep the 5 knot speed.

As a fisher woman and paddle boarder and a walker enjoying the stretch along the outlet I absolutely 100% oppose faster boats, jet skis etc

Keep it as it is!!

#57

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:48:36 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:55:26 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:49  
**IP Address:** 118.148.90.150

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Murray Jones

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river is being increasingly populated by noisy jet boats and jetskis. They are a risk to non-powered craft and to swimmers, create a lot of wash, and the noise is at odds with the peaceful nature of the area.

I support the river being powered-craft free from the Outlet to the last house in the Albert Town section of the river.

#58

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:52:45 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:06:30 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:45  
**IP Address:** 49.224.76.56

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Degerholm

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am most concerned about the noise and the dangers to other river users including swimmers and kayakers of jet boats being operated at high speed.

#59

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:00:37 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:07:28 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:50  
**IP Address:** 203.109.234.100

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Mark Winter

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My children swim regularly in the Clutha River (in Summer) in many places between the end of the Outlet Track (Albert Town end) and the Albert Town bridge. And fast jet boats are frightening and dangerous for them (and others).

Also, I'm concerned about erosion of the banks on both sides of the Clutha river between the Outlet and Albert Town bridge.



#60

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:49:57 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:10:59 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:21:01  
**IP Address:** 49.224.104.32

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

David Purton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The noise made by powerful jet boat engines will be disruptive.  
Safety for swimmers and canoeists will be compromised.  
Erosion of fragile banks will be likely.  
Birds will be threatened and distressed.

That stretch of river bank is used by very many walkers and cyclists because of the tranquility of the river.

---

#61

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:03:18 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:11:23 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:04  
**IP Address:** 122.57.28.45

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian Hall

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It seems clear that the Council wishes to place the interests of commercial jet boat operators ahead of the interest of local residents, and recreational users of the river. The river should be maintained as a primarily recreational river for casual boating, rafting, fishing, and swimming. There is also a local rite of passage for youngsters to jump, safely, into the river from the Albert Town bridge and this pleasurable activity will be endangered by the proposed change. The commercial Go Jets operation from the Albert Town bridge is already causing significant and unwelcome disruption to the tranquility of the area, and any extension of such operations will be completely unwelcome. The proposed change is neither needed nor desired, and will be strongly opposed by many local residents who value the environment and the peace and relative tranquility of the area.

---

#62

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:11:58 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:13:18 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:19  
**IP Address:** 69.181.197.157

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Josiah Roe

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I'm a tourist who has visited the pristine and serene Clutha for years and jetbook access is loud, noisy, and there's too damn much of it.

#63

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:10:37 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:18:22 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:44  
**IP Address:** 125.239.131.188

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lindsey Turner

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The stretch of river from the Outlet to Albert Town bridge is used regularly for kayaking and families who take boards and flotation items and float down the river.

Removing the speed limit is very dangerous and should not happen. The idea that it is getting removed because it can't be enforced is ridiculous.

Having no speed limit opens the area up to jet boats and jet skis and is likely to end up in someone being killed.

It sounds like this is another way for the council to make money. 1 by not having to monitor the area and 2 by letting commercial operators into the area. This is a family friendly part of the river. If anything all motorised craft should be banned from this stretch of the river if not abiding by the speed limits.

---

#64

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:06:06 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:22:13 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:16:06  
**IP Address:** 131.203.103.107

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Susan Marion Grant

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe the Clutha river should be enjoyed by all residents. By increasing the speed and activity this will affect locals and others passively enjoying the river, for snorkeling, rafting, kayaking, swimming and tubing and fishing. Jet Boats should be allowed to enter the river below the Albert town bridge and be restricted to 5 knots down to the Red bridge at Luggate.

#65

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:14:33 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:24:05 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:31  
**IP Address:** 122.57.191.12

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Heather Thorne

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I use the walking tracks from the lake outlet to the Alberrtown bridge almost on a daily basis. It is usually a tranquil respite from the increasingly busy Wanaka scene. Our family regularly swim in the river in summer and this includes our small grandchildren. We also fish in the river in the fishing season and have considered even camping down by the river in our caravan just for fun. At present the only intrusion on the quietness of the area is jet boats. At times I would suggest the speed limit is already exceeded by some boats and an increase in the legal speed limit would ruin what is a special place. There are plenty of other rivers and the lake where boat users can go faster but to allow a speed increase would take away from the enjoyment of the passive users of this area. We can often hear boats hooning up the river from our home and our property is quite some way from the river.

---

#66

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:01:40 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:24:26 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:22:46  
**IP Address:** 50.203.107.132

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

William Richards

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No



**Q12** Please explain your decision

I object to the proposed Schedule 2 uplift of the speed limit on the Clutha River between the Outlet Camp Ground and Albert Town between 10am and 4pm (Winter) and 10am and 6pm (Summer).

Section 35.1 of the proposed Bylaw provides for the current 5 knot speed limit on this section of the Clutha but Schedule 2 proposes to "uplift" this limit during the day. Given the definition of "uplift" this would mean no effective speed limit on this section of river during the day. The purpose of the 5 knot speed limit is not just noise abatement. There are many who enjoy this section of river be they people using the outlet track, fishermen (such as myself) who enjoy the fly fishing section of Dean's Bank (at night and during the day) or swimmers and inexperienced kayakers who frequent this stretch of water. In addition people often picnic beside the river off the Outlet Track and paddle / swim in some of the slack water areas.

As someone who regularly wades in this part of the river to fish, jet boats cause significant wash even at 5 knots. To have them using this part of the river at full speed would make any other water use hazardous.

It would be trite to say that a jet boat driver who observes the proper protocols would slow down whilst passing other river users. Jet boats travel at such a speed that even if they were fully concentrating, they would be on a fisherman or swimmer before they had time to properly react. This is exacerbated where there are trees or bends which obscure the site lines for such boats. Swimmers would be especially vulnerable given that they are not easy to spot in choppy water at the best of times.

The area needs a section of the river where people and families can enjoy the river in relative safety.

I am therefore totally opposed to the proposed uplift on the Clutha and am surprised that the Harbourmaster (who I know to be very safety conscious in general) would countenance such an amendment.

I would add that the comparison chart between the old and proposed bylaws stating that there is no major change to the speed limits is stunningly, if not negligently, misleading.

---

#67

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:05:11 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:08:49 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:37  
**IP Address:** 49.224.102.176

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Cousins

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My children regularly use this stretch of the river to paddle, float and play in.

The upper stretch should be a serene bit of natural river. Not like the stretch over. Where natural splendour is broken by the sounds of large engine boats.

Don't get rid of the speed limit.

#68

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:08:59 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:12:01 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:01  
**IP Address:** 49.224.103.157

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Janine Joseph

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Because of the danger to swimmers and noise pollution

#69

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:08:34 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:26:17 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:17:43  
**IP Address:** 96.44.145.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Simon John Buchler Darby

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The current 5 knot speed restriction allows for peaceful, quiet enjoyment of a unique track that runs by the river through mainly native forest.

Currently many commercial and recreational jet boat users launch from the Albert Town bridge ramp and operate downstream from there, which is appropriate for jet boat use as it not a populated area and rarely used by swimmers and anglers. If the speed restrictions are lifted recreational and possibly commercial jet boaters are far more likely to launch from the Outlet Camp boat ramp which will increase jet boat traffic on the currently peaceful stretch of the Clutha.

There also seems to be no evidence to support the claim that jet boats travelling at speed do less damage than those idling through the current 5 knot zone. If they are doing any damage, should they be allowed on the river at all?

Also the section of the Clutha is well used by kayakers, paddleboarders, and people tubing as it is a relatively benign section and perfect for learning river paddling. Running jet boats at full speed could present a danger to those users and diminish the peaceful experience.

The navigation change seems to be at the behest of commercial operators who will gain financially from use of a well used and enjoyed public resource.

---

#70

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:52:15 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:35:16 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:43:00  
**IP Address:** 101.53.220.167

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Julian Pettit

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think unrestricted use of the river between the outlet and the Albert Town bridge would lead to increased noise levels for Albert Town residents and cause safety issues for children who float and swim in this section.

#71

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:52:55 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:00:06 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:11  
**IP Address:** 125.168.44.25

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Deborah Kolb

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly oppose removing the speed restriction between the Clutha outlet and the Albert Town bridge. I enjoy that stretch of river on a daily basis, walking and also floating, swimming, kayaking, SUP and snorkeling.

Removing the speed limit sounds extremely dangerous. If council goes ahead with this, it will greatly increase the danger of using the river for the many of us who use methods of enjoying the river, other than power boating.

And then there is the noise issue. I can hear power boats speeding when that stretch of the river was open for higher speeds for an event and it's NOISY and my home is well away from the river.

Keep that stretch of the river maximum 5 knots all the way to the last house on the river in Albert Town, which is down stream of the Albert Town bridge.

---



#72

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 1:39:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:12:55 AM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 121.75.214.240

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Larry Nathan Weathington

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Given the increased amount of boat traffic, specifically the commercial jet boats, the Upper Clutha is already an accident waiting to happen. There have already been many near misses, and this new 'safety' bylaw is going to get someone killed eventually. As is, passive users of the Clutha are being run off the river. It is no longer safe or enjoyable to float the river in a non-motorized craft or even relax in the swimming hole. My kids have been swamped numerous times by jet boats. The noise and traffic is ruining one of the best spots in NZ and as a fishermen I now avoid the river. There are hundreds of kilometres of the Clutha that people can jet boat on, I'd like to see the Clutha be 100% motor free, year around from Albert Town to the Outlet.

---

#73

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:15:51 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:22:51 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:00  
**IP Address:** 115.189.103.211

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

b c foster

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

noise from jet boats now is totally undesirable and there doesnt seem to be any regulations over noise on jet boats.  
the swimming area is a popular spot during summer and this proposal will put bathers and river users at risk.  
also this is a world renowned fly fishing area day and evening. lets not spoil it for the sake of a greedy few

#74

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:44:36 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:53:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:32  
**IP Address:** 122.56.235.199

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Thomas Martin Fisher

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Already, the powered boat traffic on this stretch of the Clutha river is noisy and intrusive and sometimes downright dangerous. This stretch of river is a peaceful haven for walkers, bikers and kayakers. Power boat enthusiasts have the whole lake to work off their speed manias.

---

#75

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:51:43 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:55:19 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:35  
**IP Address:** 49.224.105.209

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Joanna williamson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This is a quiet, safe place for people to fish and young people to enjoy floating down the river on rings/boards. Speed boats will destroy it.

#76

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:49:38 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:56:06 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:27  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.166

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bridget Frances Spain

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Living on the river at Albertain you observe a lot... this area has many locals and visitors who walk swim float kayak canoe raft down this stretch it is very dangerous with motor boats / jet skis, they do not adhere to the speed bouys... children play along the river! The noise level is outrageous. People who live along this area can't hear their own conversation... please leave this area free for wildlife / people to enjoy.... don't destroy the last remaining kiwi lifestyle by people just out to make money and have no respect for nature!!

---

#77

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:04:29 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:06:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:48  
**IP Address:** 122.57.214.68

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nicola McDonald

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Unrestricted speeds on this section of the Clutha River could cause danger to people who use the river for swimming and other non boat activities.

#78

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:27:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:39:40 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:56  
**IP Address:** 121.75.213.55

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Patricia Wrigley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river is used by swimmers, kayakers, paddle boarders and fisher people. It's a tradition to float down the river during summer to beat the heat and the swimming area by the windmill is a well known swimming spot. The area should be a powered-craft free zone.

The population of Albert Town is growing, and the demographics shows a large number of children in the area. The upper Clutha is one of the few rivers clean enough to swim in. Please restrict the use by powered boats.

I've seen many close calls with powered boats coming close to swimmers, snorkelers and paddlers. They are often not doing the speed limit. I feel the risk to swimmers is too great with powered boats in this area.

I propose the bylaw be changed to restrict all powered-craft from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge. Five knot limit from the Albert Town Bridge to the last downstream residence of Albert Town.

---



#79

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:14:22 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:53:01 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:38:39  
**IP Address:** 203.173.149.46

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Vickie moses

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

An 'unrestricted speed limit' seems to be a contradiction in terms and hence makes little sense as a notion to begin with. Having an unrestricted speed limit would appear to be extremely unsafe. So much so that I was not aware that such a concept could even be legal on a relatively small public river used for recreational purposes. In my mind such a bylaw would open up a higher risk of future litigation. Unless I am misunderstanding something, the risk of the following scenario occurring would increase as a result of the introduction of an unrestricted speed limit. Your child is swimming in a public river and a speedboat travelling at an 'unlimited speed' hits the child. I must be missing something because the bylaw has gotten this far and it does not make sense to me at all as a law that would in any way be of benefit to a vast majority of the people living in Wanaka.

#80

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:24:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 1:07:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:42:46  
**IP Address:** 210.54.153.192

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Matt Constantine

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not agree with the proposed changes for the Clutha river between the outlet and Albert Town bridge.

The river is a peaceful place for anglers, swimmers and other river users, the planned changes will ruin this.

As a river user myself I believe that any increase to the speed of vessels would be a disaster waiting to happen. I feel like the speed limit already in place needs to be policed more to reduce the risk of injury.

Please keep the river in the best interests of the public and not the businesses who use it. The public were here long before the businesses and will be here long after. The public give back to the river by taking care of it. I would like to see the businesses do the same.

---

# #81

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 1:42:37 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 1:45:19 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:42  
**IP Address:** 49.224.106.161

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Morgan weathington

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The speed limit should not be lifted. In fact I would like to see the river from the outlet to the bridge motor free. My kids routinely get water thrown on them when they are fishing from the jet boats, and private jet boats regularly scream through the swimming hole - someone is going to get killed

---

#82

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 1:11:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 1:59:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:48:46  
**IP Address:** 122.57.232.140

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Pioneer Rafting

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **No**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The peaceful recreational (non-motorised) use of the Clutha Matau River corridor is significant and should be fairly accommodated. Trail users, fishermen, kayakers, rafters, paddleboarders etc. do not obviously disturb the natural values of the river environment. However, just ONE motor on the river can disturb all of the peaceful users, and this already happens often. Why should one type of user be given the right to disturb all the peaceful users on any part of the river? Is that fair? As a rafter, river conservator and advocate (since 1981), I regularly raft the river, sharing it with people who specifically come to enjoy the natural, non-motorised, river environment. We are increasingly experiencing jet-boat and jet-ski noise, sometimes enduring two passes as they go downriver and return upstream. Private jet-boaters seldom comply with the existing rules. I have seen private jet-boats pass at high speed dangerously close to swimmers and other passive users, and have been deliberately "sprayed" by them many times. They seem to think that this is a great joke, and they are sometimes holding cans of beer. Commercial jet-boaters are more responsible, but they can also approach at speed especially if they do not see a passive user until the last few moments, and their noise is no less disturbing. Any relaxation of the regulations pertaining to jet-boats would be unfair on peaceful users, and potentially highly dangerous. Therefore, to be fair, and for safety reasons, we support the status quo.

---

#83

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 2:27:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 2:37:55 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:10:15  
**IP Address:** 171.6.242.148

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John Cornelius Oorschot

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Our family, friends and all our visitors to Wanaka swim in the Clutha.  
It would become very dangerous and unsafe. How long would it be before someone maybe a child was killed !!!!  
Our quite and beautiful waterways would become a noisy heavily polluted dangerous place to go to.  
Think about the enviroment and the future consequences that this will cause.

#84

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:11:15 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:13:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:27  
**IP Address:** 203.86.207.224

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rachel Sarah Bell

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Because it is causing a huge disruption to the environment particularly destroying the river bed and the pollution the boats cause going up and down the Clutha.

---



#85

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:06:36 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:20:10 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:34  
**IP Address:** 202.49.0.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Emma Bilous

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The section of the river between the outlet and Albertain bridge is popular for swimmers, fishers, paddle boarders, kayakers and float rafters. Lifting the speed restrictions for the times proposed will increase danger and decrease the ability of other users to enjoy the amenity. I am most concerned with the increased safety risk posed to non motorized users of the river as well as the noise pollution the increased speeds will cause. I do not believe it can be justified to impose a bylaw that supports one user group at the expense of all other users.

---

#86

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 4:04:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 4:06:38 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:46  
**IP Address:** 101.53.220.167

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Chrissi Pettit

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Unrestricted speed limit is NONSENSE!!!!

#87

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 3:37:15 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 4:54:54 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:17:38  
**IP Address:** 203.118.174.110

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

paul van der Kaag

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I agree that the bylaws need updating and in doing so I feel that they should be inline with Maritime New Zealand rules and some changes and additions need to be made.

Lifejacket is no longer used in rule 91 but is replaced with Personal Flotation Device. Here is their definition that I believe we should be using:

personal flotation device means any serviceable buoyancy aid that is designed to be worn on the body and that is certified by a recognised authority as meeting—

(a) type 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, or 408 in NZ Standard 5823:1989 or NZ Standard 5823:2001 or type 401, 402, 403, 404, 405 or 406 in NZ Standard 5823:2005; or

(b) a national or international standard that the Director is satisfied substantially complies with types 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, or 408 of the NZ Standard 5823:1989 or NZ Standard 5823:2001 or type 401, 402, 403, 404, 405 or 406 in NZ Standard 5823:2005:

Inflatable PFDs are perfectly acceptable and belt pack style of PFD is the most practical option for stand up paddlboarding however not all beltpack PFDs are certified for use in New Zealand and some of those that do meet the required standards cannot be recommended for use on paddleboards due to the way they have been designed. The following devices meet with Maritime New Zealand approval and have been tested and approved by NZSUP:

MTI Fluid 2

Safety at Sea

Lalizas Delta

Palm Glide

Leashes, appropriate leashes should be worn at all times as the paddler cannot be separated from their board. There is a "leashes save lives" campaign that has been taken up by many brands overseas and the Human Powered Watercraft Association in the USA have a poster campaign advocating the of leashes as the #1 safety item in Paddleboarding.

I also understand that Hot Works and the carrying of Hazardous Substances are also covered in Safety Guidelines/Specific Identified Hazards in Maritime New Zealand commercial safety management systems 3.5 Hazardous Substances and 5.6 Hot Work and I see no reason to duplicate them in our bylaws.

---

#88

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, September 30, 2017 10:26:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 5:18:04 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 122.57.215.246

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rod Macleod

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

QLDC Submission: Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

1. Reference Paragraph 51. The maximum speed for power boats on the Clutha River from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge is 5 knots. The draft bylaw proposes the speed limit be uplifted through much of the daylight hours every day.
  2. The media have quoted the Harbourmaster 'proposing the uplifting because he is unable to enforce the present 5 knot limit.'
  3. I am not aware of any third party submissions being tabled in favour of this proposal.
  4. The objective of a navigation safety bylaw is the ongoing evolution of rules and education around public safety on our waterways. The proposal appears counter-productive. Speed has contributed to many incidents and accidents on our waterways.
  5. The Outlet to Albert Town reach of the Clutha River was originally popular with holiday makers for swimming and fishing (being a fly fishing mecca).
  6. Kayaking, rafting, tubing and paddle boarding have all followed those activities when road access improved. Swimmers now enter the water at a number of locations along this reach.
  7. All the above activities are enjoyed by increasing numbers, drawn by the relative quiet and safety of this reach. (Outboard power boats wisely avoid this reach because of the rapids).
  8. The above reach now has a continuous walking and cycling track along its true right bank, with the original stiles and steep gradients removed. The track is popular with those locals and visitors happy to enjoy the relative quiet and the ever changing scenery.
  9. Power boat noise. The proposed bylaw does not specify QLDC's power boat noise limits nor the need for owners to display an acoustic certificate of fitness. Reference should be made in the bylaw to Section 4.6. and Appendix 2 of the District Plan. Noise rules should be better enforced along all of our waterways. Power boat noise will become a significant issue along this river reach as its popularity grows, particularly should the 5 knot be uplifted.
  10. I propose, in the interests of public safety and of all who appreciate the relative quiet and beauty of this river reach, that all power boats be excluded at all times from navigating the Clutha River between the Lake Wanaka Outlet and the Albert Town Bridge. (Specific power boat events could be approved subject to permit).
  11. In the event QLDC will not apply this navigation safety rule I propose the pre-existing bylaw remains (viz. the 5 knot rule).
- Rod Macleod, Albert Town, October 2017
-

#89

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 12:26:11 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 6:46:05 PM  
**Time Spent:** 06:19:53  
**IP Address:** 49.224.108.167

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Susan Jones

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We live by the river and love the quiet. The boats and jet skis are noisy and dangerous.

#90

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 6:45:22 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 6:52:53 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:31  
**IP Address:** 49.224.109.26

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sambo stewart

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think the safety and environmental benefits out way the current law. It will be safer less noise less wake less erosion and easier as a community member I fully support the new bylaw.

---



#91

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:23:45 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:45:35 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:21:49  
**IP Address:** 203.184.20.168

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jim McQuillan

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

1. The inability to police a bylaw is not a justification for its removal which would exacerbate the problem and reward bad behaviour. Modern methods of traffic monitoring and control could be used to identify errant boaties which would change their behaviour.
  2. We have seen the degradation of this section of the river by didymo. Now an additional form of degradation over which we have control is now being proposed. This beautiful tranquil section of the river should be free of noisy power boat behaviour which conflicts with quieter activities such as walking, cycling and fishing.
  3. There are ample boating opportunities below the Albert Town Bridge and in most of Lake Wanaka. If commercial power boat forms wish to operate down the Clutha River they should work from below the Albert Town bridge.
-

#92

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:48:14 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:58:16 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:10:01  
**IP Address:** 49.224.104.196

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Neal Kaler

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The outlet and deans bank area is too heavily used by swimmers, fisherman, kids etc to increase the speed limit. There should be no motorboats in the area above the Albert town bridge.

---

#93

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:53:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 9:03:34 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:42  
**IP Address:** 115.189.101.112

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Alix Wilson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The current 2014 bylaw is sufficient for all users to enjoy their chosen recreational activity safely around one another. De-restricting the speed will have a negative impact on some groups which seems needlessly unfair. Particularly when there is a large distance downstream of Albert town that is already unrestricted.

#94

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:09:41 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 10:23:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:26  
**IP Address:** 49.224.31.70

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Simon Stewart

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a commercial operator i witnessed a large proportion of the private boating fraternity failing to recognize the present five knot speed restriction. Many of these boaties were abusive when reminded that a restriction was in force. It is a fact that a jet boat traveling at low speed puts up a bigger wake than those traveling at higher speeds. Many fishermen have said that they would rather have boats pass them quicker rather than take two or three minutes to pass, resulting in a less invasive passage.

#95

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:26:08 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 13, 2017 11:29:38 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:29  
**IP Address:** 121.75.85.244

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Scott Matthew Downham

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I don't agree with lifting speed restrictions  
On Clutha river between wanaka and Albert town bridge

#96

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 12:28:09 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 12:34:20 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:10  
**IP Address:** 202.180.72.61

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Graham Walmsley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Many people use the river around the albertown area for swimming and recreation. It's not unusual to see people in wet suits or inflatable dinghy floating past.

It is already alarming the speed at which some jet boat owners are driving there boats through that stretch of water, waves from the boats create a real risk to any children at the waters edge and there is a high probability that there will be a serious casualty.

In addition there is the noise factor in a residential area from the jet boats.

#97

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 6:38:47 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 6:43:45 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:57  
**IP Address:** 203.173.142.135

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sandra McTavish

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The safety of all users of the river should be considered. The best way for that is a speed limit for jet boats. Especially when the river is getting busier as it has been.

---

#98

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 6:42:28 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 6:51:28 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:00  
**IP Address:** 199.168.151.36

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Deborah Ann Richards

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

I object to the proposed Schedule 2 uplift of the speed limit on the Clutha River between the Outlet Camp Ground and Albert Town between 10am and 4pm (Winter) and 10am and 6pm (Summer).

Section 35.1 of the proposed Bylaw provides for the current 5 knot speed limit on this section of the Clutha but Schedule 2 proposes to "uplift" this limit during the day. Given the definition of "uplift", this would mean no effective speed limit on this section of river during the day. The purpose of the 5 knot speed limit is not just noise abatement. There are many who enjoy this section of river be they people using the outlet track, fishermen (such as myself) who enjoy the fly fishing section of Dean's Bank (at night and during the day) or swimmers and inexperienced kayakers who frequent this stretch of water. In addition people often picnic beside the river off the Outlet Track and paddle / swim in some of the slack water areas.

As someone who regularly wades in this part of the river to fish, jet boats cause significant wash even at 5 knots. To have them using this part of the river at full speed would make any other water use hazardous. I have on several occasions had the wake of passing boats cause me to stumble while fly fishing at Deans Bank.

It would be trite to say that a jet boat driver who observes the proper protocols would slow down whilst passing other river users. Jet boats travel at such a speed that even if they were fully concentrating, they would be on a fisherman or swimmer before they had time to properly react. This is exacerbated where there are trees or bends which obscure the site lines for such boats. Swimmers would be especially vulnerable given that they are not easy to spot in choppy water at the best of times.

To say uplifting is needed because the current rules are unenforable is ridiculous. Should we do away with all safety regulations if they can not be continually monitored?

The area needs a section of the river where people and families can enjoy the river in relative safety.

I am therefore totally opposed to the proposed uplift on the Clutha and am surprised that the Harbourmaster (who I know to be very safety conscious in general) would countenance such an amendment.

I would add that the comparison chart between the old and proposed bylaws stating that there is no major change to the speed limits is stunningly, if not negligently, misleading.

---

#99

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 6:57:05 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 7:20:41 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:23:36  
**IP Address:** 101.98.48.215

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Andrew Nicholson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river between the outlet and the Albert town bridge should have a powerboat restriction of 5 knots only at All times there would be too many safety issues with swimmers , kayakers and also for fishermen.

Apart from safety aspect the noise level of power boats racing full throttle up and down the river disturbs the peace and tranquility much sought after by the residents and visitors to Wanaka and Albert town.

Also the erosion damaged caused by jet boats wakes on the river banks needs to be taken into consideration.

PS they can not really be called safety regulations if they make the situation more dangerous for other river users.

#100

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 7:43:27 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 7:44:44 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:17  
**IP Address:** 23.30.186.33

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

eric morgan

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

regular tourist who sees too much boat traffic on clutha. there are many other places to do this.

---

# #101

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 10:35:18 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 11:07:32 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:32:14  
**IP Address:** 101.98.205.20

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Catherine Rezaei

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am particularly concerned about the removal of speed-limits for boats on the Clutha River where people swim or enjoy other slower water sports (kayaking or paddle boarding etc). I am fortunate enough to live alongside the river, just a little downstream from the Albert Town bridge and I already have concern about the increased jet boat traffic in that area. I have owned this land since 2002 and have watched the amount of boat traffic grow rapidly, especially over the previous 3 or 4 years.

Most boat owners are generally pretty responsible, but I have witnessed too many reckless boats and alarming near misses with swimmers. I have myself had a near miss with a speeding jet boat while I was swimming in the river last summer. The boat in question was doing one last glory burst of speed before finishing boating for the day. Unfortunately there is already a lot of that going on, and removing the speed limit would just encourage more of that behaviour.

Lots of people swim in this area and having no speed limits on the water seems very dangerous to a point of insanity. The Albert Town bridge is right next to a very popular camp ground which brings a lot of people to this area for swimming (as well as jumping of the Albert Town bridge). The Albert Town bridge area is also a popular area for summer time for locals and tourists alike. I see many people swimming or fishing and they should be entitled to continue to enjoy this kiwi experience without fear of speeding boats.

Albert Town has become a very popular developed residential area and I believed that all residents should be allowed to enjoy the benefits of the proximity of the Clutha river without fear of safety. There are plenty of places further downstream that would be much safer for faster speed in boats. But a limit to speed in a populated holiday and residential area is common sense.

I understand that at times policing the speeds of boats is not easy, but the majority of people will follow rules and be considerate if they are aware of them. We should not be removing the speed rules just because they are difficult to police and a minority of boaters ignore the speed restrictions.

---

# #102

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 12:00:42 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 12:05:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:54  
**IP Address:** 121.75.81.206

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bex Thornton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I treasure the peace and tranquility of the clutha river. I am also a frequent unpowered user of the river. I feel this would considerably add to noise and pollution of the clutha. I live here, my kids will swim in the river I don't want them to be at risk when they are using the river at any time. Why remove a rule because no ones abiding by it?

#103

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 7:45:35 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 2:01:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 06:16:01  
**IP Address:** 63.153.78.211

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Zack Black

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I don't want jet boats disrupting my recreational activities.

---

# #104

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 3:15:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 3:30:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:13  
**IP Address:** 110.92.19.73

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jan Caunter

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---



**Q12** Please explain your decision

This section of the river is highly valued and recognised for its peace and tranquility. I enjoy walking down the river tracks every day, and sitting on the river banks to enjoy quiet solitude. My family swims in the river near the Albert Town bridge, in the area known as "the island". This is a popular swimming spot for locals and their dogs. So too are other areas near The Outlet. Removal of the speed limit will make swimming in the river dangerous, and will remove the peace and quiet enjoyed by so many local members of the community at the present time.

From my house in Hardie Place, I can hear the noise of boats on the river even though the speed limits in place now. Removing that speed limit will simply increase the noise levels. The noise is intrusive, and will be more so for members of the community living closer to the river, such as those living at Deansbank.

Many boat users on the river, particularly in summer, are from out of town. Given behaviours I have observed by such users to date, I do not expect those river users to pay much attention to the noise they are creating for other members of the community, or the danger they are creating for other river users as they move up and down the river without control. All of us in the community are entitled to enjoy peace and quiet and the special naturalness of this part of the river corridor, at all times of the year. The community cannot lose the special qualities that attracted so many of us to this beautiful place.

I do not accept that the Council's problem with enforcement of the speed limit (if this is correct) is resolved by taking the speed limit away. That is akin to the Police removing speed controls on our roads because some drivers continue to disobey the road rules and cause accidents. It is a lazy response.

---

# #105

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 7:02:17 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 8:53:20 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:51:03  
**IP Address:** 121.75.84.85

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Neil Sloan

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are too many other users of the river. The minority of users, Jet boaters, have not always been careful or considerate of others. No numbers or ID on boats do not allow reporting of these offenders.

Kayakers can not out manoeuvre fast moving craft and are vulnerable to the violent wake from passing boats.

Swimmers are particularly vulnerable as they can be well nigh invisible. I don't think it is fair that those not in jet boats need to be on constant alert for the next boat coming up or down river at high speed. It is frightening to hear a jet boat approaching from behind or wondering whether you have been seen or what the actions of the driver are likely to be even at present.

All manner of river craft filled with families and young folk float down this section of river in surprisingly large numbers during the summer months. Jet boats moving at speed cannot mix safely with this crowd.

Jet boats have a massive foot print of noise and drivers are absolutely oblivious to the fact that their recreational fun impacts heavily on those not on board the craft. Other users, the majority of recreationalists of the area, are there because of the fact that is scenic and a quiet place to recreate. Walkers and picnickers are not there to thrill to the sight and sound of a jet boat racing on the river. They wish to enjoy the natural surrounds, the flow of the river, the changing colours of the riverside trees and the bird life.

As tourism numbers increase, inevitably the commercial jet boat operators using the river will feel compelled, as usual, to "cater to the demand" and the traffic will increase. Eliminating the speed restriction zones will lead to a great deterioration of the peace and enjoyment expected by those involved in quiet recreations or living near the river.

The fishers who enjoy one of the special fisheries on the Clutha River will also be subjected to an increased disturbance of the fish and the considerable swash resulting from the passing of the boats' hulls.

Birds such as the various ducks and shags will possibly be pushed out of their roosting and feeding homes.

I believe that instead of lifting the speed restrictions, that in the interests of public safety and enjoyment, the section of river from the lake outlet down to the Hawea River confluence should have a blanket 5 knot restriction imposed. There will be less jet boat traffic on the river and the river will be a safer and more pleasant place to be.

---

#106

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 9:23:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 9:44:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:21:03  
**IP Address:** 115.189.98.68

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Scott Bewley

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The creation of an unrestricted speed limit will pose significant safety, environmental and noise risk to all uses and properties that are close to the river. I have experienced fast jet boats rocketing along rivers around Te Anau while I have been peacefully kayaking along and on one occasions almost been taken out by a driver that did not see me. Why do we need to lift what seems like a very sensible by law already just to appease a few tour operators, they have the rest of the river? If tourists want noisy jet boat rides drive over the hill to Queenstown.....The big problem is that once a speed limit is lifted it opens it up to a wide range of very noisy craft, including the popular jet ski. I don't live by the river, but if I did I would be dreading the thought of ANY craft doing whatever speed they liked every day, there are many other places they can go. Please lets not destroy the beauty and safety of a small section of this amazing river.

---

# #107

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 8:50:28 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 9:09:06 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:18:37  
**IP Address:** 103.198.184.251

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Michael John Roberts

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I vote for five knots at all times from the outlet to the last downstream residence of Albert Town. No powered craft in the Albert Town swimming island area.

In balancing the interest of different recreational users on the Clutha River from the Outlet to lower Albert Town, powered boat owners should not have dominance; this would represent a bias negatively affecting non powered craft and swimmers. By permitting powered boats to go down this section at less than 5 knots they are not being excluded. Powered boats have the opportunity to go at speeds greater than 5 knots below lower Albert Town and in other water ways; the interests of powered boat owners would still be upheld.

The co-mingling of boat owners, swimmers and fisherman where boats are permitted to go over 5 knots, poses safety issues and would inevitably lead to an accident.

The pristine nature of this river would be negatively environmentally impacted through air, noise and water pollution of powered boats going 5 knots.

---

# #108

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 8:10:30 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 9:31:02 AM  
**Time Spent:** 01:20:32  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nick Stewart

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe the proposed NSB 2017 is a great outcome if accepted, it is not only practical but a safe decision as an experienced private jetboater and ex-commercial operator on this stretch of river I would like to think my opinion is better supported.

I have experienced on two separate occasions on the proposed stretch of water in the late afternoon hours of summer people in serious trouble I believe drowning was imminent on both occasions if a jetboat was not present.

The time of day was between 4 and 6 pm which is relevant to the new proposal if jetboats can still use the stretch of river with fewer restrictions it is safer for all river users with no 5-knot restrictions at the outlet means less time at low speed which results in less wake less noise and happier fishermen and those camping at the outlet campground

All river users need to work in conjunction with each other and to the rules rather than singling out the jet boaters.

Regards Nick Stewart.

---



#109

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 10:19:57 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 10:22:11 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:13  
**IP Address:** 111.69.85.236

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John robertson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

More rivers open for people to boat on and use the better. Great way to check on things an see some great scenery this country has too offer

---

# #110

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 12:07:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 12:12:22 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:41  
**IP Address:** 114.23.230.96

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

nicola woolford

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think the river will be used as a commodity and the lack of speed restrictions encourage behaviours that are disrespectful of other users who want to actually go at the pace of nature and not have noise pollution and the potential of being run over. Natural places are being eroded by trying to provide a buzz from nature rather than being with nature. Lets not go the same way as Queenstown and other high use rivers. It limits the level of interaction a person can have with the natural world. Speeding though it serves to further remove ourselves from it...

---

#111

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 12:52:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 12:58:10 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:39  
**IP Address:** 122.58.48.87

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Cherilyn Walthew

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe there is talk of extending the speed limit for jet boats between the Outlet and Albert Town.  
I feel this will be detrimental to the safety of other water users and is inappropriate in an area that is enjoyed by other residents and track users who want the natural beauty of the area to be protected from noisy activities. Furthermore, I believe this would cause issues around erosion to the banks of the river.

---

# #112

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 2:04:32 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 2:08:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:19  
**IP Address:** 203.118.173.164

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Astrid Geneblaza

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It will spoil the tranquil peaceful environment for passive water users and importantly, it poses a major health and safety issue.

#113

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 4:41:19 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 5:26:26 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:45:07  
**IP Address:** 121.75.86.11

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Wilson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Withstanding the unprecedented population growth in the Upper Clutha your own council is aware of the current "variations of consent under the RMA" being sort by various commercial operators for the already congested portion of the Clutha - the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge

QLDC have been far from transparent in notifying clearly "affected parties" re the above and QLDC have only just saved face in terms of public consultation on the proposed uplifting of the current speed restriction on the Upper Clutha river

It is sheer lunacy in terms of safety alone to have powered craft being able to go at full noise on this portion of the river

I am opposed to any change

#114

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 6:01:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 6:11:26 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:29  
**IP Address:** 203.173.150.207

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kim Badger

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The 4 of our family members and friends often paddle board this section of the river. Jet boats create wake which knocks paddle boarders off their boards which is unsafe for them. Also there is a swimming area near where jet boats speed at the doc camp ground. Young children swim there so the speed limit should be 5 knots like in other swimming areas of the lake. We swim there in summer.

---

# #115

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 7:15:23 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 7:22:41 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:17  
**IP Address:** 49.226.206.214

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Malcom Lawrence Sincock

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I take my grandchild kayaking at Dean's Bank. I do swim training in that part of the river and I paddle my kayak up to the outlet and back weekly. Keep the speed restriction so we the public can enjoy nature as it should be.

# #116

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 6:36:48 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 7:27:54 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:51:05  
**IP Address:** 101.98.210.242

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anna Ritchie

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

From the outlet to the cardrona mouth is still and has good swimming areas for my children any where from the cardrona mouth onward is perfectly fine for unlimited speed limit for jet boats ... it is far to dangerous to have anything before the mouth of the cardrona due to erosion of the banks and safety of my family

---



# #117

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 8:31:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 9:09:56 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:38:26  
**IP Address:** 122.56.205.37

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Denise Bunn

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

For over 40 years we have had a property at Albert Town and enjoyed all the amenities the area offers. Central to these is the river from the Outlet to the bridge. We have regularly walked and cycled the Outlet track, enjoying its wonderful views and, above all, its tranquility. As you often see trout while you walk along the bank, you know why its such a popular fishing location. Our children learnt to kayak this stretch of river and also frequently snorkelled or came down it in a rubber dinghy. The swimming hole near the bridge has become an even more popular spot in recent years.

All these activities would be spoilt by unrestricted access to speed boats:

1. the fishing would be ruined
2. the peaceful nature ruined
3. quiet river activities would become too dangerous - the harbor master could not possibly monitor all boat drivers to make sure they were not driving dangerously

Some years ago , I recall a QLDC report emphasized it was an area for quiet recreation. There is a huge area of lake for speed boats and if they wish to go down a river, the stretch from the Albert Town bridge to the Red bridge is a much better option as it is used much less by Albert Town residents and visitors.

QLDC needs to consider residents who pay the rates, many of whom choose to live in Albert Town because it is much more peaceful than Wanaka. At a meeting I attended, James Helmore emphasized that the Wanaka tourist board wanted to encourage a different sort of tourist experience from Queenstown's i.e. walking and cycling tracks in particular. Allowing more commercial speed boats on the upper Clutha runs contrary to this vision.

Do not destroy the character of Albert Town and the recreation of its residents!

---

#118

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 5:14:23 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 5:22:14 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:50  
**IP Address:** 49.226.206.214

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Louise Johnson Sincock

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I live on this section of the river and find that the speed/jet boats that use the river can be very loud and disturb the peace and tranquility that comes from living on the river. We use this section of the river for kayaking and swimming. I also enjoy that as we walk along the edge we can watch the fly fishermen, paddle boarders, and those floating down in tubes and on body boards. This is the only river out of the lake and the only spot that people can enjoy for these purposes with out worry of being tossed off by a high speed boat and their wake.

Boats travelling along this section of the river at speed will only destroy the what we live on the river for.  
It is very noticeable the extra noise and disturbance when the annual race on the river is held.

#119

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 8:38:45 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 8:48:11 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:25  
**IP Address:** 103.250.228.148

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Geoffrey Costello

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think that the speed limit should stay the same, the river is for all to enjoy, I am a boaty myself but I think the speed limit should stay the same. This part of the river is very much used piece of water, swimming, fishing , kayak, rafting etc. I have used the river for about 40 years for the above recreation uses, my kids have enjoyed all the above and hopefully my grand children. I could see serious and dangerous problems if the speed limit was raised. There is to much of New Zealand being spoiled by these sort of changes. Why should a few make money out of this and spoil a life time of fun for so many. Do not let this happen !!!!!!!!!!!

---

#120

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 9:01:55 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 9:14:35 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:39  
**IP Address:** 121.90.91.244

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Chritine Joy Thomson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are kilometres upon kilometres of lake and waterway area where boats can go at faster speeds. The Outlet to Albert Town River stretch is an iconic area which is enjoyed by kayakers, paddleboarders, tubers, floaters and picnickers. Even with the present speed restrictions there are boaters that disregard the speed limit and from experience I know how frightening that can be when paddle boarding around a corner!

Please don't lift the speed limits. It is no hardship to wait until one is below the Albert Town bridge. I am a person who also enjoys boating , so sometimes we put the boat in just below the bridge and continue downstream.

---

# #121

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 10:04:11 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 10:09:02 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:51  
**IP Address:** 121.90.181.143

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jan Grant

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I use the river to swim and sail to walk dogs and children I do not want motor boat going fast down from outlet to the last home in Albert town. I fear someone will get killed if boats are allowed to go at speed

---

#122

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 11:27:09 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 11:42:13 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:03  
**IP Address:** 8.36.116.210

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Zenda Badger

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Over many years my family & I have enjoyed the Clutha River outlet area for recreational activities such as swimming, cycling, fishing and walking. These activities, which are shared by many, many people, would be seriously undermined if unrestricted access and speed were granted for water craft. There is a whole lake available for boating and jet skis, as well as other parts of the Clutha River, so I fail to understand why increasing their domain, at the expense of other recreational users near the Outlet, could even be considered. The enjoyment of tranquil river walks and cooling off in safe swimming spots would be forever adversely affected. Believe it or not, some people seek to escape the raucous whines of jet skis and boats that dominate the area already. This is a last 'haven' where nature and the natural environment can be enjoyed. I strongly disapprove of this proposed Bylaw.

---

# #123

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 11:44:39 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 12:16:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:31:37  
**IP Address:** 122.56.206.121

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Susan Adams

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not support the suggested removal of the speed limit imposed on boats on the Clutha River downstream from the outlet as it raises huge safety concerns for the many people who use that part of the river for swimming, floating down and kayaking. Boats and jet skis are not the only users of the river and should not have priority over these other users. Any lifting of speed restrictions will be disruptive to other users and put them at much greater risk than they already face. The current speed restriction should remain and violation of it should be more rigorously policed.

---



#124

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 12:06:23 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 12:17:05 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:10:42  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Diana

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are plenty of locations for fast boating and water sports in the Wanaka area already. This area should be preserved as a safe place for families, beginners and those wanting to swim, kayak, paddle board, etc.

# #125

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 1:36:39 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 1:41:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:10  
**IP Address:** 122.56.209.228

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jaime Hutter

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a resident of Albert Town, I'm frequently in or beside the stretch of the Clutha River from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge. For the safety of us non-motorised users (and the safety of our children), I prefer to retain a 5 knot speed limit on this section of the river.

#126

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 3:54:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 4:08:34 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:24  
**IP Address:** 122.56.207.240

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John Barlow

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

In the absence of an overarching plan for water recreation in the Upper Clutha I consider it most unwise to uplift the 5 knot speed restriction from the Clutha outlet to the top of the first rapids. There are many passive users of the river in the top section of the Clutha now and this is only set to increase with further growth in Wanaka and any increase in motorised boat use at speed will be extremely dangerous. Safety of the public in our waters should be paramount. My preference in any plan for the future would be to work towards banning all motorised boat use above the Albert town bridge and a five knot speed limit down to the confluence with the Hawea river.

---

# #127

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 6:27:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 6:34:54 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:57  
**IP Address:** 122.57.233.118

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Brian knapp

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Increases in boat speed on the upper Clutha river would endanger all other river users

---

#128

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 8:37:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 8:57:15 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:40  
**IP Address:** 122.57.233.118

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Karolyn Knapp

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river is not wide enough for fast boats with paddle boarders, swimmers, canoes etc  
Fast boats would be dangerous and would also create wash damaging the banks  
Deans bank attracts people from around the world for fly fishing and the environment would be ruined by noisy speeding boats  
therefore I don't agree with the proposal to increase the speed limit for boats

#129

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 16, 2017 9:50:12 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 16, 2017 9:53:58 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:45  
**IP Address:** 125.237.163.192

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Disa Evans

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a person who regularly paddle boards down the Clutha, I would feel safer if the speed limits are kept in place. It should be an environment safe enough for everyone to use.

# #130

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 12:33:59 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 1:02:16 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:28:16  
**IP Address:** 125.237.164.87

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rosalind Goulding

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are a large number of passive recreational users of the Clutha River from the Outlet to the Cardrona river confluence than mechanical users (powered vessels).

Management and rules over this section of the river require the development of a plan to improve safety and to reduce conflict between users. In summer passive recreational use is very high, swimmers, paddle boarders, kayaks, rafts, fishermen, walkers all enjoying passive recreation of the waterway. This is in direct conflict with jet skis and jet boats who are travelling at speed in and around passive users. I have witnessed conflict between passive users and powered vessels over many summers and strongly advise the council to undertake a process and create a management plan that has input from all groups so we as a community can have safe and sensible access to this waterway. It should result in some restriction and control of powered vessels who are causing conflict with the larger number of passive users who have little or no conflict with other passive users. In winter months some control of powered vessels is required as its not just the vessel on the water in conflict with other users its also the excessive noise that Alberttown residents have to endure, particularly on still quiet winter days when jet/powered boats shatter the peace and tranquility and send wildlife scattering.

The Matukituki River is another location where passive users are in conflict with powered vessels. Access for powered vessels should be limited to below the confluence of the East and West branch, it is hugely disturbing when walking in the East Matukituki to have jet boats zooming up and down the river, particularly given that the public have only walking access up this East branch. And one side of the river has now been retired from farming and is DOC park. Consideration to the higher number of passive users must be taken into account particularly in the summer months when the numbers of passive users are greatest. I urge the council to look at the needs and affects of all users and introduce rules that allow users to appreciate this environment within the different seasons.

---



# #131

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 1:12:46 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 1:27:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:55  
**IP Address:** 122.57.113.61

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Macdonald RHODES

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Speed Uplift for Clutha River from Outlet downstream to Albert Town or Luggate Bridge.

Object to ANY removal, or change to existing 5 knot speed restriction for the following reasons:

1. This part of Clutha is an established egg laying and hatching ground for trout which would be largely destroyed with unlimited speed of power boats and jet skiers.
2. This part of the Clutha River is an established trout fishing zone for which New Zealand and visiting fresh water fishing folk have developed, visited and used for many years.
3. This part of the Clutha River is an accessible part for freshwater fishing folk via public access tracks that are either not available or of difficult access at any part of the Clutha down to Lake Dunstan.

Peter Rhodes. Wanaka

---

# #132

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:00:47 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:08:10 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:22  
**IP Address:** 203.118.172.137

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Keith Murray

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

THE PROPOSAL

I agree with Clause 35: "The proper speed of vessels must not exceed 5 knots on the Clutha River between the Outlet Camping Ground (marked by a five knot buoy) and the five knot buoy positioned downstream at Albert Town Bridge (GPS -44.68, 169.19)."

This part of the Clutha river is very often used by swimmers, kayakers, and particularly in summer by lots of people floating down in or on all manner of inner tubes/rafts etc. It is extremely dangerous to allow jet boats to drive on this part of the river at high speed and there is significant potential for a serious accident or fatality.

I therefore do not agree with the schedule 2 speed uplifting for that part of the Clutha River, and respectfully submit that the speed uplifting clause below be removed.

Schedule 2 Speed upliftings and access lanes:

"Clutha River from Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town bridge. All year between the hours of 10am to 4pm in the winter and 10am to 6pm in the summer. Outlet camping ground -44.66 to 169.15 Albert Town Bridge -44.68 to 169.19."

There is no rationale to allow motorized access on this part of the river, and jet boats can either use the lake, or launch at the Albert Town Bridge ramp for the part of the river below the bridge. Let's keep at least this small part of the river safe for non motorized users.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kind regards

Keith Murray

---

# #133

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 1:54:53 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:09:55 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:01  
**IP Address:** 115.189.99.55

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian Kennedy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My family and I use the Upper Clutha between the Outlet to Albert town extensively for swimming, kayaking and floating down the river. Powered water craft are a danger and an intrusion to our use of the river especially around the Albert Town swimming spot off Allison Ave.

I would prefer a total ban on power craft for those 3 kilometres but at the very least the retention of the 5 kilometre per hour speed limit.

---

# #134

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:30:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:43:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:34  
**IP Address:** 118.149.145.120

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Craig Andrew Adams

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

User conflict ...

Passive river trips floating swimming kayaking multi sport training rafting wading fishing ...

These activities are completely at odds with an unlimited speed zone ...

I would like to put forward that the outlet to alberttown bridge is permanantly free of engine powered vessels!

I have many years of travelling on this stretch of water and already the power boat people are not adhering to the rules ... Stronger education and enforcement is needed ... Not throwing it open to a minority group to do as they please !

This stretch of water is so valuable as a community resource for recreation .. Gathering of food

Noise pollution ... To busy too fast too noisy

More regulation ... For the benefit of all ...

Thank you

Craig Adams

---

# #135

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 5:30:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 5:52:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:21:12  
**IP Address:** 122.56.235.112

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Glynis Woodrow

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe that the speed for jet boats and jet skis should be restricted to 5 knots at all times for the area from the Outlet to the last residence in Albert Town, and be excluded from the Albert town Island swimming area. The increasing amount of powered craft traffic on the Clutha River in this section is negatively impacting the quiet enjoyment of the Outlet walking and bike track which is a wonderful walk enjoyed by many locals and visitors, and of the Albert Town area in general. I have also noticed increasing numbers of people kayaking, floating and swimming in this section of the river and I feel that the speed of powered craft along with their increasing numbers is posing a real safety risk.

---



# #136

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 8:57:16 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:10:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:51  
**IP Address:** 122.56.235.112

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Neil Woodrow

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My concern is in relation to the proposed speed limit changes for powered craft on the Clutha river between the outlet and Albert town bridge.

This section of river is used by people in non powered craft like kayaks, standup paddle boards, and inflatables, as well as swimmers. Any speed greater than 5 knots would put these users at risk.

Fast jet boats are also noisy and disturb uses of the outlet track as well as residents who live close to the river - we hear them very clearly from our house which is probably 500m away. Jet skis are even worse for noise as they tend to go mindlessly round in circles. The proposed change is even more confusing than the current rule, which the Harbour master has stated is not practical to enforce. I would recommend it is simplifying to a single blanket restriction of 5 knots from the Outlet to the Albert Town bridge. If this is not considered manageable, then possibly a total ban of powered craft on this section would resolve enforcement issues without creating another worse safety problem. Under a total ban one or two concessions to tourist operators could still be applied without materially increasing the risk.

---

# #137

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:32:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:36:05 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:35  
**IP Address:** 222.154.237.91

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Graeme Sinclair

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I don't think the local residents of the area in question should be subjected to undue noise or have to watch for speeding boats should they be using the river as a swimmer, snorkeler or for other recreational purposes when there is adequate areas in the surrounding lakes and un-populated rivers to use speed boats.

# #138

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:29:08 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:38:46 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:38  
**IP Address:** 125.239.49.143

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Katharine Wynn-Williams

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river from the Outlet to Albert Town, and especially the Albert Town swimming area, is a really special place for families to gather and play. Adults and children both enjoy swimming, fishing, walking and the whole riverside environment. Already there are too many noisy fast boats in this area, disturbing the peace and causing nuisance. I have seen boats at far too fast speeds and well within the supposedly safe distance from the marker buoys at the swimming area, causing significant danger to those in the water. With growing tourist numbers, the section of river down to the end of Albert Town must be kept safe and enjoyable.

#139

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:39:33 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:53:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:17  
**IP Address:** 110.92.19.111

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

perry brooks

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Regarding the proposed changes to the speed uplifting on the Clutha from outlet to albert town bridge. This will be very dangerous for the many other users of the river, I fly fish, swim, kayak as do many others and do not think a powered boat hurtling pass will be safe for me or anyone else even those sitting on the banks. The harbour master has said it cannot be policed, well most of New Zealand roads cannot also, but they still have speed limits. I totally reject the proposal.

# #140

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 9:43:39 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 9:49:54 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:15  
**IP Address:** 121.90.42.254

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Helen May JAMES

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As an angler & frequent user of the Albert Town Camping ground I believe this section of the river should have speed restrictions. It is used extensively by swimmers and they would be put in huge danger.

---

# #141

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 3:23:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 11:07:50 AM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 125.237.166.202

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bruce Hebbard

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Proposed By-law Changes

Boat Ramp Charges

22

The Council proposes to revoke the existing ramp / launch permit, and replace it with paid parking areas around all Council ramps / launch facilities in the District.

My submission

A person using a current boat launching area should not be charged if they are using the area for non-boat launching purpose, e.g. fishing, walking, or a picnic/BBQ.

The simplest way to collect the ramp fee is to modify a parking fee ticket dispenser to pay the fee. Once the fee is paid a ticket is dispensed for one launch and one retrieval valid for a 48 hour period (minimum) to allow for an overnight stay somewhere on the lake. This would be displayed on the towing vehicle's windscreen/dashboard. It will be up to the council's enforcement people to see the fee is paid. The fee should only be payable where a boat ramp and other Council supplied facilities are available.

Ultimately the lakes should be considered a community asset such as the library, sports-ground or parks and funded from the rating base.

Speed Clutha River

2014 law (existing)

18 Clutha River

18.1 The proper speed of vessels must not exceed 5 knots on the Clutha River between the outlet camping ground (marked by a five knot buoy) and the five knot buoy positioned downstream at -44.668044,169.1616 (This includes a permanent restriction for a swimming area)

9 Speed of vessels<sup>2</sup> (Existing)

9.1 Except where the bylaw specifically provides otherwise, no person may, without reasonable excuse, propel or navigate a vessel (including a vessel towing a person or some object) at a proper speed greater than five knots within:

(a) 50 metres of any other vessel or floating structure or person in or on the water;

My Submission

The speed limit as existing (including the current permanent 5 knot swimming area restriction) from the outlet camping ground and the Albert Town Bridge should be retained and I oppose any change to this. This includes rule 9 of the current by-law regarding passing other vessels both motorized and passive. With the popularity of the river and the number of craft using this over the summer most of this stretch of the river would remain at 5 knots in order to comply with this.

I have read media reports the Harbourmaster has difficulty enforcing the current speed limit. It is up to the Queenstown Lakes District Council to provide him with all the resources to do his job including enforcing speed limits.



# #142

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 12:10:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 12:24:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:17  
**IP Address:** 122.62.248.149

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Justine Marra

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Please explain the process of consultation that this document has been through to become a proposed Bylaw?

Why is the Harbour Master involved in commenting on consenting issues - would suggest it is outside of his mandate?

Current consent holders are not at the top of the pecking order - their effects still have to be measured and introducing an increase in the speed/length of river they can speed on - the effects will be more significant and would have to be readdressed, as their consent was issued on certain parameters at the time of consenting.

If a few consent holders are holding the whole community at ransom over this I would also suggest, the Council is outside of its mandate under the RMA to consider all users.

---

#143

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 1:56:03 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 2:03:20 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:17  
**IP Address:** 111.69.114.243

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Annika Hackerschmied

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed bylaw would make the river considerably more dangerous and undesirable. The Clutha River should remain peaceful and safe for local residents, swimmers, fishers, snorkelers, kayakers, paddle boarders, rafters, bikers and walkers.

#144

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 2:32:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 2:34:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:45  
**IP Address:** 111.69.114.243

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Steven Bartrom

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed bylaw would make the river considerably more dangerous and undesirable. The Clutha River should remain peaceful and safe for local residents, swimmers, fishers, snorkelers, kayakers, paddle boarders, rafters, bikers and walkers.

# #145

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 2:41:53 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 2:43:46 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:53  
**IP Address:** 139.80.239.129

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jane Evelyn Guise

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Lots of people use that stretch of river who are not in powered boats and I believe an open speed limit puts them in danger

---

# #146

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 3:09:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 3:23:48 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:45  
**IP Address:** 203.118.172.6

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kristine Mary Vollebregt

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like to see the following out in place - "Five Knots at All Times. This applies from the Outlet to the last downstream residence of Albert Town. No powered craft in Albert Town swimming island area."

This would better respect that which is so special about the Clutha River.

In this busy world we live, tranquillity is becoming a rarer and rarer commodity. It must be protected for humans as well as the myriad of life living in, on and around the Clutha River.

I also have concern for safety of those floating, swimming, kayaking, and diving in the river at these times. It seems crazy to lift the current restrictions and defile a unique part of NZ that is semi-urban with powered craft noise.

---

#147

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 3:41:28 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 3:54:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:57  
**IP Address:** 121.75.216.91

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jocelyn Toomey

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not agree to allowing boats including jet boats to travel up the Clutha River at more than 5 knots. The area from The Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge and just beyond is used by many for recreational activities such as floating in the river from the Outlet to near the Albert Town Bridge, fishing, paddle boarding, kayaking, swimming, jumping off the bridge and picnicking by the edge of the river. It would be dangerous for people including children to be engaged in any of these recreational activities especially floating with boats traveling regularly and speedily along this stretch of River. There are many other rivers where this commercial practice is possible. Let them have it. I believe it is important "the many" can safely and freely enjoy this waterway rather than "the few" who gain financially from commercially monopolizing it.

---



# #148

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 4:18:32 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 4:24:40 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:08  
**IP Address:** 110.92.19.78

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

ChrisWhite

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha river should be available to everyone safely, an increase in the speed that craft are allowed to do during daylight hours would make it much less safe for other boaters, kayakers, swimmers, fishermen and all other river users.

#149

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 5:41:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 5:45:41 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:05  
**IP Address:** 163.47.238.26

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Luke Wilson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think that it would make that section of the river VERY dangerous for other river users. Myself among others paddle down this section of river during summer and I believe it would only be a matter of time before someone was killed or seriously injured if there was no speed limit in this section of river.

---

# #150

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 8:19:52 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 8:44:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:24:32  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anthony William Marino

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe the unrestricted speed limit will pose a danger to other non motorised river users. As a person who has lived on this river just below the Albert Town Bridge on Wicklow Terrace I have witnessed many dozens of swimmers, divers, padlers, kayakers, and tubers enjoying this section of river during the summer without the worry of fast motorised boats. As a personal note I am a keen fisherman and fish quite often this section of river which includes Deans Bank, an important fishing destination. More jetboats travelling at faster speeds would make fishing here less enjoyable. I believe private individuals would not slow down and the wakes from their boats would be a nuisance. Currently there are at two commercial jet boat operators who use the river and they are always mindful of other river users and adjust their speeds accordingly.

---

# #151

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:41:05 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:43:28 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:23  
**IP Address:** 122.57.210.127

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Pip Harker

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This is a peaceful family area, no place for fast noisy boats. Families should be able to swim, kayak etc in that stretch of river without safety concerns or loud boats.

---

# #152

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:46:06 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:51:54 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:47  
**IP Address:** 182.54.160.214

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bronwyn Bain

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Ambience of the river walk ; bird life disturbance; soil erosion;canoe and paddle boarders unhinged,fishing disturbance, etc etc

---

# #153

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 18, 2017 8:49:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 12:09:45 PM  
**Time Spent:** 15:20:45  
**IP Address:** 110.92.19.111

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Carol Brooks

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The stretch of the Clutha between the outlet and Albert town bridge is one of our iconic destinations for walkers, bikers, kayakers, fisherman, swimmers. It is beautiful, peaceful and a real asset to this region. It seems this proposal to uplift the 5 knott limit is driven by commercial interests with no regard to public safety of other river users. There seems no need to change this part of the bylaw jets can travel through and enjoy this stretch rather than for high speed and potential dangers if this is changed.

# #154

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 12:04:14 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 12:10:45 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:31  
**IP Address:** 122.57.186.204

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kenneth Alexander Warburton

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I object to the uplifting of speed limits on the Clutha river. This section of the Clutha River is heavily used by swimmers, including children, Paddle boarders and anglers.  
Uplifting the speed limit will only increase the dangers for all users.

---

# #155

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 12:45:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 1:04:47 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:18:57  
**IP Address:** 121.99.129.73

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nadia de Blaauw

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

The proposed bylaw, creating an unrestricted speed limit from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge from 10Am to 6PM over the summer and 10AM - 4PM in Winter does sufficiently address/manage:

1. safety concerns arising from the significant recent increase in water traffic along this stretch of river in recent years. Without restricted speed limits, the volume of relatively high speed traffic (eg from motor boats) will negatively impact on the safety of swimmers, paddle-boarders, snorkelers and kayakers who are also using this stretch of water. in addition, the bylaw should also include a 5 knot limit around the Albert Town island swimming area, which is used regularly by swimmers in the summer months. Children, and tourists who are not always experienced river-swimmers are at particular risk in this type of situation.
  2. environmental degradation along the banks of the Clutha resulting from wake and backwash generated by high speed traffic. Without restriction of speed limits, this problem will continue and could, indeed become worse as volumes of traffic increase. in addition, an open speed limit effectively prioritises the rights of motor boat owners/users over the safety of other river users - swimmers, paddleboarders, snorkelers and kayakers. This is unreasonable and unfair given the diversity of river users. Finally, the proposed bylaw contradicts the QLDC's own District Plan. (The tradeoff between unrestricted speed limits and natural conservation and wildlife values is already admitted in section 4.6.2 of the Queenstown District Lakes own District Plan!)
-

# #156

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 1:45:32 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 1:46:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:10  
**IP Address:** 203.173.141.97

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Vanessa Oatley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It will make the river too dangerous and create excessive noise pollution for residents.

# #157

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 3:38:01 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 3:46:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:41  
**IP Address:** 115.189.99.61

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Allan James Easte

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Albert Town residents have witnessed boats, jet skis on the river with no regard to other water users. They also bought their properties to enjoy the calm and quietness of walking by the river.

The noise from some if these users, who do not follow the rules is inappropriate for the area. As tourism increases more people will be walking the tracks and hopefully able to enjoy the peace and beauty without the noise from these boats.

#158

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 4:38:15 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 4:44:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:13  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.12

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Claire O'Connell

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This stretch of the river is used by children, adults, tourists, swimmers, floaters, kayakers, small boats, kids in tyre tubes, swimmers with flippers.....some days/evenings it's like a thoroughfare of un-motorised craft, floating peacefully down the river. It has been this way since I've lived here - 15 years - and will not be possible if this stretch is opened up to have no speed restrictions for jet boats or jet skis. I can't even believe that someone has thought that this is ok to propose. The lake is huge and this is one short stretch of a very long river which has historically been usable by anyone for a gentle float. Whoever put this idea forward clearly has never floated down a river, they need to have a go so that they can get some sense of the activity which, by their proposal, they are putting a complete end to!  
Claire O'Connell - a committed peaceful swimmer.

---

#159

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 6:17:58 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 6:23:31 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:33  
**IP Address:** 111.69.112.99

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Robert Gareth Roberts

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha River between its outlet and Albert Town Bridge is an extremely busy stretch of water, used by anglers, paddleboarders, kayakers, swimmers. The proposed unlimited speed restriction will not work, it will be extremely dangerous for river users. It will also spoil the ambiance for the majority of users.

---

# #160

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:46:03 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:52:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:10  
**IP Address:** 118.149.178.216

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Stefan Austin

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I recreate and work on the Clutha River teaching kayaking. This new bylaw would put my students and I at risk and could cause us a potentially fatal accident!

# #161

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:58:45 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 9:21:04 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:22:18  
**IP Address:** 122.61.67.184

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Eley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This is safety issue, this means any boat driver can drive down this stretch of river at speed. Driving a 1 tonne machine with a 150hp engine requires training and understanding .

This stretch is use by multiple river users from , school groups, day trippers, fishermen, kayakers, canoeists, stand up paddle boarders.

There is a current speed limit that works.

There is 192 km2 of lake, with no speed limits , use that.

Unless this is just the continuing erosion of river user rights by the QLDC for just a few commercial operators

---



# #162

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 9:44:33 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 19, 2017 10:27:59 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:43:25  
**IP Address:** 121.75.86.164

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jeanie Ackley

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A POWER FREE ZONE BETWEEN THE OUTLET CAMP AND ALBERT TOWN BRIDGE ON OUR TREASURED RIVER - MATA-AU, THE MIGHTY CLUTHA.

FORMOST - THIS IS IN THE INTEREST OF SAFETY. THIS IS THE ONE STRETCH OF THE MIGHTY CLUTHA RIVER WATER THAT IS CLOSE TO ALBERT TOWN RESIDENTS AND WANAKA RESIDENTS AND HAS AMAZING RECREATIONAL POTENTIAL FOR SWIMMING, KAYAKING, SNORKLING AND DRIFT DIVING, FISHING AND FLOATING. MOST IMPORTANTLY THERE ARE SAFE AND FUN SWIMMING HOLES IN THIS ZONE FOR OUR CHILDREN TO ENJOY SWIMMING AND PLAYING IN THE MATA-AU.

AND SECONDLY IN PROMOTION OF THE PREMIUM ENVIRONMENT THAT WANAKA IS PROMOTED AS HAVING.

THERE ARE FEW PLACES WHERE KIDS CAN DRIFT OVER THIS AMAZING HABITAT AND SEE THE FISH, THE BIRDS AND THE INSECTS THAT MAKE UP THIS REMARKABLE ECOSYSTEM. DEAN'S BANK HAS BEEN ONE OF THE RICHEST BIOMASSES OF TROUT IN NEW ZEALAND.

THE BANKS OF THIS STRETCH OF RIVER ARE SHARED BY TWO FANTASTIC CAMPGROUNDS, WALKING AND CYCLING TRACKS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE RIVER AND RESIDENTIAL ZONES. THERE ARE SO MANY USERS THAT ENJOY THE TRANQUILITY AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT OF THIS SHORT STRETCH OF THE RIVER.

THERE IS A GREAT BOAT RAMP AT BOTH ENDS OF THE PROPOSED RESTRICTED AREA.

AS A MOTHER, CITIZEN, BOAT USER, BIKER, FISHER, DIVER, RUNNER AND WALKER I BELIEVE THE BEST USE OF THIS STRETCH OF THE RESOURCE IS TO PROTECT IS AS A POWER FREE ZONE ALL YEAR AROUND ALL TIMES OF THE DAY AND NIGHT.

I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL TO IMPOSE A FIVE KNOT RESTRICTION ON THE RIVER BETWEEN THE OUTLET CAMP AND THE ALBERT TOWN BRIDGE AND THEN UPLIFT (REMOVE) THE RESTRICTION IN SCHEDULE 2 DURING THE DAYLIGHT HOURS.

THAT IS AN ABSOLUTE COP OUT ON THE PART OF THE PEOPLE IN CHARGE OF WATER SAFETY.

---

# #163

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 9:14:38 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 9:17:33 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:55  
**IP Address:** 202.49.0.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Sellar

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I kayak along this section of river and it is an essential river for my skill level. There is limited opportunity for me in Dunedin to paddle on such a river and the Clutha is my nearest accessible river. I would feel unsafe and at risk if the speed limit was to increase and would no longer kayak along that section of river. This makes me incredible sad that I feel a law would prevent me from participating and access what I love to do.

# #164

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 10:44:41 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 10:57:32 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:51  
**IP Address:** 115.189.101.202

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anna Kate Hutter

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I oppose the proposal to regularly uplift the 5 knot speed restriction for vessels traveling on the Clutha River between the Outlet Campground and the Albert Town Bridge (Schedule 2).

This area should retain the 5 knot speed limit at all times for the safety and consideration of passive river users (anglers, kayaks, paddle boards, swimmers and similar). It would be difficult to inform or educate all river users of a schedule of changing speeds; simple is better. The 5 knot zone lets boats know to be aware of passive river users at all times, and vice versa.

---

# #165

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 11:14:12 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 11:41:12 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:27:00  
**IP Address:** 203.118.175.155

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Keith C Hutton

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

More boats /jet skis on this section of the river will have adverse effects on -

- 1 More unnecessary noise to houses near by, picnics by the river, bikers, swimmers and those enjoying a quiet walk down the river track.
- 2 It would spoil the world rated reputation of flyfishing around Deans Bank + other forms of fishing on this section of the river.
- 3 Fast moving craft could endanger swimmers, boarders , kayakers and the like coming from the outlet to the Albert Town Bridge.

Boats/jet skis have numerous local waterways to enjoy .Please leave this one for us to enjoy by keeping it peaceful and safe. Boat /ski users need more information on this being a NO AREA and backed up with policing and possible fines!

---

# #166

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 11:42:49 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 12:07:26 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:24:37  
**IP Address:** 203.118.175.155

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Deirdre Hutton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha river between the outlet and the Albert Town bridge is used extensively throughout the summer by swimmers, kayakers, snorkellers , bridge jumpers etc. There are swimming spots along the river bank that are used for recreation by the locals and by holiday visitors. Allowing motor boats and jet skiers to travel with unrestricted speeds along this section of the river will make these recreational activities more dangerous and less pleasant for participants.

At present this stretch of river is a quiet haven from noisy boats. There are many houses close to the the river at Albert Town and boats travelling at speed up the river would impact on the peaceful nature of the area. The walking track, local picnic spots and the camping ground would also be affected by the noise, the wash and the obtrusiveness of many boats travelling past our favourite river spots. At present boats do not cause a noise issue to residents or holiday makers.

The river between the Outlet and the Albert Town Bridge is used extensively for recreational fishing. Boats traveling at unrestricted speed down the river can only ruin the reputation of this area as a fishing spot.

I am totally against the proposal of an unrestricted speed limit in this area of the river. Boats travelling at speed will significantly impact on the peaceful nature of the area (which is why we choose to live here) and will also impact on the recreational water activities families in this area enjoy especially in the summer months.

---



# #167

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 14, 2017 3:04:57 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 2:06:16 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 203.184.17.132

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

NZSUP

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bill Dawes

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

As the national governing body for stand up paddleboarding in New Zealand, we are very concerned about the safety ramifications in your proposed bylaw Clause 22:

Exceptions to requirements to carry or wear lifejackets

22.1 Clauses 18, 19, and 20 do not apply to: (a) any surfboard, sailboard, paddleboard, windsurfer, or other or similar unpowered craft, if a full wetsuit is worn at all times;

The most common cause of fatalities in stand up paddleboarding is riders becoming separated from their board, which can happen very easily in strong winds. This is why by far the most important item of safety equipment for the stand up paddleboard is an appropriate leash, so that the rider is always attached to their board. A PFD is a 'second line of defence' for the rare occasion that a leash might fail. However, if you are going to allow paddleboarders to go out without a PFD then it is VITAL that they are wearing a leash. Otherwise they will easily get separated from their board and then not have a PFD to keep them afloat. We would strongly recommend that any bylaw that mentions paddleboarders stipulates that a leash appropriate for the conditions is worn at all times.

We are also concerned that nowhere in your bylaw have you actually defined what a 'full wetsuit' is. We assume by 'full wetsuit' you are referring to a suit that is not a 'shortie' wetsuit, nor a wetsuit with short arms? However, whether it has full length arms or short arms or indeed short legs has very little impact on the overall flotation and insulative value of a wetsuit. These primarily come from its thickness, and the construction techniques used. A 5mm blind-stitched wetsuit is extremely warm and has lots of buoyancy. A 1mm overlocked wetsuit has very little of either. Yet they can both be described as 'full wetsuits'. However, a 5mm wetsuit (which would definitely offer a functional alternative to a PFD in terms of flotation and safety) would be entirely impractical for paddleboarding in the summer; indeed it would be a recipe for heat exhaustion! However, if the paddleboarder is wearing a legrope then a thinner wetsuit is fine anyway, as it will only need to insulate the wearer against short term immersions, as it only takes a few seconds to climb back onto a paddleboard, even in very rough conditions. Can we suggest therefore that rather than 'full wetsuit', a wording such as 'wetsuit appropriate for the conditions' is used.

So our concern is that your proposed new bylaw will actually put paddleboarders at risk, by sending entirely the wrong messages. A wetsuit is not an appropriate replacement for a PFD for paddleboarders (as nobody will wear one thick enough to offer sufficient flotation), and allowing paddleboarders on the water without either a leash or PFD is a recipe for disaster - it has been the cause of a number of fatalities worldwide.

We would like to suggest the following as a way of covering all the bases and ensuring that paddleboarders are kept safe.

22.1 Clauses 18, 19, and 20 do not apply to: (a) any surfboard, sailboard, windsurfer, or similar unpowered craft, if a wetsuit appropriate for the conditions is worn at all times;

22.2 Clauses 18, 19, and 20 do not apply to: (a) any paddleboard or similar unpowered craft, if a wetsuit appropriate for the conditions and a leash appropriate for the conditions are worn at all times;

-----

We are also concerned at your use of the word 'lifejackets' throughout the bylaw, instead of flotation device or PFD, as is used in NZ Maritime Law. This makes for confusion, as a lifejacket is generally understood to be specifically the type 401 flotation device, with a high collar that will keep the wearer face-up even if unconscious. However, nobody wears these for active sports as they are too restrictive and uncomfortable. It would be preferable to align the terminology in your bylaw with that of NZ Maritime Law and the generally recognised terminology, and refer to flotation devices or PFDs instead of lifejackets to avoid this confusion.

With regard to making a verbal submission, we would not be able to attend but our understanding is that the local stand up paddleboarding community will be keen to do this.



# #168

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 2:24:13 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 2:35:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:23  
**IP Address:** 122.57.75.54

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Toni Maguire

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

River should be for quiet enjoyment of all, not for commercial gain of just a few. It ought to be protected from noise pollution and environmental pollution. my family swim, picnic, fish, run, bike and simply relax along this river, we listen to the water flowing and the birds singing. We do not want to hear revving engines and smell fuel and have faces roaring past us. It is a terrible and downright stupid idea to degrade the river area and erode the things we most live about living in New Zealand.

---

# #169

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 2:36:23 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 3:05:03 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:28:40  
**IP Address:** 123.255.47.123

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Babu Blatt

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha river is a favourite for us locals, to swim, float or paddleboard down the river, in particular between the Outlet and the RedBridge. Lifting the speed limits during day-time would make these activities unsafe. It would also bring a lot of noise to an otherwise very peaceful place.

Being able to swim in our beautiful clean local river is an experience we need to treasure and look after.

While there have been some non-compliance issues with boat users ignoring the speed restriction, that is not a good enough reason to do away with it altogether. If it is "impractical to police the speed" of boats, then I'd prefer seeing the river completely closed to motorised boats/jetskis, rather than lifting the speed limits!

Either strict speed limits are kept and controlled on the entire stretch between the Outlet and the Red Bridge, or motorised vessels should not be allowed on that stretch of the Clutha.

Thank you.

---

# #170

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 3:18:16 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 3:25:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:35  
**IP Address:** 101.98.206.247

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nick leach

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like to request that QLDC consider the impact of increased boat traffic and increased speed limits on the clutch river from the outlet to Albert town. I note the current 5 knot speed limit around what is known as the Albert town swimming hole is not included in the new bylaw.

I spend a lot of time walking and biking the tracks and swimming over the summer and like the tranquility the river has over winter. Having just watched the international jet boat race down the Clutha today, while this was exciting as a one off, I do not enjoy the noise that motorised craft make on the river.

Every summer there are families rafting, kayaking and floating down this section of the river and people jumping off the Clutha river. Safety would be affected by an increase in allowable traffic and no speed limit enforced.

There is so much river below the bridge, that does not have as much pedestrian or water traffic, where boaters can have fun and enjoy their recreation.

---



#171

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 3:55:16 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 4:06:35 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:19  
**IP Address:** 122.57.215.64

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian Bruce Cole

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Navigation Safety Bylaw Amendment 2017  
Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Private Bag 50072  
FREEPOST 191078  
QUEENSTOWN 9384  
services@qldc.govt.nz

Name of submitter: Ian Bruce Cole  
Address: 12, Sarqood Drive, Wanaka 9305

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Telephone Number: [03] 443 7870

Cell phone: 027 208 0188

Email address: iancole.icu@gmail.com

### QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED NAVIGATION SAFETY BYLAW AMENDMENTS 2017

Uplifting current speed restrictions in Upper Clutha River.

My name is Ian Cole and I make this submission primarily as both a resident and ratepayer of the QLDC.

Since 1995 I have been an elected member of Otago Fish and Game Council and long standing trustee of the Clutha Fisheries Trust of which I now currently serve as chairman.

As a keen recreational angler and fly fishing guide and a member of the Upper Clutha Angling Club I have had a long standing interest in motorised boating activity in the region.

I am opposed to the proposal to uplift the current speed restrictions in the Upper Clutha

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Queenstown Lakes District has witnessed unprecedented growth. Forecasts are that this trend will continue well into the foreseeable future and thereby increasing demands on the regions infrastructure and recreational amenity. Recreational amenity is abundant but, ultimately, finite and limited. The section of river between the outlet of Lake Wanaka and Albert Town Bridge has long been recognised for its outstanding natural features facilitating a number of more passive recreational pursuits – walkers, bikers, anglers, bathers and canoeists.

The proposal to uplift speed restrictions is both ill considered and lacks logic. It has very real potential to be of danger to both existing and potential users. The proposal fails to adequately address safety concerns.

Reactive and ad hoc proposals such as this ill-considered proposal need to be replaced by a proactive comprehensive strategic recreational plan for our waterways and environments. This would need full community consultation to better reflect the wider communities' aspirations.

Once in place, a suitable management regime would give a far more balanced approach to regional recreational amenity planning and ultimately deliver a far more efficient usage of limited council resources.

In the meantime this proposal to uplift speed restrictions should be set aside.

#### DISCUSSION

The inherent natural features of the upper stretch of the Clutha have long been recognised by locals and the wider community as providing a peaceful and tranquil setting for passive recreation. Indeed historical management of this area has attempted to be sympathetic and sought to protect those intrinsic values.

However, with dramatic population increases we have, understandably, witnessed increasing recreational and commercial activity in this area. It defies logic to even consider an uplift of speed restrictions given such increasing demand. Uplifted speed restrictions and unregulated activity would seriously increase the potential to severely endanger water users.

Media reports suggest that QLDC's rationale for the proposals is "the existing speed limits are not effective as they cannot be monitored or policed" and "it's what the community wants".

The first statement demonstrates a concerning philosophy of "it's all too hard so lets' do away with regulation" is more likely to be construed as a lack of will on the part of management rather than any serious attempt to really address safety concerns. Modern technology and, if required, a modest increase in funding would undoubtedly remedy policing issues.

As for the second statement I am unaware of any recent community consultation that has taken place around this issue, indeed I would ask as to "where and when" such consultation has taken place?

However, I am sympathetic to the current situation where the section above Albert Town has a restricted uplift between certain hours and above the first rapid from downstream of the outlet the 5 knot speed restriction remains in place Current regulations are indeed complex and commonly misunderstood and clearly do need to be simplified. Complicated regulations have undoubtedly led to management difficulties

In my opinion, it lacks any logic from a safety perspective to then propose a complete uplift sighting safety concerns – given the acknowledged increase in passive recreation and commercial use in this stretch of water. It is a far more plausible argument to consider an extension of the 5 knot restriction down to the Albert Town Bridge, a much clearer readily identifiable landmark

There is ample opportunity to power boat the river below the bridge. Indeed, many would argue the river below the bridge is far more suited to power boating. Given the dramatic increases in usage of the upper river a 5 knot speed restriction through its entire length would undoubtedly be far simpler to understand, manage and police. Additionally, it would certainly be less disruptive to residents and

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

passive users alike and ultimately better reflect the upper rivers natural amenity values for those seeking a more peaceful recreation. Unprecedented growth and alarming forecasts for the immediate future would suggest that demands for recreational amenity will only become more intense. In today's society there is a need to recognise that it is no longer plausible to have the freedom to be able to "do everything everywhere at any time" particularly when certain activities have the potential to adversely affect the quiet enjoyment of others. Naturally, it is essential our region should accommodate all recreational pursuits. This point illustrates the underlying need and rationale for the development of a comprehensive strategic plan that provides for all recreational needs and which is sympathetic to the regions outstanding natural features. Clearly this would demand meaningful community consultation. In the medium to long term this would undoubtedly assist efficient management of our regions world class attributes and resources and logically and sympathetically assist in better management decisions and outcomes.

At present the proposal to uplift speed restrictions lacks logic and fails to address the significance of this very special part of the Clutha River. Additionally, it fails to identify the unprecedented increase in demand for recreational amenity.

Furthermore, and even more alarmingly, it poses significant health and safety issues for all water users.

---

#172

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 4:14:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 4:15:57 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:26  
**IP Address:** 122.57.208.64

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Iain Miller

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I see no benefit to public amenity of a change to current limits.

# #173

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 7:12:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 7:16:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:53  
**IP Address:** 122.58.51.225

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Martin Robb

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not agree that powerboats should be able to use the river as it would compromise the safety of swimmers, fishers and other recreational users of the river. I also believe it is likely to adversely affect the riverbanks.

#174

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 8:21:13 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 8:28:33 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:19  
**IP Address:** 203.100.223.96

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anna Scott Walker

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha needs to be motor free. As a mother with children who frequent the river, at the mouth of the outlet, down to the Albert town bridge and as far as the red bridge at luggate. It is imperative for everyone's safety. Not just those with children. There are a huge amount of active individuals who use stand up paddle boards, kayaks, rubber tyres, motorless boats, not to mention the constant stream of bridge jumpers etc...

#175

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 20, 2017 8:44:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 20, 2017 9:00:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:16  
**IP Address:** 203.118.172.126

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kathryn Collins

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are too many people kayaking, swimming & diving in the Clutha river between the outlet & the alberttown bridge to warrant an open  
Speed limit for jet boats. The danger would be extreme. My own family have been using the river for all of the above for over 40 years & I'd  
like to think that my grandchildren can continue to experience the same pleasures without having to worry about speeding jet boats.  
Also, the speeding boats do contribute to the erosion of Deans Bank.  
Jet boating should either be banned or restricted to 5 knots

---

# #176

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 10:27:49 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 10:31:33 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:44  
**IP Address:** 120.18.3.76

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Michael Barker

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Apart from the obvious impact environmentally particularly to the fisheries, after all this is a protected area, speed on the roads is a big contributory factor and so the same will apply to waterways. There is no safety/ emergency facilities available within a close enough area. For years this stretch of river has been safe for swimmers and children floating down the river in rubber rings and alike. Please can we keep it that way?

---



#177

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 10:39:43 AM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 10:42:28 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:45  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah baumanis

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It's a popular swimming place and it would be a shame to loose the freedom to go for a swim in nature there in peace. It's too popular and beautiful to be Ruined by speeding boats .... we fish there and boats scare the fish and it's the perfect place for family's cooling off in the summer... there is plenty of other areas they have to use... keep it beautiful

---

# #178

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 1:27:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 1:32:30 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:03  
**IP Address:** 125.239.129.192

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Andrew Thompson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Disagree with the lift of 5 knot speed limit from outlet to Albert Town bridge. High use area for swimmers and rafters and kayakers and children. Borders residential houses.  
All motorised craft should be banned from this stretch of river completely.

---

#179

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 1:42:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 2:01:51 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:44  
**IP Address:** 203.184.52.132

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Erin Murdie

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Clause 51 would allow applications for speed up lifting from Clutha outlet camp ground rather than from the current marker by Albert town. Having vessels operating at speed through this beautiful area would cause significant disruption and danger to swimmers, floaters, fishing, eco life and to the serenity of the area. As a regular walker of the track along this section of the river, being able to enjoy an area that is not disturbed by motorised vehicles is great pleasure, it would be devastating to have this lost to commercial operations.

---

# #180

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 1:57:01 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 2:11:51 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:49  
**IP Address:** 49.224.103.133

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Alan Robert Richardson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There is no way the QLDC have the ability to police the river now, let alone with the new reg's. During the summer holiday period you see all the time high speed jet boats on the river after the hours posted. No one around to pull them up and boats not registered so I can photograph and dob them in. The amount of people on the river is the summer holidays and high speed jet boats don't mix.

---

# #181

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 3:32:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 3:34:19 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:38  
**IP Address:** 122.61.108.253

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Karen Birkby

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would suggest no motor boats of any kind at all

---

# #182

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 3:35:21 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 3:43:44 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:22  
**IP Address:** 122.61.108.253

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Richard Birkby

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

1. Safety. The upper section of the river is regularly used by unpowered river users. Any relaxation of the rules would further endanger this user group.
  2. Noise. Jet propelled watercraft are extremely noisy and can already be heard as far away as Aubrey Road. The beauty and tranquility of this stretch over river would be further degraded if more boats are running faster for longer.
  3. Fishing. Deans Bank is a world famous fishing destination. Jet boat use doesn't make for good fly fishing. Increasing the speed and frequency of powered craft on the river will be detrimental to the fishery.
  4. Surely this section of river should have a year round 5knot limit or even a total ban on powered craft during my summer.
-

# #183

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:15:38 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:17:56 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:18  
**IP Address:** 121.99.105.40

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kansas Davis

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Unrestricted speed in areas where people swim, fish, kayak or float in the river is dangerous. Especially during summer when there are a lot of people using different parts of the river, not just the swimming hole in Albert Town.



# #184

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:38:29 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:39:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:07  
**IP Address:** 111.69.115.196

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Marian Krogh

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It's a beautiful area, a great place to swim, kayak or paddle board. Speed boats zooming up and down will ruin this.

---

# #185

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:52:14 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:54:46 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:31  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

john langley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

i support the status quo namely the 5k restriction. An increase in speed will increase risk to swimmers, kayaks, snorkelers and be obnoxious in terms of noise

# #186

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 4:58:18 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 5:03:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:47  
**IP Address:** 121.75.219.204

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Carlmurphy79@hotmail.com Murphy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I regularly use this area for swimming and fishing. I have already noticed a dramatic drop in fish numbers over the past 5 years. As this is a major spawning ground isn't this going to make it worse

---

# #187

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 5:45:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 5:51:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:21  
**IP Address:** 121.75.80.29

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Raymond John Gregg

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like to see it remain at 5 knots. Due to the use of this section of river by rafters and divers along with swimmers..Also due to the noise of jet boats. so close to residential area

#188

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 7:10:04 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 7:13:39 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:34  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Helen Clarke

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not want to see the speed limit increased on the upper reaches of the Clutha river.

# #189

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 7:30:41 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 7:32:28 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:47  
**IP Address:** 115.189.102.51

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Erika Jane Burke

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We need to keep it as safe as possible for other river users

---

#190

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 9:23:54 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 21, 2017 9:30:30 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:35  
**IP Address:** 121.75.217.248

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jo Murphy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

For the safety of my children and other families, I would like there to be no motorised craft of any kind between the Outlet and Albert Town.

---

# #191

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 7:41:56 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 7:51:43 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:46  
**IP Address:** 125.238.200.57

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Abby Gallagher

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The top section of the Clutha River, from Albert Town to the lake should be kept free of motor crafts entirely in my opinion. The section of the river we are speaking about is a very popular swimming area, and people should be able to feel safe when doing so. I swim down from the lake to Albert Town frequently in summer and hope to continue to do so in the future without a boat running me over!



#192

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 7:50:39 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 8:02:52 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:13  
**IP Address:** 111.69.85.180

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Louise Freeman

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have owned a property in Albert Town since 1974 and our family has always used the Clutha River for water activities; swimming, kayaking, tubing and rafting. Now our eight grandchildren stay at our property and want to be able to use the river in the same way. While grandchildren were swimming and jumping off the jetty recently, 9 October I think, there were two boats on the river, one red and one blue, which didn't seem to be sticking to any speed limits.  
I would like to see the river a safe place for all users, swimmers and boaties alike.

---

# #193

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 8:50:01 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 8:55:10 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:08  
**IP Address:** 49.224.107.43

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lynette Graham

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I feel strongly that the Albert Town section of the Clutha River should remain peaceful and safe for local residents, swimmers, fishers, snorkellers, kayakers, paddle boarders, rafters, bikers, and walkers! Mororised boats and jet skis need to be kept away from this area or at the least kept under tight time and speed restrictions!  
Keep the people safe and this area peaceful and calm!! Please!! ♥

---

# #194

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 6:25:26 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 9:55:54 AM  
**Time Spent:** 03:30:27  
**IP Address:** 122.57.188.213

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian Turnbull

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Not everybody subscribes to the view that if you aren't burning vast amounts of fossil fuel and making a loud noise then you can't be having fun. Please preserve this part of the Clutha River for more simple pleasures that are based on an appreciation of natural values, and not driven by commercial imperatives.

# #195

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 11:30:25 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 11:36:37 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:11  
**IP Address:** 150.107.173.214

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Scott West

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Many people use the Clutha River from the outlet to Albert town for swimming, kayaking, supping etc. Any increase in the speed limit, and/or numbers of motorised craft is going to make these activities less safe. Also I'm concerned about noise pollution. We need to keep this as peaceful and pristine as possible.

---

#196

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 11:32:30 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 11:40:29 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:58  
**IP Address:** 101.98.182.170

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

nick johnson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Outlet to Albertain has many other recreational users who are negatively impacted by unrestricted use of motorised boats. Bylaws should benefit all users not just a select few. Five knots right through this zone would be much more appropriate for the majority of users.

# #197

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 4:36:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 5:14:26 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:37:50  
**IP Address:** 79.142.68.136

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Adam Wood

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly oppose the proposal to lift the speed restriction on boats using the Clutha river between the Outlet and the Albert Town bridge for the following reasons:

- We have a house in Albert Town and frequently swim in the river with our young children over summer. We also enjoy floating down the river from the Outlet to the Albert Town bridge. If the speed restriction is lifted on the river then boats and jet skis will inevitably travel at high speed down the river, making these activities unsafe. We believe there is a high risk that if the speed limit is lifted then it will only be a matter of time until a swimmer is seriously injured by a boat or jet ski - this should be an enormous concern to the Council, particularly given the new Health and Safety legislation.
  - In our view there is a much higher number of people that use the river for swimming than for boating. We fail to see why the desire of boats to travel at high speeds on the river (including for commercial purposes) should take precedence over the safety of a large number of people swimming in the river.
  - Like many people, including a high number of tourists, we enjoy walking down the Outlet track alongside the river. The peaceful environment we all enjoy will be ruined by what will inevitably become a constant flow of noisy jet boats and jet skis using the river at high speed.
  - Lake Wanaka provides an enormous amount of room for jet boats and jet skis to use at speed - it is quite unnecessary for them to also be able to use the river at high speed
  - We have read news articles where the harbour master suggests that, as it is difficult to enforce the current speed restriction, it should be removed. This is an absurd argument. Just because it is difficult for the police to enforce speed limits on our roads, this does not mean that speed limits should be lifted! Also, presumably it is equally difficult to enforce a speed limit on boats of 5 knots within 200m of the shore of Lake Wanaka to protect the safety of swimmers - does this mean this restriction will also be lifted?
  - to conclude, we strongly submit that for the ongoing protection of swimmers in the river, and to ensure the quiet enjoyment of the river for everyone, the current restrictions should remain in place.
-

# #198

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 5:31:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 5:48:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:17:06  
**IP Address:** 222.153.253.103

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Charlotte Dempster

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---



**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly oppose the proposal to lift the current speed restriction on boats and jet skis using the Clutha river between the outlet and the Albert town bridge.

We have a house in Albert town and swimming with our children in the river is a frequent activity over summer. They also often paddle and play at the edge of the river, and we float down the river with them from the outlet down to the bridge. Currently this is a safe activity, however if the speed limit is lifted there is grave danger of serious injury or death to swimmers using the river.

Boats are able to travel at speed at multiple other sites around the area, and there is the whole of Lake Wanaka for them to use. There are only limited places that are safe and easily accessible for swimmers .

The Outlet track currently provides a pleasant, and peaceful environment to cycle and walk. This will be adversely affected by a constant stream of noisy jet boats and jet skis.

The argument that the current speed restriction is too difficult to enforce is ridiculous. Most people will adhere to the laws as they stand and by lifting the limit the council must be aware that the potential for injury will put them at risk through the Health and Safety legislation.

I strongly oppose to lifting the speed limit in this very built up and busy area. The interests of many swimmers and children living in the area should be protected rather than those select few boat owners.

---

#199

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 6:55:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 7:03:18 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:17  
**IP Address:** 222.152.60.158

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Craig Smith

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I wish there to be no motorised craft from where the river begins flowing at the outlet (below the boat ramp) until the Albert Town bridge. It will be far more beneficial to the town and the area to have it peaceful and safe for users now and in the future. The harbourmaster says he wants it "nice and simple to keep people safe. This will make it easier to enforce". I should think no motorised craft will tick both of these boxes perfectly, and if the council listens to the community, this is what will happen.

---

#200

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 9:41:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 9:43:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:42  
**IP Address:** 222.152.56.60

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jonathan Homer

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As there are a number of users on the river during summer I believe speed limits should be in place for the safety of all. Isn't that the reason why we have limits on speed on our roads?

# #201

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 9:37:19 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 22, 2017 9:58:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:21:09  
**IP Address:** 125.237.164.25

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Mary Gilmour

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We want to retain the peacefulness of the river so we can bike along it without noise.

We also paddleboard down the river and exit either at the Albert Town camping ground/bridge area or all the way to the red bridge. I love biking to and swimming in the Clutha by the diving platform in the hot summer. We enjoy seeing people quietly fishing near Deans Bank.

Please be careful not to turn this into a jetboat and jetski cowboy town. They can go to Queenstown for that. The boating traffic in summer is getting dangerous. There are too many cars and trailers along the bike path. Also, the lake is getting more and more boy racer type boats with extremely loud engines. Isn't there a noise limit?

---

#202

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 1:06:52 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 1:10:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:32  
**IP Address:** 122.57.213.181

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sam Metcalfe

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a regular lake And river swimmer I think it is madness to boats go fast on that stretch of river. It's such a lovely thing to float down the Clutha which I do with my kids. Terrible not to be able to do that

---

#203

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 2:42:52 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 2:45:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:44  
**IP Address:** 116.251.149.109

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

AL Taylor

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a regular visitor to Wanaka in winter and summer, the section of the Clutha from the outlet to Albert Town bridge is a regular swimming and kayaking location.  
The main lake feels less and less safe each year; while this section of the river is a beautiful quiet spot for walkers and water users alike.

---

#204

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 3:20:39 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 3:31:16 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:10:37  
**IP Address:** 101.53.222.52

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rod Walker

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am comfortable with the current situation and see absolutely no need to change it. I fish, swim, kayak and regularly walk the track of the this section of the river. Allowing boats to travel and high speed will definitely create a hazard for me. Knowing that I can be on the river and not get run over by some jet ski or boat is comforting. All boats wanting to travel the river can do so from launching below the bridge and should be encouraged to do so. Pressure from those who wish to hoon down and up the river from the lake whilst endangering sedentary users is not right. They can still travel but at the 5 knot pace. I have been fishing up the Hunter river when jet boats and skis come flying around the corner and it is not a pleasant feeling trying to get out of the way. This is on a river that has the slower speed restriction lifted at certain times and it makes for a very unpleasant experience for me. The number of places where non motorised activities can be safely undertaken on a river are few. Leave the Clutha alone.

---



#205

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 5:28:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 5:51:55 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:23:20  
**IP Address:** 121.75.84.73

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Megan Tracy Van

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Each year, from around December 10th onward and throughout the summer, my teenage daughter and I float from halfway down the stretch of Clutha in question, to the bridge, on an almost daily basis. It's something we have always done. Besides the float/swim, we kayak on the Clutha at least once a fortnight. Often we take friends, and the children jump on and off the kayaks as we make our way from the Outlet to the Bridge. We also have 2 large tractor tubes which we float on regularly, from the Outlet to just before the bridge. A family member dives for lures up at the Outlet on a regular basis with a snorkel and mask. He is very careful about where and when he does this and is mindful of boat users, but imagine the carnage should the speed limit be increased!

My greatest concern is for our safety during the float/swim that we do. Often there is a group of 7 to 8 of us submerged in the river, and even with boats sticking to the 5 knot rule, we have to be vigilant in order to stay safe. I have lived here all my life and I saw Deans Bank disintegrate (on the corner opposite the Hikuwai Subdivision) when jetboats used to tear up and down the Clutha with seemingly no lower speed limit. Consequently, the limit was lowered, and subsequent bank damage almost ceased thereafter.

The lower reaches below the Clutha bridge are far better suited to boats travelling at higher speeds, given that there are very few areas suitable for swimming. Apart from the confluence of the Cardrona and Clutha, the lower reaches not such an accessible, popular part of the river for recreational users.

The way I see it, we have lower traffic speed limits through residential areas for a good reason, and as regular users of the Clutha (I have lived on Gunn Road for 44 years), it stands to reason that our council will protect we river users in a similar manner, by limiting boat speed on the stretch of water outlined.

I have several friends who swim parts of the stretch of water in question; they train against the current. Surely, given this is the most popular and heavily used part of the river, raising speed limits is not only irresponsible, but incredibly dangerous. There is the open lake for boaties to travel at speed on if they wish.

---

#206

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 5:48:18 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 6:00:59 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:41  
**IP Address:** 121.99.141.25

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Philippa Jane Clearwater

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am not in support of the suggestion that boats travel along the upper Clutha (outlet to Albert Town bridge) with no speed restriction during the day. At present the riverside walkway (Outlet track) is a lovely tranquil place to enjoy the natural beauty of the river. Walking or biking the track, swimming in the river and its eddies, swinging into the river from the rope swing, kayaking or paddleboarding, or jumping off the Albert Town bridge are how the families and residents of Wanaka and Albert Town want to use the river. The occasional jet boat is a noisy disruption but can be tolerated as long as their speed is safe enough to allow the other activities. The recent Jet Boat Marathon race showed just how noisy and dangerous having boats at high speed on the river could be.

I'd like to see the 5 knot restriction in place along the whole of the upper part of the river from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge, and there should be NO provision to uplift that limit during the day.

I realise that enforcement of this restriction is difficult but I still think it should be in place, to best protect the interests of the majority of river users.

---

#207

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 7:07:20 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 7:14:11 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:50  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.125

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jeanette Hatten

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The river from the Outlet to the Albert Town bridge has a peaceful walking track beside it and is used by many people to fish, swim, float down the river and kayak.

Taking away the 5 knot regulation would definitely impact on this section of the river. When jetboats come down the river faster than this (as they do already) it creates quite a wash that disturbs the water as well as creates quite a wake on the edge of the river.

With increase in the traffic on the river it affects the other recreational activities on this section of the river. In particular the swimmers and people floating down the river are put in danger. For the fisherman it is also affects the water adversely and since this is a very popular place to fish it is very disruptive.

Going forward I see the long term plan for this section of the river is to keep it quiet and calm so it doesn't adversely affect all these leisure activities.

---

#208

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 15, 2017 6:18:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:00:09 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 118.92.73.77

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Alistair Moore

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I live in Dunedin, but own a house in Albert Town, and have a thorough understanding of the Clutha River between the Outlet and the Albert Town bridge, and of the two walking and cycling tracks that flank its length.

This section of river and its banks are unique in Central Otago for the combination of beauty, accessibility, and multiple use opportunities. The numbers of people that use it annually will only increase with the development of the new subdivisions along Aubrey and Outlet Roads. With sensible planning all users will continue to be able to enjoy this extraordinary piece of water, but to remove the current boat speed limit will lead to conflict between the various users, and inevitably accidents and perhaps even fatalities. There is also the issue of increased engine and exhaust noise which will lessen the experience of track users and affect (from personal experience on race events) nearby house owners.

There is perhaps even an argument that this stretch of river should be off limits to power boats—there is plenty of water downstream from the Albert Town bridge which is not as intensively used (and even then some speed limits would seem necessary), and it is not really necessary to use it as access between Lake Wanaka and Albert Town, being a short drive with vehicle and trailer to any one of a number of launching places. However as I said above, all users should be able to continue to enjoy it with sensible planning.

Sensible planning is to maintain the 5 knot limit, and sensible planning should not be derailed by reported enforcement difficulties and individual lobby groups.

Thank you for reading this submission.

---



#209

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:09:17 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:10:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:26  
**IP Address:** 88.207.134.61

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

ANDREA ODDONE

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

IT WOULD BE DANGEROUS FOR SWIMMERS AND OTHERS

---

# #210

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:15:21 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:30:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:30  
**IP Address:** 118.92.220.170

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Richard Kay

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly oppose the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017 to lift the speed restriction for boats on the Clutha River between the Outlet and the Albert Town Bridge for the following reasons:

- We love visiting Wanaka and Albert Town and in summer we always use the river to swim with our young children along with family and friends. Like so many, we enjoy kayaking and tubing down from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge and allowing boats and jet skis to go faster along this stretch of river will needlessly endanger the lives and safety of Kiwi holiday makers and tourists. It will be only a matter of time before there is a serious injury especially around the New Year holiday period.
  - The adverse environmental impact of this proposed bylaw should also be considered. The tranquility will disappear with the high pitched sound of more boats and jet skis going up and down this stretch of river. And the bigger wake from the increased boat use and speed will cause further erosion problems along the river bank. And isn't Lake Wanaka big enough for boats and jet skis?
  - We have seen media stories that the harbour master suggests that because it is hard to enforce the current speed restriction it should be removed. This is a ridiculous argument and seems like the District Council is giving up on enforcing the rules.
  - Leave the Clutha River in peace and instead provide the harbour master with increased resources to enforce speed rules and ensure the safety of people on the water.
-

#211

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:39:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:44:56 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:07  
**IP Address:** 125.237.110.95

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Yvonne Ludlow

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

There are a number of people who use the river for several recreational activities. If this law is passed this will result in accidents, which otherwise could have been avoided.

---

# #212

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 9:18:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 10:35:22 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:17:21  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.206

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Patrick Perkins

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Outlet / Alberttown speed restrictions ?

I'm writing this submission in favour of opening up the operating hours and speed limits from the Outlet to Alberttown and down stream on the Clutha River, however with restrictions in place.

My reasons for this I will point out.

Please also note I'm a current commercial operator, operating on the Clutha River.

As a keen local fisherman / jet boater with a family, I am restricted under the current bylaw to take my family fishing or jet boating after 6pm during summer, and 4pm during the winter ?

I do not see any reason there being any restriction from the Alberttown Bridge and down stream as there is no built up residential properties down stream from the bridge apart from a handful of houses opposite the Alberttown boating ramp.

It would be nice to maybe take the family fishing or jet boating during a nice evening, however as stated and with the current bylaw you're not able?

Sure you can still boat, but speed is restricted to 5 knots after the above times which makes boating unrealistic and just not possible.

As a local, why should the average boater be restricted by some bylaw ( which currently doesn't work ) on speed restrictions which makes boating impossible.

I believe by making some small changes we could have an outcome that suits all.

1) Keep the 5 knots from the outlet to the current 5 knot buoy.

By doing this, this will allow the fishermen, swimmers etc a safe haven and area which is currently in place.

2) Remove times and speed from below the Alberttown Bridge, this would then allow the average kiwi jet boater / fisherman and family, to enjoy the river during evenings and will more than likely reduce boats from entering the outlet.

By having two small changes will keep families wanting to swim in a safe zoned speed area safe and within a dedicated area. It also allows the fishermen to have an area of probably less traffic/noise.

As I stated above, yes I'm a commercial operator and this is not in favour to benefit myself in any way. I can't operate after the stated times anyway as it's in our current operational plan.

I'm writing this on behalf of all the users wanting to enjoy the river should the lake be too rough to operate, or the general joe public wanting to boat during the evening.

It must also be noted the following,

A boat doing 5 knots creates more noise for a longer period which creates larger wake creating more damage to river banks. It's also more dangerous going past kayakers as larger waves are created.

I hope that a decision is made that suits all users wanting to enjoy this special place that we are so lucky to have.

Best regards Patrick Perkins

# #213

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 23, 2017 5:34:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 23, 2017 10:36:18 PM  
**Time Spent:** 05:01:48  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.188

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

geoffrey Blackler

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe that part of the NSB 2017 bylaw wants it to remain as the 2014 bylaw with the 5 knots speed limit from the outlet of Lake Wanaka to the Albert town bridge for powered craft's/vessel's.

I personally as a fly fisherman would like to have all power controlled craft's/vessel's to be banned on this stretch of river, I also love to walk and bike along the fisherman's track ,

It is a exceptional area of beauty and the peace and tranquility of the area is more valued than a slow noisy power controlled craft/vessel that creates wakes in the water and disturbs walkers, fishermen and those that love to kyak and float down that stretch of river in safety.

There is plenty of river for the powered crafts/vessel's to enjoy below the Albert town bridge for as long as they wish.

Wanaka is becoming a very populated place and one of the top tourist attractions in NZ so it is only going to get busier and noisier on this section of the Clutha river, so now would be a good time to set this into the bylaw for the peace and tranquil seekers of our societies from all over the world and not to be spoilt by the noisy and polluted users of powered craft/vessels.

Thanks :-)

---



#214

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 8:19:56 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 8:55:19 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:35:22  
**IP Address:** 92.143.184.37

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Richard Owen Boyd

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I do not support the proposed vessel speed uplifting on the upper Clutha River.

-there has been no consultation with the public or river users

-it defies common sense and poses undue safety risks to the public recreational water based passive use of this part of the river which in my experience is increasing rapidly

-it would increase noise pollution in an area enjoyed for walking along an otherwise natural and peaceful setting

-the upper Clutha River has an internationally recognised trout fishery (Deans Bank) which the speed uplift is in conflict with

-to suggest a reason for the uplifting is an inability to enforce the current speed limit is pathetic and weak, and avoids every aspect of what constitutes responsible management. There are many ways to effectively enforce bylaws, all that is required is a willingness to do so. The public expects more than this drivel from QLDC.

-it is time QLDC addressed the existing and growing recreational use of the upper Clutha River by comprehensively examining current passive recreational use and patterns, consults honestly and fully with the community and identifies community aspirations for the future, and develops a plan for its future management that protects its recreational values and natural environment for future generations.

Richard Boyd  
1Baker Grove  
Wanaka

---

#215

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 9:42:00 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:05:44 AM  
**Time Spent:** 01:23:43  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.125

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Geoffrey Stewart Hatten

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The stretch of water from the Outlet to the Albert Town bridge has a wide range of users, including boat and jet ski drivers, fishermen, divers, swimmers, people floating down the river with or without flotation aids, and walkers and cyclists on the Outlet track. This section of the the river is almost certainly the most heavily used in the Wanaka area, and is valued for its accessibility and peacefulness. I am concerned that opening this area to boats and jet skis travelling at unrestricted speeds will not only threaten the character of the resource but also pose a very real risk to the safety of other water users. I believe that there is ample room on Lake Wanaka for those water users who wish to travel at speeds in excess of 5 knots. I have inserted below some text from the website of Maritime New Zealand which appears to me to be highly relevant to the proposal. I believe that there would be few if any points between the Outlet and Albert Town bridge where it would be possible to comply with Maritime New Zealand's guidelines.

5. Stick to safe speeds

Keep to a safe speed – this means slowing down in situations where you may find it difficult to see another boat, eg in waves, rain, or fog, or when there is glare on the water. Understand and operate within the speed limits – the maximum speed permitted for all boats in New Zealand is 5 knots (about 9 km/h) within 200 metres of shore or any boat with a dive flag, and within 50 metres of any other boat or swimmer.

---

# #216

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 10:23:30 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:06:28 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:42:58  
**IP Address:** 121.99.141.25

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Daniel Clearwater

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My objection is specifically to the speed upliftings on the Clutha River. I am an Albert Town resident and frequent user of the Clutha river track and Deans bank.

I am not a power boater, but I cannot see the need to allow any vessel to navigate between the outlet and Albert town bridge at high speed.

This stretch of river offers huge amenity for walkers, cyclist, fisherfolk and paddlers/floaters, being so close to Wanaka/Albert Town. The amenity value would be considerably reduced by the presence of noisy, high speed vessels on this stretch of river. Not to mention the safety concerns of power vessels versus swimmers/paddlers/floaters.

Whilst I recognize that the new bylaw is actually slightly more restrictive than the previous one, with morning and evening 'slow' periods, the ammendment of a bylaw should be the chance to put right a previous wrong. With that in mind, I propose that the 5 knot speed restriction remain at all times between the outlet and Albert Town campground.

I haven't been bothered by Jetboats up until recently with the Jet Marathon. Although I know the race was a special case, with the required permissions, I could hear the boats at my house. I'd also been for a bike ride the previous day, and felt afraid for my safety to take a swim in the river afterwards. Not to mention the visual impact of a boat ripping through a beautiful and very public space.

As Wanaka grows, more and more residents will be looking to enjoy the river environs close to home. Why do skippers need to transit that stretch of water at high speed, when there are boat launching options at the outlet and Albert Town? Are there not huge distances of river in the region, which are away from people's homes and backyard recreation areas?

I cannot accept that the desires of a minority group (owners of high speed vessels) could outweigh the impact on the river amenity for the majority (residents close to the river and river users).

As such I implore the representatives of the ratepayers to actually represent us; by ensuring the year round amenity of this section of river for the rate payers is fully protected from future degradation by a minority user group.

---

# #217

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 10:39:04 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:10:33 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:31:29  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jane Hawkey

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly do not support this proposal on the following grounds:

This proposal is a total disregard for the residents of Alberttown especially the residents of the riverbank and thousands of river and track users!

The intrinsic nature of this iconic river particularly the stretch from the Outlet to the Albert town bridge is one of peace! And our connection to nature and the water....this is the sole reason we chose to live here and have done for the past 23 years..... It is the quiet, soul restoring quality of the river that keeps us here and although we have made concessions with regards to noise pollution from motorised vessels using the river- ultimately any further increase in access and speed by these vessels will destroy the qualities that myself and the wider community including the international community have enjoyed to date.

Furthermore the safety of river users particularly children is of paramount concern to me! My children and the community use this river for swimming, diving, playing, learning river skills, kayaking, standup paddle boarding, floating on a daily basis...sometimes multiple times a day in the summer months! This is one of the most special activities that people and children can enjoy with abandon in this pristine paradisiacal section of the Clutha!

This is a privilege and acknowledged as such and cannot be threatened for any reason!

Even now when the kids are jumping into the river and diving down and swirling around in the eddies I fear for their safety when I can hear a powerboat or jetski approaching!

It is my desire to provide a completely safe haven for children and adults alike on this section of river....this is irreplaceable! it is a perfect river for children to learn about water and river safety and how to manoeuvre in moving water and currents....this needs to be facilitated without the threat of getting run over or killed by a speeding vessel!

You only need to look at recent boating tragedies where people in the water have not been seen by the fast moving vessel and have been sadly killed! There is an accident waiting to happen on this section of the river!

I totally support not just a reduction of speed to 5 knots by motorised vessels but A COMPLETE BAN OF MOTORISED VESSELS FROM THE OUTLET TO THE ALBERTTOWN BRIDGE! This would preserve the world class experience hundreds of people per day have come to enjoy and seek out as a pristine part of the world to recreate, fish, walk, bike and find their solitude and rejuvenation in what is progressively becoming a crazy busy town!

I dearly hope you can see the sense of declining this proposal and even going a step further and creating an even more tranquil place that supports less invasive types of activities which don't involve speed and motors!

Take a step in the right direction and preserve what is possibly one of the last and most beautiful stretches of river in NZ if not the world!

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on this matter

Kind regards  
Jane Hawkey  
(Riverbank resident)

---



# #218

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 9:40:39 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:11:27 AM  
**Time Spent:** 01:30:48  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Alan Cutler

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This submission opposes the proposed uplifting of speed limits on the Clutha River and the removal of time restrictions on the section below Albert Town. This submission advocates for greater recognition of the ONF status of the river corridor and prohibitions and/or greater controls on motorised craft on the Clutha River.

Background.

The Clutha River and the related Clutha River corridor are highly valued as a recreational asset for a diverse range of users. Potential conflicts arise between those involved in 'passive' or non-motorised activities and those involved in motorised activities.

The Clutha River and adjoining corridor of riverbanks are classified as an Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) in the QLDC District Plan. This definition acknowledges the natural values of the river corridor. Landscape values relate to both the ecosystem as well as human perceptions and aesthetics. The presence of motorised craft compromise natural/wildlife values, aesthetic values and the enjoyment a significant proportion of river users attain from the river corridor. The Council is responsible for the protection and upholding of ONF values, therefore restrictions on the presence and activities of motorised craft on the Clutha is essential.

Existing time limits on motorised activities address some of the potential conflicts, primarily with regard to fishers. During the day, and particularly during the summer months, potential conflicts arise between motorised craft and swimmers/river floaters, kayakers, SUP's and other 'passive' craft. The presence of speeding motor boats compromises the peace and quite and enjoyment river bank users including picnickers, walkers and cyclists.

In the last few years there has been an increase in use of the river and the river corridor. A significant change has been the numbers of jet skis and squirt boats that race up and down the river, particularly throughout the reach adjacent to Albert Town. Commercial jet boat use of the river has also increased. Jet skis are particularly obnoxious as their level of disturbance is comparable to trail bikes. It is accepted that trail bikes need separate and defined areas and they are excluded from passive recreation areas and walking and cycling trails. Specific limitations on jet skis are justified and they should be excluded from the Clutha River.

In advocating for increased controls on motorised craft throughout the Clutha River corridor it is essential Council acknowledges that motorised craft, including jet skis presently have largely unrestricted use of lakes Wanaka and Hawea as well as many rivers in the District. Furthermore motorised craft have exclusive use of significant outstanding natural river corridors such as the Shotover River gorge. It is timely for this Council to respect the general public's use, interest in and passive enjoyment of the Outstanding Natural River corridors in the District.

Proposals.

1. Motorised craft on the Clutha River, from the Outlet to the confluence with the Cardrona River should be restricted to a speed limit of 5 knots.
2. Jet skis should be banned from the section of the Clutha River between the outlet and the confluence of the Cardrona River.
3. The existing time limits for motorised craft on the Clutha River between the Outlet and the Red Bridge should be retained.

In advocating for the proposal 1 above it is noted that a ban on all motorised craft is desirable, however given the existing and established use a complete ban could be considered to be overly prohibitive and disenfranchise a portion, albeit relatively small portion, of the population.

#219

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 12:04:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 12:17:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:41  
**IP Address:** 125.239.133.169

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jeffrey William Donaldson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It makes sense it's easier to understand than the current rule and doesn't require an individual to try and work out where the boundary is  
As all recreational users currently share the river downstream of the buoyed 5knot area without any major issues it makes sense to  
apply the time restriction rule for the full length of the river under QLDC authority

I am also disappointed to note that most of the reported info about this change has been incorrect particularly in regard to the remaining  
5knot swimming area

The public are confused, as are users, make it simple 'time restriction only"plus 5knot remains for swimming area behind the island

---

#220

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 12:25:48 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 12:57:32 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:31:44  
**IP Address:** 158.140.226.92

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Niamh Tomes

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

While I agree with simplifying the Navigation Safety Bylaw and aligning it where possible with the MTA, the Clutha and Wanaka Lake are central to quality of life in the district and have broad recreational use. Safety and noise pollution are already eroding the Clutha's attraction to swimmers and non-motorised vessel operators. At the least, speed on the Clutha should be restricted to a maximum of five knots with no motorised craft in areas popular with families and swimmers.

Rather than compile rules around where motorised craft are not allowed, perhaps consideration should be given to restrict motorised craft to limited portion of local waterway.

In short: relaxing restrictions satisfies a minority of motorised craft owners at the expense of the majority of us who love the beautiful waters and peace of our waterways

---

# #221

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 1:02:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 1:14:15 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:32  
**IP Address:** 125.237.165.234

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Richard Sidey

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The 5 knot zone from Lake Wanaka Outlet to the body downstream needs to be extended to the Albert Town bridge as it is currently dangerous with an accident waiting to happen due to the popularity and number of powered and unpowered recreational users. There are too many close calls with snorkellers, tubers, rafters, paddleboarders, swimmers and kayakers from high speed jetboats. The noise of boats at speed also impacts the serenity of one of Wanakas most beautiful family walking areas.

#222

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 1:04:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 3:00:45 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:56:19  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jo Haines

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have lived on the banks of the Clutha at Albert Town for 18 years and I regularly walk/bike alongside the Clutha as well as swim and kayak in the river.

I disagree with the proposal to lift the present speed restrictions and it is my opinion that the present speed restrictions should apply to the river from Lake Wanaka outlet to the Hawea River confluence. This section of river is frequently used for unmotorised craft and swimmers as a safety consideration - it is only a matter of time that there is a collision/incident between users.

The Outlet Track is heavily used by walkers and bikers and I think the enjoyment of walking/biking alongside this Outstanding Natural Landscape environment is diminished by the sound of motorised craft racing up and down the river. The number of boats and jet skis used on the river is increasing as the population/visitor numbers increase therefore the negative impact of motorised craft is getting bigger.

I also believe the time restrictions should be kept as they presently are. Non-motorised users and riverside residents should be able to enjoy the river environment without the noise and adverse effects of motorised craft in the mornings and evenings.

---

#223

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 3:18:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 3:20:02 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:35  
**IP Address:** 49.224.107.24

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Inga booiman

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Because I don't think it is good for an area and we should let nature do nature

---

#224

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 10:57:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:28:19 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:30:48  
**IP Address:** 203.118.174.123

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Pedro Pimentel

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I completely disapprove of any kind of high-speed travel from the outlet through to the Albert Town bridge with exception of any emergencies.

Despite some 'slow speed periods' in the morning and evening have been contemplated in the bylaw, it is during the daytime that the river will most likely be also enjoyed by slow speed means of transportation like boards and kayaks hence increasing the potential for serious accidents.

The area has also seen an increase in population and houses and will see more and more people enjoying the area through its walks, fishing opportunities, mountain biking, swimming and floating not to mention the slow means of transportation like kayaks and paddle boards.

In my opinion, considering high speed travelling in this section of the river has way more disadvantages than advantages and should not be allowed at all. The whole section of river from the outlet to Albert Town (at least) should be a permanent slow zone.

There is plenty more river to travel at high speeds that won't impact so many people, risk lives and hinder the enjoyment of so many others at the same time.

---

#225

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 10:48:06 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 10:50:44 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:37  
**IP Address:** 121.75.218.82

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

roger north

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Want greater restrictions on speed, not fewer. I swim in the clutha, often drifting from outlet to albert town. Its already too unsafe to do this without a kayaker alongside. I do not trust jet boats to go at a speed in which they can react in time. Swimmers are in danger of they hug the shore line as we try to avoid willow strainers by staying further out.

#226

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 10:50:13 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 10:52:44 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:31  
**IP Address:** 203.96.201.4

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John Highton

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Private Bag 50072

Queenstown 9348

PROPOSED NAVIGATION SAFETY BYLAW AMENDMENTS 2017

Uplifting current speed restrictions Upper Clutha River.

Dear Sirs

I would like to make a submission against uplifting the speed limit on the section of the Clutha River between the Outlet of Lake Wanaka and Albert Town.

This is a highly valued and scenic section of the Clutha River adjacent to a rapidly growing population. It is suited to peaceful activities such as walking, biking, picnicking, swimming, fishing and other quiet recreational pursuits. Access has been improved with tracks to cater for these uses and to accommodate the increased numbers of people using this section of the river for peaceful pursuits.

All of these peaceful activities are disrupted by the intrusion of boats and especially jet boats and jet skis. Jet boats have large and noisy engines and large wakes both of which are disruptive to other river users. Jet skis have similar effects. The desire of a few boaters to negotiate this section of river at speed should not be allowed to predominate over the peaceful use of the river by the majority.

It is worth noting that jet boats were designed for use on braided rivers. In this environment they can spread out over several braids thus reducing the disruption to other river users. In addition, their ability to traverse shallows is necessary in braided rivers. None of this applies on a deep single stem river like the Upper Clutha.

With the increase in numbers in the Wanaka area especially in the Christmas and New Year period there is a danger that the whole nature of the upper Clutha could be changed towards becoming a noisy highway. Regulations should be in place to prevent this happening.

In my view powered boats should be excluded from this section of the river except for emergency use. If boat traffic is to be allowed it should be kept to 5 knots maximum to minimize disruption. There is no need for jet boats to travel at speed as there are no shallows to be negotiated.

In addition to the above considerations I also have some concerns about safety. When I fish the Upper Clutha in periods of lower flow, typically in February, I wade well out into the river. This is possible at the Outlet, at Hogan's and at Dean's Bank where there are gravel bars. I am concerned that jet boats and jet skis travelling at speed could result in a collision or swamping and dislodging wading fisherman with their wake.

Taking a wider view the above considerations also apply to Lake Wanaka. The increasing number of boats is becoming intrusive to other users and a danger to each other. Certain sections of the lake should be set aside and have powered boats excluded or their speed strictly limited. Paddock Bay is such an area. It is used by increasing numbers of anglers whose activities are disrupted by power boats travelling fast. I would suggest a 5 knot limit in this area as well.

There are huge areas of the Lake and Clutha River available to power boats. Serious consideration should be given to excluding them from some small areas where other uses predominate. This includes the Upper Clutha between the Outlet and Albert Town and Paddock Bay in the main Lake. If exclusion is not possible then at the very least boats should be restricted to 5 knots or less.

Yours sincerely

John Highton

#227

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 1:49:04 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 2:00:04 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:00  
**IP Address:** 202.9.116.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Graeme & Andy Oxley

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

We believe that an uplift of the 5 kn speed restriction between the Outlet and Albert Town bridge on the Clutha River will make the river significantly less safe for passive users of this section.

It should be remembered that this section of river has two adjacent camping grounds, one at the outlet and the other at Albert Town. These camping grounds add large numbers of passive users of the river - swimmers, paddleboarders, rafters and kayakers. Increasing the proximity of swiftly moving motorised boats to passive users will reduce safety.

There are large areas of the Clutha River and Lake Wanaka that offer unrestricted speed limits for motorised craft and keeping the 5 kn speed limit is not an unreasonable restriction on the movement of motorised craft and access to the Clutha River.

---

#228

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 3:30:44 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 3:40:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:22  
**IP Address:** 111.69.113.19

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Anthony Joseph Clarry

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am strongly against the granting of Consents for high speed private and, especially, commercial boat traffic from Lake Wanaka outlet to Albert Town bridge. This section of the river should remain peaceful and safe for local residents and visitors alike for swimming, fishing, rafting, walking, biking, and similar.

In particular, Commercial Jet-boating will, ultimately, involve accidents with people who may be swimming or just floating down the river. Isn't the Lake big enough?

Witness the Jet Boat fatality in Canterbury in mid October where a world class driver hit a clearly defined tree trunk .....

#229

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 6:15:09 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 25, 2017 6:27:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:19  
**IP Address:** 122.58.50.35

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lennon Bright

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Firstly I fish in that part of the river and don't want boats screaming past scaring all the fish away, Secondly all the swimming spots along that stretch of river wouldn't be very peaceful with boats and jet skis flying past, And thirdly the erosion to the river banks caused by the boats waves should be a strong reason not to do it to. Not to mention the noise that we hear from our house already that would be a lot worse if this goes ahead. I think you will find most residents around the river area of Albert Town would prefer if it was off limits to boats completely from the Albert Town bridge up stream.

---

#230

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 10:32:10 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 11:28:35 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:56:24  
**IP Address:** 122.57.214.213

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Lakeland Wanaka

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Michael Donald

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Currently the Bylaw does not make much sense and there is massive confusion through out the community. Currently 90% of private vessels we see on the Clutha River don't understand the speed restrictions and uplifting times and this proposed change will make the process simple to understand. The current 24 hours 5knot area around the outlet causes more bad than good in our opinion. During the approx 5 minutes it takes to travel though this area more wake, noise and nuisance is created by vessels at 5knots vs a vessel being able to quickly get through and away from this zone. We see no increase in safety concerns as vessels operate below this zone with no problems and by lifting the 24 hour speed restriction the vessel numbers aren't going to increase through this zone. We agree that there should be some protection for passive users of the river and think this proposed change accommodates these early morning and evening users.

---

# #231

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 5:07:58 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 5:12:39 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:40  
**IP Address:** 203.118.173.212

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ian and Nichola Greaves

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We oppose the proposed Navigational Safety Bylaw 2017 and seek the following decision from the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

1. Refuse the uplifting of the 5knot speed limit (between 10am - 6pm in summer and 10am - 4pm in winter) on the upper reaches of the Clutha River as detailed in Schedule 2 of the Proposed Bylaw; and
2. Add a new clause restricting motorised boat speeds to 5knots on the Clutha River between Lake Wanaka and the Albert Town Bridge; or
3. Add a new clause prohibiting all motorised craft on the Clutha River between Lake Wanaka and the Albert Town Bridge.

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

It is our opinion that boats travelling at unrestricted speeds between Lake Wanaka and the Albert Town bridge poses an unjustified safety risk to passive river users and will significantly detract from the recreational values of this section of the Clutha River.

We regularly use this section of the Clutha River for kayaking, stand up paddle boarding, tubing, swimming and fishing. We are not alone in this type recreational use on this section of the Clutha River, it is well known as a world class fly fishing location and one only needs to take a walk along the Clutha River track to see the high level of passive recreational use by the Community. Restriction on boat speeds along this section of the Clutha River make these passive recreational activities both fun and safe. Boats travelling at speeds exceeding 5knots directly conflicts with this river use. From a safety perspective the proposed speed limit change will create an 'accident in waiting', with a high potential risk of a collision between a motorised craft and passive river user.

In addition, the noise of boats travelling at unrestricted speeds down this section of the Clutha River will detract from the tranquillity of this area, significantly effecting enjoyment for passive river users and users of the popular riverside walking track. We believe this section of the Clutha River should be reserved and protected as a key passive recreational use zone. There is literally 100's of km of river below the Albert Town Bridge for jet boaters to enjoy what the Clutha River has to offer. The boat ramp at the Albert Town Bridge is a perfect starting point. Why ruin the enjoyment of 5kms of river with incredibly high passive recreational values for the benefit of a few commercial jet boat operators and a limited number of private jet boat owners.

Council has long recognised that this section of the Clutha River is an important passive recreational area that requires a high level of protection. The following provisions detailed in Part 4 - District Wide Issues of the District Plan highlight this:

### "4.6.3 Objectives

Recreational activities undertaken in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates, their potential adverse effects on:

- natural conservation values and wildlife habitats,
- other recreational values,
- public health and safety,
- takata whenua values, and
- general amenity values.

Section 4.6.3 - Policy 5 - To avoid the adverse effects of motorised craft in areas of high passive recreational use, significant nature conservation values and wildlife habitat.

Section 4.6.3 - Policy 10 To protect the special qualities of the Clutha River upstream of Albert Town bridge and those recreational activities which benefit from those characteristics.

Explanation and Principle Reasons for Adoptions: The special qualities of the Clutha River - its large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility - make it particularly suited to those recreational activities requiring and benefiting most from these qualities. Angling, non-powered boating, riverside walking and picnicking are the most suited activities to this river. In addition, the environment of Albert Town is most protected by such activities. The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated. For these reasons, motorised boating on the upper reaches of the Clutha River has been restricted".

The proposed 2017 Navigational Safety bylaw fails in every respect to align with these policy outcomes and is overall inconsistent with the QLDC District Plan.

Section 33M of the Transport Act 1994 provides the mechanism for the creation of Navigational Safety Bylaws. Section 33M 2(d) states that a Navigational Safety Bylaw must not be inconsistent with the Resource Management Act. It is submitted that the proposed uplifting of the 5knot speed restriction on the upper reaches of the Clutha River is inconsistent with the QLDC Operative District Plan (as outlined above) which is the primary method for a territorial authority to give effect to the Resource Management Act (Section 31 of that Act) and therefore this provides a clear framework for refusal of proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw (as it relates to uplifting of the 5knot

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

speed restriction on the upper reaches of the Clutha River).

Overall, uplifting of the 5knot speed restriction on the upper reaches of the Clutha River as proposed in the 2017 Navigational Safety bylaw creates substantial safety concerns and will significantly reduce the passive recreational values of highly valued piece of the Clutha River. The proposed bylaw presents an opportunity to for QLDC to not only refuse this unjustified change but also go further than this and secure a 5knot speed restriction for the full length of the River between Lake Wanaka and the Albert Town Bridge or be bold and create an incredible passive recreational river reserve by removing all motorised craft from this section of the River.

Kind regards,

Ian and Nichola Greaves

---



#232

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 6:27:19 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 6:40:23 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:04  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Marc Walker

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think that the current rules for above the albert town bridge are suitable as is and its such a short stretch from the lake to the first 5 knot buoy that its easy to stick to. Just because there is no speed restriction it does not mean people drive recklessly, and just like on the road there are varying levels of ability, knowledge, courtesy but not everyone is an idiot so please dont let a few ruin it for those who adhere to the rules and drive responsibly.

As for below the bridge the current rules make it impossible to head out for an evening fish and bbq. Below the bridge or even 1 km below away from the houses there should be no time restriction especially in the evening as there is no reason for the current rules.

---

#233

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 7:55:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 7:59:21 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:46  
**IP Address:** 122.58.51.199

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kim Kelly

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I walk, run or mountain bike the Outlet track at least 3 times a week. I cannot imagine the noise and disturbance that a higher speed limit would cause would be of benefit to the pristine clear waters and peaceful atmosphere of this area. There is plenty of lake for these water craft - stay up there!!!

#234

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 8:19:53 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 8:49:15 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:29:22  
**IP Address:** 122.58.76.188

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Roger Bruce Munro

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Having the stretch of river from the outlet to the Albert Town bridge remain under the present restrictions is in my opinion by far the best option. I have fished , boated, drifted etc on this water for over 40 years and have seen a huge increase in the number of passive users in that time. In this era areas such as this are rare and should be respected. I have done hundreds of hours boating in the area and observing the speed limits on Clutha are a pleasure rather than a problem. Above all else safety of all users should be a priority.

---

#235

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 04, 2017 8:54:59 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:06:48 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 219.88.78.24

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jono Donald

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Clutha River is used by boats, fishermen and swimmers etc and believe they all deserve to enjoy the water. The proposed change makes the rules clear to everybody and don't see how it could make it worse for any one group. The change wont increase boating traffic and still provides the same times for fisherman swimmers etc to enjoy the water to themselves like they currently do

#236

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:02:27 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:08:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:14  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.99

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

johanne

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

That river is used by many families and people of all ages, to recreate. This includes people in kayaks, boards and even floating, with no protection from motorized craft. If the speed limit gets increased, this would create an even more dangerous situation for these users.

It is reckless of the QLDC to consider this.

Look at the users and assess the outcome of such a change on the safety and usage of this outlet-AlbertTown section in particular.

---

#237

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 2:41:59 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:38:11 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 115.189.102.101

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

test test

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I oppose the proposed Schedule 2 –

Speed upliftings and access lanes;

the uplifting of the 5knot speed limit all year between the hours of 10am-4pm in winter and 10am-6pm in the Summer on the Clutha River From Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town Bridge.

The uplifting of the 5knot speed limit all year round from the Albert Town Bridge to the Red Bridge

**Safety:** I am concerned about the risk of injury or death that could result from the uplifting of the 5knot speed limit at the Lake Outlet and first portion of the Clutha River.

I am also concerned about the risk of injury or death that could result from uplifting the speed limit of 5 knots through the Albert Town swimming area. The time of speed uplifting (10am-6pm summer and 10am-4pm winter) coincides directly with the times that swimmers, kayakers and people floating on the river are likely to be present. This particularly applies over the summer. I have observed that the Outlet and uppermost area of the river is used by a large number of swimmers, kayakers and families doing river floating. I have also observed the large number of swimmers, children wading and families that use the swimming portion of the River adjacent to Albert Town. I frequently see people swimming all along the banks of Albert Town starting from the bridge (either side) to the picnic table at the start of the Outlet Track (near the Hikuwai Reserve). People are using both sides of the river for swimming (both the Albert Town Camping Ground and Swimming Island side). People are also frequently swimming right across the river. As a powered craft owner, I know the dangers of boating at speed when there might be people in the water or other boats in the vicinity. The faster boats are going, the less time the driver has to spot people in the river, the higher the risk of injury from impact, and the slower they may be to manouvre.

**Impact on other passive users - anglers, walkers, bikers:**

Uplifting speed restrictions on these areas of the river will negatively impact on the fishermen using these areas for recreation. Lake Wanaka and the Clutha River are internationally renowned for fly fishing, and this activity is a draw card for many middle aged and older tourists to visit the region. Uplifting the speed restrictions will mean more powered craft such as jetskis, jetboats and even outboard motor boats are creating noise, wash, and alarming fish as they speed by. Making the river an open speed zone all the way from Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town Bridge during the day is likely to attract more jetskis, motor boats and speed boats to Outlet and River. Many people like to fish, walk and bike the river during the day, not just morning and evening. Keep the status quo of 5 knots at all times on the Outlet, first portion of the Clutha River and through Albert Town will help minimise the noise and wake created by powered craft.

**Environmental impact:** As the population of Wanaka grows, and more and more people are using powered craft, removing speed restrictions during the day is likely to encourage more powered craft into the area.

Invariably there is pollution from engines and sediment stir-up from the motors. Particularly outboard motors, and less-so jetskis and jetboats, can cause sediment to be stirred up. The faster powered craft are moving the more likely this is to occur. Wake created by high speed craft causes erosion of the riverbanks and lakeshore. This contributes to decreased water quality as soil and sediment are stirred up. It means that algae and exotic weeds may be able to bloom. It may affect the trout and salmon fisheries.

**NZ's clean green image.**

Many of the tourists I have met are visiting NZ because of their perception that we are a country of natural beauty and pristine environment. Weakening regulations on powered craft on the Outlet and Upper Clutha River to allow open speed limits during the day negates this clean green image. The Lake Outlet is special in that it is unique in being the start of the biggest river in the South Island. It gives a sense of remoteness, yet is very close to the Wanaka township. Allowing noise and visual pollution from open speed boats negates the pristine image of this special area. I note that there is a vast area of Lake Wanaka, and the area downstream of the Albert Town bridge for which powered craft can travel at open speed. I do not believe that there is a need to open up speed restrictions on this special portion of Lake and Upper River.

#238

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 7:20:25 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:40:32 PM  
**Time Spent:** 02:20:07  
**IP Address:** 219.88.76.205

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Ana Aliscia

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

Other

**Q12** Please explain your decision

In regards to the stretch of Clutha River between the Lake Wanaka Outlet and Albert Town bridge - this is a busy stretch of river used for recreation by families, the community and travellers. The speed that powered craft can do on this stretch of river must be an absolute minimum for safety and serenity.

---



#239

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:42:44 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 26, 2017 9:46:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:59  
**IP Address:** 122.56.207.203

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Andrew McLean

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

oppose Schedule 2 –

Speed upliftings and access lanes;

the uplifting of the 5 knot speed limit all year between the hours of 10am - 4pm in winter and 10am - 6pm in the Summer on the Clutha River From Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town Bridge.

The uplifting of the 5 knot speed limit all year round from the Albert Town Bridge to the Red Bridge

**Safety:**

I am concerned about the risk of injury or death that could result from the uplifting of the 5knot speed limit at the Lake Outlet and first portion of the Clutha River. I am also concerned about the risk of injury or death that could result from uplifting the speed limit of 5 knots through the Albert Town swimming area. The time of speed uplifting (10am-6pm summer and 10am-4pm winter) coincides directly with the times that swimmers, kayakers and people floating on the river are likely to be present. This particularly applies over the summer. I have observed that the Outlet and uppermost area of the river is used by a large number of swimmers, kayakers and families doing river floating. I have also observed the large number of swimmers, children wading and families that use the swimming portion of the River adjacent to Albert Town. I frequently see people swimming all along the banks of Albert Town starting from the bridge (either side) to the picnic table at the start of the Outlet Track (near the Hikuwai Reserve). People are using both sides of the river for swimming (both the Albert Town Camping Ground and Swimming Island side). People are also frequently swimming right across the river. As a powered craft owner, I know the dangers of boating at speed when there might be people in the water or other boats in the vicinity. The faster boats are going, the less time the driver has to spot people in the river, the higher the risk of injury from impact, and the slower they may be to manoeuvre.

**Impact on other passive users - anglers, walkers, bikers:**

Uplifting speed restrictions on these areas of the river will negatively impact on the fishermen using these areas for recreation. Lake Wanaka and the Clutha River are internationally renowned for fly fishing, and this activity is a draw card for many middle aged and older tourists to visit the region. Uplifting the speed restrictions will mean more powered craft such as jetskis, jetboats and even outboard motor boats are creating noise, wash, and alarming fish as they speed by. Making the river an open speed zone all the way from Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town Bridge during the day is likely to attract more jetskis, motor boats and speed boats to Outlet and River. Many people like to fish, walk and bike the river during the day, not just morning and evening. Keep the status quo of 5 knots at all times on the Outlet, first portion of the Clutha River and through Albert Town will help minimise the noise and wake created by powered craft.

**Environmental impact:**

As the population of Wanaka grows, and more and more people are using powered craft, removing speed restrictions during the day is likely to encourage more powered craft into the area. Invariably there is pollution from engines and sediment stir-up from the motors. Particularly outboard motors, and less-so jetskis and jetboats, can cause sediment to be stirred up. The faster powered craft are moving the more likely this is to occur. Wake created by high speed craft causes erosion of the riverbanks and lakeshore. This contributes to decreased water quality as soil and sediment are stirred up. It means that algae and exotic weeds may be able to bloom. It may affect the trout and salmon fisheries.

**NZ's clean green image.**

Many of the tourists I have met are visiting NZ because of their perception that we are a country of natural beauty and pristine environment. Weakening regulations on powered craft on the Outlet and Upper Clutha River to allow open speed limits during the day negates this clean green image. The Lake Outlet is special in that it is unique in being the start of the biggest river in the South Island. It gives a sense of remoteness, yet is very close to the Wanaka township. Allowing noise and visual pollution from open speed boats negates the pristine image of this special area. I note that there is a vast area of Lake Wanaka, and the area downstream of the Albert Town bridge for which powered craft can travel at open speed. I do not believe that there is a need to open up speed restrictions on this special portion of Lake and Upper River.

#240

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 27, 2017 12:38:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 27, 2017 12:50:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:40  
**IP Address:** 219.88.77.109

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Gary Dickson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I am concerned about the proposal to uplift speed limit on the clutha river in the region from the outlet of Lake wanaka to the alberttown bridge.

This region of river is now over the last 20 years gone from a fishing spot to being used by many other recreational river users me included. People tube it, paddle board it, drift raft, river board, scuber it.

lower down the clutha below the alberttown bridge and above the red bridge is a jet boat operation that goes full speed. I have found this daunting as a user , a. thier and my ability to avoid each other and the wash created by the jetboat is significant at speed , compared to idle.

I have observed jet boats at idle on the clutha and their ability to go up and down the river is no problem. I want the 5 knot rule kept in place .

A suggestion is to better educate with signage at the lake outlet - the 5knot bouy is not very much to tell jet boats to slow to idle. Also educate those that their are others who are using that stretch of water that are not necessarily easy to see in the water, are easily affected by boat wash etc etc. Help them realise why there is a 5 knt restriction.

If they want to go at more than 5hts on a braided reiver which is ideal jet boat country don,t thaey have the perect place nearby - the matukituki?

more thinking required by the hourbor master and the council please

---

# #241

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 27, 2017 1:36:15 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 27, 2017 1:43:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:28  
**IP Address:** 121.90.136.229

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Beth Campbell

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

It is important to maintain the current speed restrictions because

- 1) well documented that native bird species are heavily impacted by higher speeds in boats ( water movement, noise, increased human activity ect)
- 2) huamn safety - many people use this stretch of water for swimming, paddling, canoeing and so on -this becomes unsafe if boats are speeding in the river
- 3) increased noise pollution
- 4) increased human pollution

#242

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 27, 2017 2:30:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 27, 2017 2:32:17 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:06  
**IP Address:** 49.224.99.223

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Hydro Attack

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Lee exell

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Yes**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Ok

---

#243

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 27, 2017 4:28:29 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 27, 2017 4:32:33 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:04  
**IP Address:** 121.90.242.81

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Wayne Hudson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I see no reason why higher speeds should be allowed. Who benefits from the higher speed? Certainly not the residents along the river - all they will get is increased noise and danger from boats travelling faster in an area that has a lot of residents who like to enjoy the tranquility of the Upper Clutha.

Residents should not have to put up with high speeds and noisy joy riders who come here for a few days, make a lot of noise, create a lot of distress at our expense and then go away again.

---

#244

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, October 27, 2017 4:20:50 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, October 27, 2017 4:33:56 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:06  
**IP Address:** 203.173.188.44

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Gail Harper

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We use the river as small beaches for our young grandchildren, and a fast moving jetboat may not see them, and it creates surges in the river flow, which could knock them down. I would not feel safe swimming in the river, if I knew a speeding boat could come by at any second. The water disturbance caused by fast moving jetboats will also add to the river banks eroding. We all enjoy the river just the way it is, and don't mind boats using it, as long as they aren't going very fast.



#245

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 12:27:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 12:33:24 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:23  
**IP Address:** 121.75.81.229

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bridget Gould

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This part of the river is used a lot by swimmers, people fishing, kayakers and people rafting or floating down this portion of the river with boards etc.

I disagree with the speed uplift for this area of the river as it would make it unsafe for other river users.

#246

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 4:08:50 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 4:14:47 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:57  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.180

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jon sedon

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I'd like to restrict the speed of boats on the river between the outlet and alberttown bridge for safety and noise pollution thanks

---

#247

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 9:34:08 PM  
**Last Modified:** Saturday, October 28, 2017 10:04:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:30:33  
**IP Address:** 203.173.141.64

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah fairmaid

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

If we stopped motorised boats on the river between Albertown and the top bouy. We would maintain the save passive use and tranquility of the river. Is that a huge price to pay when the rest of the river and lake is open access? I don't think so. Let's make a stand now as it will only get harder. Also lets look at how commercial jet boat use of the rivers in queenstown have almoat completely locked out recreational users due to safety concerns over collisions. This is not what we want in Wanaka surely. Not only do we not want that but we can do even better. Lets stop motorised boats!

#248

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 6:03:29 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 6:07:32 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:02  
**IP Address:** 203.173.141.212

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jane Mawson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

.

#249

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 11:37:33 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 11:47:03 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:30  
**IP Address:** 121.75.213.179

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Robert Yule

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a family that uses this part of the river for swimming , paddle boarding and relaxing by, can we not leave it as it is ? If you open the speed limit up to the whole river someone will be killed or injured at the very least. I cannot believe that this bylaw has been given consideration.

#250

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 3:23:00 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 6:07:27 PM  
**Time Spent:** 02:44:26  
**IP Address:** 163.47.115.67

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kay George

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I DO NOT SUPPORT INCREASING THE SPEED LIMIT ON THE CLUTHA RIVER FROM THE LAKE WANAKA OUTLET TO THE ALBERT TOWN BRIDGE.

IT DOES NOT SUPPORT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE - ONLY THE COMMERCIAL JET BOAT BUSINESSES.

COMMUNITY USE: The stretch of the Clutha River from the Lake Wanaka Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge is used by many people for a variety of non-motorised activities, such as swimming, tubing, kayaking, rafting etc. There is also a trail by the lake that is very popular for hiking and biking. I believe it is imperative that the Queenstown Lakes District support local families rights to live and enjoy their natural environment in a safe and peaceful manner.

PEACEFUL/NOISE POLLUTION: The reason we chose to live in Albert Town was because it is more peaceful than in Wanaka, we cannot hear the boats on the lake from here. The noise pollution will increase with a faster speed limit.

SAFETY: An increase in speed will threaten the safety of everyone using that stretch of the river. It will mean less people will get to enjoy using the river, as they do not feel it is safe. We all live in this area to enjoy the outdoors we should not be pushed aside or disregarded for commercial operations.

OTHER OPTIONS FOR JET BOATS - Jet boats can already travel at speed on Lake Wanaka, there is no need for them to travel faster down this stretch of the Clutha river. It would only benefit commercial jet boat businesses trying to do faster turn arounds with their clients.

ENVIRONMENT: This area is used by a lot different of animal species, many ducks and waterfowl nest and raise chicks along the shores and swim in this area.

ENFORCEMENT: While the harbour master may say (Stuff article Sept 27th, 2017) it is hard to enforce the speed limit there, that becomes a staffing issue rather than a reason to allow an increase in this area of the river.

TOURISM: With the increase of tourism in the area it is essential the Lakes District Council works hard to find a balance between managing tourism and working/protecting the local community for the people that live here. While tourism generates money it is the local community members that are paying the taxes to support the community (and working the jobs needed to sustain tourism).

FUTURE PLANNING: This area would be a fantastic area for the council to consider protecting as non motorised for the community. Jet boats can be put in below the Albert Town Bridge.

COMMON SENSE: Increasing the speed limit on a popular, non motorised, family orientated, residential, water activities area would be like increasing the speed limit outside of a school because people needed to get to work faster. It doesn't make sense and it is not SAFE.

Please do not increase the speed for this stretch of the Clutha River.

---

# #251

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:04:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:15:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:06  
**IP Address:** 163.47.107.1

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rachael Moore

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**



**Q12** Please explain your decision

The entire section from Lake Wanaka the Albert Town bridge should have a speed limit of under 5 knots. The speed limit should not be increased, rather the less than 5 knots restriction should be extended to the bridge. This is a multi use section of the river, it must remain safe and tranquil.

It is one of the few sections that is easily accessible to all users and has moderate rapids which are enjoyed by people on many different types of non-powered craft. Swimmers also use this section; with it's safe pools and easy flowing water it offers a unique swimming opportunity.

There is ample river already available for motorized craft to go over 5 knots. Increasing the speed limit on this section would add almost nothing to their opportunities, but would take away a substantial opportunity for all other river users. Extending the restriction to the bridge would ensure that as our population and tourist numbers increase, this section remains a unique and highly valuable recreational opportunity for all river users.

---

#252

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:28:56 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:33:41 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:45  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jean Kenney

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Too much noise and fast boats in the river prevent me from enjoying swims and spending a lot of time by the river. I would prefer it if the whole section of river from the outlet to Albert Town should be a permanent slow zone.

#253

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 8:21:16 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 8:25:44 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:28  
**IP Address:** 49.224.105.160

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jennifer Pare

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Allowing higher speeds for boats on the Clutha River between the outlet and the Albert Town bridge will endanger swimmers, fisherman kayakers, paddle boarders and people who float down the river as well as dogs who fetch sticks in the water. It will also increase noise pollution in a peaceful, residential area.

---

#254

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:33:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:37:45 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:39  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.180

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Megan Davies

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

This is a danger for all the local and visiting users of the Clutha River. It spoils our lifestyle environment is noisy, polluting and generally harmful to this high quality naturally beautiful and peaceful area. Mostly I am concerned about the danger to my young children who use this area and will be forced into harms way if this bylaw were to pass.

#255

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:28:54 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:37:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:56  
**IP Address:** 122.56.234.41

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Allen

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Please do not remove the 5 knot speed limit from the Outlet to the rapid. The needs of all river users need to be balanced, and this restriction makes the area safer for anglers, swimmers, dogs and non-motorised watercraft, throughout the day. I have read that the Harbourmaster commented that boaters disregard the limit anyway and it is impossible to enforce. That is not a good reason to remove it. That would be like saying we should remove the road speed limit because people break it anyway. The speed restriction improves safety of river access and should remain. I would in fact prefer if the 5 knot restriction remained in force throughout the day to the Albert Town bridge. This would increase the consistency of the applicable speed restrictions and may in fact help with compliance by reducing possible confusion.

#256

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:50:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:58:56 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:48  
**IP Address:** 103.233.21.129

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kate Young

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The section of river between the Outlet & Albert Town bridge is constantly used by people 'floating' down the river, commonly children. Opening up the river for a relatively short distance to unrestricted speeds is asking for a serious accident to happen. All it takes is a lack of concentration (or alcohol) and anyone floating with little visibility is at high risk of being run over

---

#257

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:48:03 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 11:04:00 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:15:56  
**IP Address:** 121.75.213.192

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Marie Jean Lewis

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a resident and a B&B operator we have the privilege of living 50 metres from the mighty Clutha River. The river is world renowned for its fly fishing and passive recreational activities. We have fishermen who come from all over the world to stay with us and their attraction to this area is the ready access to a beautiful stretch of water where they can fish undisturbed by jet boats and loud motorized craft. Our location by the river is a point of difference from other B&Bs around the Wanaka area. Our guest reviews commend our quiet location as "as an idyllic, peaceful oasis" This is an integral part of part of the unique visitor experience we can offer our guests. I feel that the speed restriction to five knots should apply to past the bridge as far as the Cardrona River. The noise pollution from the Jet Boat operators and the disturbance of the river for fisherman are detractors for our visitors and the local residents, therefore I cannot approve the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017.

---



#258

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 5:51:31 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 5:56:18 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:47  
**IP Address:** 103.233.22.117

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jenny Maybin

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have concerns it will cause traffic increasing on the Clutha River. My concerns is for noise, shore erosion, and most importantly the safety of swimmers and other passive river users.

---

#259

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:37:30 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:46:26 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:55  
**IP Address:** 121.90.242.81

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Alycia Walker

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Used by locals for a variety of recreational activities that would be compromised and risk devastating consequences if speed limit of boats was increased, and all for the sake of 'x' (not many!) additional minutes spent cruising this stretch of the river.

---

#260

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:09:20 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:18:32 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:11  
**IP Address:** 203.184.38.175

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Andrew Penniket

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I support a 5 knot restriction at all times between the Outlet and Albert Town. I have drift dived, and swum that stretch of water many times and often with a group of kids in wetsuits -it is one of the best places in the country to see a river habitat with abundant trout.

An unrestricted speed limit for boats here would be very dangerous for other river users and quite unnecessary when they have use of all the rest of the Cultha River as well as other rivers.

It would also greatly diminish the peacefulness of the river walk, to have noisy jet boats roaring past.

It would be unfair that other users should sacrifice their enjoyment for the sake of a few boaters.

---

#261

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 7:03:32 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:23:05 AM  
**Time Spent:** 02:19:32  
**IP Address:** 203.173.142.70

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rob Jewell

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The maritime fees and charges blanket approach provides no flexibility for the number of lake users that are visitors to the area and would use the ramps for a limited number of times or local residents that only use the facilities on a limited basis. The Department of Internal Affairs operates a successful fees for boating facilities for Lake Taupo and why couldn't this be replicated for the districts facilities?

The speed uplifting for the Clutha River From Lake Wanaka downstream to the Albert Town bridge should be in force all year round due the expected number of recreational users increasing through local population and visitor growth. This popular year recreational area natural peace and tranquility should be better protected.

---

#262

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:42:45 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:46:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:22  
**IP Address:** 122.57.211.225

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jethro Robinson

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My objection is specifically to the speed upliftings on the Clutha River. I am a Wanaka resident and frequent user of the Clutha river track and Deans bank.

I am not a Jet boater, and I cannot see the need to allow any vessel to navigate between the outlet and Albert town bridge at high speed.

This stretch of river offers huge amenity for walkers, cyclist, fisherfolk and paddlers/floaters, as it is so close to Wanaka/Albert Town. The amenity value would be considerably reduced by the presence of noisy, high speed vessels on this stretch of river.

Whilst I recognise that the new bylaw is actually slightly more restrictive than the previous one, with morning and evening 'slow' periods, the ammendment of a bylaw should be the chance to put right a previous wrong. With that in mind, I propose that the 5 knot speed restriction remain at all times between the outlet and Albert Town campground.

As Wanaka grows, more and more residents will be looking to enjoy the river environs close to home. Why do skippers need to transit that stretch of water at high speed, when there are boat launching options at the outlet and Albert Town? Are there not huge distances of river in the region, which are away from people's homes and backyard recreation areas?

I cannot accept that the desires of a minority group (owners of high speed vessels) could outweigh the impact on the river amenity for the majority (residents close to the river and river users).

As such I implore the representatives of the ratepayers to actually represent us; by ensuring the amenity of this section of river for the rate payers is protected from future degradation by a minority user group.

---



#263

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:52:03 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:57:31 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:27  
**IP Address:** 121.75.217.181

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Bie van den Borne

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like the entire zone on the Clutha river between the outlet and alberttown to be permanent slow zone

---

#264

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:46:16 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:00:23 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:14:06  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.180

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jan Dobbie

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We are from Auckland but have family including grandchildren living in Wanaka who have been here for 20 years. We spend a lot of time here and love the beauty and tranquility of the Clutha River, both as a walking & cycling route along the shores, and as a swimming and picnic spot for many local families. Jet boats roaring up and down the river at any time in the summer months would totally ruin this unique area, and you only need to come to Auckland and sit on a beach to see and hear the absolute noise pollution and danger to swimmers caused by jet skis.

As a preferred option I would suggest no powered-craft from 1st October until 31 April. However if this isn't possible I would like to see 5 knots at all times, from the Outlet to the last downstream residence of Albert Town, and no powered craft in Albert Town swimming island area.

---

#265

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:07:49 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:12:43 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:53  
**IP Address:** 210.54.120.216

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Megan Williams

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We enjoy this area for passive recreation...river floating, swimming and SUP'ing. The proposed changes are dangerous for all the local and visiting users, spoils the serenity of this area and is not good for the environment.

In regard to being too difficult to enforce the current speed restriction - spot checks work well in other areas. A hotline for all the passionate river users would also be used to dob in individuals or companies that flout the current restrictions.

Furthermore, I request that any further resource consents to commercial river operators be put out to public consultation.

---

#266

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:12:12 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:28:24 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:16:11  
**IP Address:** 121.75.83.180

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Denis Dobbie

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Although I live out of Wanaka, we have family and grandchildren living here and spend a lot of time in Wanaka.

Throughout New Zealand our bylaws concerning speed on the water dictate that you cannot go over 5 knots if you are within 200 metres of the shore. This applies to all areas commonly recognized as popular swimming and recreational waterways, and would apply to both sides of the Clutha in the areas you are proposing to make changes. Why would you change the regulations here to be different from anywhere else in NZ??

This is a very special area for local families, and a great gathering place for the community for picnics, swimming, walking, cycling, etc. I implore you to please retain the area as it is and not introduce the danger that merging speeding jetcraft and recreational swimmers would create. Even 1 accident or death caused by a speeding boat is not worth the risk caused by changing this by-law.

---

#267

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:22:33 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:43:32 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:20:58  
**IP Address:** 121.75.80.29

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Albert Town Community Association

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nathan Weathington

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Albert Town Community Association Opposition to the Proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw

Executive Summary:

The Albert Town Community Association seeks the following decision from the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

1. Refuse amendments to Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes, as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River of the Proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw; and

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

2. Add a new clause into the 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw prohibiting any motorised craft operating between Lake Wanaka and the Albert Town Bridge; or
3. Add a new clause into the 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw restricting the speed limit to 5 knots from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge at all times.

The Albert Town Community Association opposes the 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw. Specifically, we are opposed to Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River. This schedule allows jet boats and jet skis to travel at unrestricted speeds from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge in summer from 10am-6pm and winter from 10am-4pm. The current 2014 Navigational Safety Bylaw is similar and also allows unrestricted speeds from the Albert Town Bridge upstream to the 5 knot buoy just below the Outlet Campground. We have safety concerns with the Speed Upliftings in both the 2014 and proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaws. We should note this stretch of river constitutes only 1% of the total 338-kilometre Clutha River.

The Clutha River from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge is a well-known and popular multi-use section of the Clutha River. This section of the river is visited by thousands of bikers, walkers, joggers, fishers, kayakers, swimmers, stand up paddle boarders and rafters every year. Floating and passive use of this section of river is a time-honoured tradition for Wanaka residents and visitors. The number of people living and visiting Wanaka has grown considerably in recent years. This growth is also reflected in the passive use of the river.

The number of motorised craft and passive users on the Clutha will continue to grow. The QLDC must commit to developing a long-term strategy, including safety bylaws for the waterways in the Upper Clutha with designated areas for passive use. This means listening to the entire community and writing new bylaws, not simply editing the existing 2014 Navigational Safety Bylaw or solely focusing on the incremental changes between the 2014 and proposed 2017 Navigational Safety bylaws.

“It’s always been this way”, inability to enforce bylaws, or bylaw confusion are not reasons to keep or build upon an existing dangerous bylaw. This is the case for the proposed 2017 Navigational Safety bylaw, which merely extends the same unrestricted speed limits mentioned in Schedule 3 of the existing 2014 Navigational Safety bylaw. We need to determine the best way for everyone to safely enjoy the Clutha River from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge based on where Wanaka is today. What the bylaws have said over the past 30 years is irrelevant. We must take a fresh look and base our safety bylaws on what our entire community needs to remain safe, based on our current population and river use patterns.

To be clear, the safest option for the Clutha river as it runs from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge would be no motorised craft at any time. Council might believe this is not feasible for other non-safety related reasons, but if we are strictly discussing safety, this is the safest option. There is also plenty of jet boating water downstream from Albert Town. Council acknowledges this incompatibility in the Operative District Plan:

4-44 “The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated.”

A motorcraft-free section of the river would be a unique attraction in New Zealand for both tourist and local residents, and again, we are only talking about a five kilometre stretch of a 338 kilometre river. A motorcraft-free section of the river would remove bylaw confusion and be easier to enforce.

Another option would be restricting the speed limit to 5 knots from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge (or the farthest downstream Albert Town residence) at all times. There will be reasons to oppose this option as well, but they will not be safety related. This would also naturally decrease the number of motorised craft in the area, making it even safer for passive use. It would also be prudent to remove all motorised craft from the small Albert Town Island swimming area.

It is the Harbour Master’s personal opinion that a full speed jet boat on plane is more manoeuvrable and therefore safer where



## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

swimmers are present. The Harbour Master is also the author of the proposed 2017 Safety Bylaw and we are told will be an expert witness for the same bylaw. We have yet to find evidence to support the Harbour Master's opinion that faster jet boats are safer when mixed with swimmers, and it seems to run counter to Maritime NZ navigational guidelines and 9.1 (a) of the proposed 2017 Navigational Bylaw. Both safety guidelines require a 5 knot limit when passing within 50 metres of a person in or on the water. This 5 knot restriction is nullified during the proposed unrestricted speed limit periods from Lake Wanaka to Albert Town during summer from 10am to 6pm and winter from 10am to 4pm.

Manoeuvrability and safety are not synonymous, which we have witnessed with several tragic boat accidents on the South Island in recent years. A boat traveling at 5 knots has considerably more time to dodge a passive river user, and if an accident were to occur the consequences would be far less dire. This is why we implement 5 knot speed restrictions in high traffic areas across New Zealand. The proposed 2017 bylaw also aims to simplify the current 2014 bylaw, which is needed. However, the primary purpose of the bylaw is safety, and the simplification of the proposed bylaw only extends unrestricted speed limits further up the river — it does not increase safety.

It is also of the Harbour Master's personal opinion that existing Resource Consents for commercial jet boaters are at the "top of the pecking order" and impossible to change. First, our safety bylaws that protect our community would be at the "top of the pecking order" as is clearly stated in the aforementioned Resource Consents (RM990262 and RC940300):

(22) In all other respects the consent holder shall comply with the relevant Council by-laws for waterways at all times, and all other regulations.

Secondly, resource consents can and do change. In accordance with Section 128 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) which is also noted in the aforementioned Resource Consents:

The conditions of this consent may be reviewed within 10 working days of each anniversary of the date of the consent, if, on reasonable grounds, the consent authority finds that: (i) there is or is likely to be an adverse environmental effect as a result of the exercise of this consent, which was unforeseen when the consent was granted (ii) there has been a change in circumstances such that conditions of the consent are no longer appropriate in terms of purpose...

It's important to note that the RMA defines the environment to include people and communities, as well as the social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matter (RMA Part 1,2 (1) Environment). The Wanaka district had less than five thousand residents when these Resource Consents were signed (1994, 2000). Our drastic increase in residents and visitors has led to an increase in passive and motorised river users. This increase clearly constitutes an 'unforeseen change in circumstances', especially as it relates to the safety of the people in our community.

A key component to the commercial jet boat Resource Consents was the 5 knot speed limit on the upper stretch of the Clutha River. Unrestricted speeds would not have complied with the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan at the time, and therefore it is unlikely consent would have been granted. Consequently, the proposed amendment to Schedule 2 of the 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw removes the 5 knot section of the Clutha. If accepted, this should justify a review of the commercial jet boat Resource Consents (RM990262 and RC940300). We are not advocating for the removal these consents, merely establishing the fact that Resource Consents can be reviewed and amended and that they are not at "the top of the pecking order" as the Harbour Master suggested.

Other safety options for the Clutha River from Lake Wanaka to the Albert Town Bridge might include restricting motorised craft during certain months or decreasing the uplifting times to allow more time for safe passive use of the river. The uplifting times could revolve more around passive river use behaviour and not cover most of the daylight hours as they currently do (summer 10am-6pm, winter 10am-4pm). As is, the uplifting times revolve completely around jet boats. This seems to run counter to the Operative District Plan, which repeatedly focuses on multiple use of our lakes and rivers, specifically on this section of the Clutha.

The Council's own Operative District Plan, which was overseen by our elected officials and drafted with considerable public consultations, discusses the uniqueness and value of this specific section of the Clutha River in detail. There are many guidelines in the Operative District Plan on how to manage this area, these guidelines also include noise pollution and environmental protection

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

standards which are not covered by this bylaw. However, these standards are directly and negatively impacted by the proposed bylaw. And again, our 'environment' does include the safety of our people and aesthetics according to the RMA. The current and proposed Navigational Safety Bylaws do not align with the Operative or Proposed District Plan nor the Resource Management Act in any way. According to the Maritime Transport Act 1994, this is not allowed:

33M (2) (d) (ii) Navigational bylaws may not — be inconsistent with the Resource Management Act

If the bylaw is to reflect "what the community wants" as the Harbour Master suggests, the District Plan is a good indicator, and should be used as a blueprint to create a new, original bylaw.

### Operative District Plan - District Wide Issues

4-41 10 To protect the special qualities of the Clutha River upstream of Albert Town bridge and those recreational activities which benefit from those characteristics.

4-38 On the Clutha River, multiple use of the river by various users has been tried in the past with speed and time limits for motorised craft. However, there may be no potential for multiple use of this river in a way that is acceptable to all parties. Jetboating, even with speed and time restrictions, may inevitably adversely affect such a nationally regarded fishery or the experience sought by users of that significant waterbody. The complex speed and time limits also create uncertainty for river users and enforcement difficulties for the Council.

4-44 The special qualities of the Clutha River - its large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility - make it particularly suited to those recreational activities requiring and benefiting most from these qualities. Angling, non-powered boating, riverside walking and picnicking are the most suited activities to this river. In addition, the environment of Albert Town is most protected by such activities. The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated. For these reasons, motorised boating on the upper reaches of the Clutha River has been restricted.

4-42 i (c) To specify rules limiting or prohibiting motorised boating craft in areas of high passive recreation use, significant nature conservation values and wildlife habitat.

4-43 In some instances where motorised craft will in most circumstances be incompatible with the values defined for the lake and river, motorised craft will be excluded from these lakes and rivers.

Also see 4-26 3.1, 4-41 5, 4-42 (i)e, 4-43

We must look to the future. Having more jet boats and jet skis traveling at unrestricted speeds in the same area as an increased number of passive users is an accident waiting to happen. Council must write an original, clear Navigational Safety Bylaw that factors in the needs and safety of everyone in our community.

---

#268

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:49:45 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:56:14 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:29  
**IP Address:** 103.198.184.211

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

David Vass

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Submission on: Navigation Safety Bylaws 2017 35.1 Clutha river speed uplifts.

Submission by Dave Vass 30th October 2017

Relevant Personal Background

I have lived in Wanaka for 25 years. For most of that time I have been a recreational user of the river and river corridor in the following ways:

Albert Town resident.

Angler

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Drift diver

Boater (passive and powered craft)

Walker, biker, swimmer, picnicker etc..

I am also an adventure tourism operator, having run Deep Canyon (canyoning adventures) for over 20 years. In this capacity I construct and oversee the development and application of safety plans and risk management strategies, as I also have for film rigging and safety events. Much of this work involves water safety.

I am also a current board member on the Otago Conservation Board.

I have divided my submission into different topic sections, which deal specifically with:

the proposed changes to the bylaws with regard to the speed uplift on the Lake Wanaka to Albert Town section of the Clutha.

the lifting of the time restrictions on the Albert Town to Red Bridge section of the Clutha.

At the end of this submission I have brought up some other issues that I see as relevant to the Navigation Safety Bylaws.

### Safety

"A basic principle of safe navigation is that if a speed uplifting be put in place, safety cannot be diminished." (Southland Regional Council Navigation Safety Factsheet).

"51.2(f) uplifting the speed limit will not unacceptably increase the risk to navigation safety or endanger persons using the waters that are the subject of the application." QLDC Navigation Safety Bylaw 51(Speed Upliftings)

Important background information on this proposal is that all waterways in the QLDC have a 5 knot restriction on them unless specifically 'uplifted' by the regulations eg: ski lanes, most areas of the lakes and almost all of the larger rivers have an uplift on them, ie: no real speed restrictions..

Areas that do not have the 'uplift' are: within 200 metres of the shore of the lakes and within 50 metres of an object or person in the water (in the lakes), so the 5 knot restriction is in force in these zones.

So, of note here is that there are no real restrictions on speed or proximity to the shore or objects or people in any of our rivers, including the Clutha. This is a largely pragmatic thing as powerboats need to be 'up on the plane' in stronger currents to have steerage and may need to navigate close to the bank to take the best line or whatever. Which is great for powerboats, but not necessarily other river and riverbank users.

Given that this stretch of river is heavily used by all sorts of people for all sorts of activities, safety is one of my main concerns. Removing the 5 knot restriction is something that will only benefit powerboat users by way of a couple of minutes less time to get through this section. Combined with the complete lack of rules governing proximity to others, this has the potential to severely compromise the safety of other users. Bear in mind that powerboat users are the only users of the river that potentially threaten the safety of others and who represent a minority of river users.

The only area left in the Clutha with a 5 knot restriction is the top, calm bit. This section is slow and does not require a powerboat to be up on the plane to navigate. This proposal would allow unrestricted speed here without the safeguards in place that exist in the lake (5 knots near the shore and around other people and boats), even though it is essentially an extension of the lake.

To put it another way, as boats from the lake arrive at the river and come into much closer proximity to other users – often lots of them - they can throw the safety restrictions out the window. Given that the river is a far more dynamic, difficult and confined place to navigate safely in than the lake, this seems ridiculous.

As it stands, the safety bylaws governing the river seem written exclusively for powerboats and yet I can't think of any other place in the district that has a higher proportion of other users. The outlet section is getting busier all the time and is being used by many other people - their safety needs to be taken into account.

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

In light of the quote at the beginning of this submission, it should not be for the public to put a case for maintaining the status quo – it should be on the harbourmaster to prove that safety will not be diminished. The question needs to be asked - how is drastically increasing the speed limit, in a busy multi-use area, with no safeguards by way of proximity regulations, not diminishing safety?

### Peace and Quiet

I would've thought one of the main intrinsic values of the river, is the tranquility. Boats going faster make more noise and create more vigorous wave wash than slow ones, effects that will doubtless create more annoyance for other users. This is especially so in the calm section below the lake which is particularly peaceful and calm and is something of an echo-chamber.

There are very few restrictions on where and how power boats can operate on rivers in the QLDC. Uplifting the speed restriction and allowing powerboats to operate 24/7 on the lower section (down to the Red bridge), I feel does a disservice to wider river user groups such as anglers fishing the evening rise, people wishing to descend this section without being buzzed by jet boats and people out for an after work stroll or bike ride.

It's getting harder and harder to find a quiet place around Wanaka. People go to the river for this very quality and as the area gets busier, quiet places become more important. Now is not the time to make a beautiful and quiet place noisier, for longer.

### Efficacy

I have talked to the harbourmaster about these issues and his only stated reason for proposing the speed uplift is that " it's really hard to enforce/ people don't understand it".

The way I see it, taking away any restrictions makes it even harder to enforce due to increased complexity ie: there will now be increased monitoring and enforcement activity to control dangerous speed in a busy area - but how do you enforce a speed limit when there isn't one?

Also I suspect nuisance complaints will increase and the subjective nature of these, combined with a lack of actual rules against which to refer to, will create a far more complicated and time consuming (and ineffective) enforcement situation than at present.

Also, how is it any harder to enforce than the other (45 pages of) bylaws? There are good reasons for the existing regs – they should stay.

### Angling

The area from the lake to the first rapid (the area in question) is less affected by didymo compared to the rest of the river by the nature of its depth, current speed and substrate material. This, along with its proximity to the lake, which allows for more fish movement to and fro, means that, unlike the bulk of the river downstream, fish numbers are similar to what they used to be pre-didymo, making it a valuable angling resource which would be severely affected by the uplift – speeding powerboats and fishing not really going together - and it's the very last bit of the river remaining with a speed restriction in place.

### Summary

This seems to me a poorly thought through proposal with a negative impact on safety and likewise peace and quiet. At present, the bylaws are only serving one sector of river users, to the detriment of safety and enjoyment for other users and it is worth noting that this minority user group [powerboats] is the only group that compromises these values for others.

This proposal highlights the need for a comprehensive review of river useage, taking in the needs of all river users and users of the wider river corridor.

I submit that this proposal to uplift speed and increase hours be rejected and that following on from that, a comprehensive plan that includes input from all river corridor users, including Albert town residents, be developed. The plan needs to reflect the values of the river as a wider resource and incorporate the needs of a wider group of river users from a holistic viewpoint.

The council needs to help develop a management plan for river and river corridor users in the area so conflicts between different user groups can be avoided and this should be a process of open and public consultation.

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

### Other

#### Speed uplift on the Hunter river

I disagree strongly with the part-time speed uplift on the Hunter. The river is one of the best trout rivers in the district and is too small to share with jetboats – they ruin the fishing experience on this size of river.

Access up the Hunter is hard-earned for any angler and to have the days fishing ruined by jetboaters is unacceptable and the uplift is for half of the summer fishing season.

There are virtually no rivers in the QLDC that do not allow powerboats and some rivers such as the East Matukituki, have been totally lost as fishing rivers, to jetboats.

The uplift should be removed.

#### Commercial Operators

Commercial Operators on the Clutha are generally responsible and subject to concession requirements. However, there are now more commercial operators on the river, with potential for a further increase.

I would urge the council to ensure that any applications for commercial powerboating on the Clutha, or any of the districts waterways, be publicly notified, given the multi-use nature of the river.

#### Smaller waterways

Given the recent increase in the use of smaller powered vessels (jetskis and very small jetboats – often homemade), there are increasing encroachments into smaller rivers. Examples would be the Motatapu River and the Albert Burn.

I feel the bylaws need to be more explicit in stating that these waters are subject to the 5 knot speed restriction.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters and I look forward to debating them in person.

Regards, Dave Vass

---

#269

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:53:21 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 11:07:05 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:43  
**IP Address:** 222.154.233.224

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Matthew Davidson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My family and I are regular user of the tracks on both sides of the Clutha as well regularly swim or kayak down the stretch from the outlet to Albert Town. To lift the speed limit in this area is ridiculous. As well as put swimmers and other non-motorised users at risk from speeding jet boats it will encourage even more jet boats to come through the area. Particularly swimmers/floaters are not easy to see. The amenity values will also be destroyed by the increase in users and noise from the larger numbers and speed of boats coming through the area. The fishermen's track walk is world renowned and should not have its reputation put at risk.

There is plenty of awesome jet boating downstream from Albert Town. Users should be encouraged to put their boats in at the Albert Town boat ramp and proceed downstream from there. I would encourage an extension of the 5 knot limit to down past the swimming hole/eddy opposite the camp ground and make sure inside the island there is out of bounds to motorised boats.

---



#270

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 11:14:02 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 11:42:06 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:28:04  
**IP Address:** 203.57.212.84

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Dr Michael Arthur Turner

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I believe that the above proposed change to The Navigation Safety Bylaw, will reduce safety for passive users of the Clutha river from the outlet to Albert Town .The people affected are recreational users of the river,kayakers,paddleboarders,swimmers,picnickers.and fishermen.

Fast moving boats and jet skis can run down the above users.

Anyone can buy a boat or jet ski ,there is no current test of seamanship.( unlike Australia ).Similarly there is no registration of boats and ownership of .Australia.

Fatalities have already happened in the Southern Lakes.

Is boating to continue to be poorly controlled on lake Wanaka and the Clutha River ?

Is the lake to become a "Boating Lake ", at the expense of others.

The above uplifting will increase noise nuisance a beautiful tranquil lake lost.

In other countries boat speed is restricted ,examples being Lake Bohinj in the Triglav National Park Slovenia and Lake Windermere in the English Lake District.

I am making this submission as an individual .I am a Councillor for Otago Fish and Game Council as well as a member of the Upper Clutha Angling Club I endorse the submissions of these organisations.

Yours truly.

Dr Michael A Turner

---

#271

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 1:18:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 1:21:02 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:54  
**IP Address:** 203.118.131.237

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

James Helmore

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Recreational opportunities and safety for both locals and visitors will be seriously compromised by uplifting the speed limit. As a novice kayaker utilising this section of river the proposed changes would be concerned for my safety. Retain or enhance the status quo.

#272

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 1:26:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 1:29:25 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:33  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.2

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Wulf Solter

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

While the proposed bylaw is an improvement, I believe the section of river between outlet and Alberttown should be a permanent slow zone. There is no need for hooligans to blast up and down the river in what is a residential area used by lots of recreationalists. This is like putting a drag racing strip in the middle of a children's playground - sooner or later someone is going to be hit and killed.

---

#273

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 1:52:48 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 2:12:19 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:31  
**IP Address:** 103.198.184.235

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Heath

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I Don't think any type of power boat or jet ski should be allowed on the Clutha river from the outlet motor camp to the Albert Town bridge. This area is a peaceful place for families and walkers and bikers. People fly fishing have to contend with the loud noise and waves of jet ski's and in Summer many people use the river to kayak or paddle board down this piece of river and enjoy the peace and quiet. It has to be one of the most amazing river tracks in New Zealand and it's outrageous that we are not protecting it from power boat noise and wave pollution. There is plenty of other river to enjoy going fast in a boat??

---

#274

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:00:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:02:40 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:44  
**IP Address:** 203.173.143.114

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

HILARY ROBINSON

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I think that stretch of the Clutha River should have a maximum 5kt speed limit so that individuals and families can enjoy the river safely by canoe, kayak, swimming etc

---

#275

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:12:19 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:13:31 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:12  
**IP Address:** 121.75.85.113

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Sarah Ellmer

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Here's text you can copy and paste and amend as you wish to make the submission easier and quicker, takes just 1 minute with this;

The proposed changes to remove the speed limit on the clutha river outlet between the lake outlet and Albert town bridge have an overall net negative impact;

- Health and Safety; it will make it very dangerous to use for recreational users who regularly float down the river on non powered inflatable vessels.

- Increase in noise pollution from faster boats, this will impact locals who have their houses on the river side, campers at the Albert town camp-site and recreational users who walk, run and bike the outlet track for its serene atmosphere.

Please do not change the current speed limits on this part of the clutha river.

Protect this special part of our environment for future generations to come.

Many thanks

---



#276

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 4:38:17 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:35:49 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 114.23.98.38

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Otago Fish and Game Council

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Nigel Paragreen

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

[1] The Otago Fish and Game Council (Fish and Game) is the statutory manager of sports fish and game bird resources within Otago. It has a duty to manage these species as well as advocate for the protection of habitat and the interests of hunters and anglers. However, as it is limited in its powers, in most cases it must rely on participation in planning processes to fulfil its statutory functions.

[2] Aspects of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017 (pNSB) create additional risk and loss of amenity for members of the public who are engaging in angling activities in the region. As a result, Fish and Game does not support the pNSB in its current form. It has 3 primary points of objection:

- a) The proposed speed limit uplifting between Lake Wanaka and the 5 knot buoy creates unnecessary conflict between power boating and passive river uses, such as angling, swimming or unpowered boating. It will lead to reduced amenity of users and creates a safety risk due to close proximity and potential differentials in speed between water users. Fish and Game requests that the current 5 knot limit be retained in this stretch at all times.
- b) The wording of the Clutha speed uplifting in Schedule 2, Table 1 of the pNSB is not clear. The area downstream of the Albert Town Bridge is the only part of this table that specifies a "...5 knot uplifting". This should be clarified and the language made consistent with the rest of the table in order for constructive discussion to be able to take place.
- c) Map 8 indicates an access lane will be put in place at the outlet of Lake Wanaka; however, this is not referenced in the pNSB. If an access lane were to be situated in this location it may have significant consequences on the amenity of other forms of recreation. While it is recognised that the map series provided does not form part of the pNSB, Fish and Game would appreciate if this point could be clarified for the community to discuss.

[3] While Fish and Game does not necessarily oppose the removal of time restrictions on the uplifting below Albert Town, it does ask that any decision be placed on hold until the effects of current and potential surface water traffic can be assessed. Fish and Game is currently engaging with community groups, commercial operators and the Queenstown Lakes District Council regarding ways to provide a spectrum of opportunity for recreational and commercial activities while reducing conflict between users. Long term planning in this area, with a focus on community consultation, will likely provide information to assess the impacts of removing the time restrictions on this uplifting.

[4] The amenity and safety conflicts between recreational activities referred to in 2a are discussed in many parts of the operative district plan. Fish and Game considers this speed uplift to be incongruous with the plan, particularly the section 4.6.3 objective and 4.6.3 policies 2-5, 10 & 12. Furthermore, the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption for section 4.6.3 (pg. 4-44) provides additional detail in the context of the Clutha River which doubles as an excellent summary as to why the proposed uplifting on the Wanaka Outlet is unsuitable for the conditions.

"The special qualities of the Clutha River - its large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility - make it particularly suited to those recreational activities requiring and benefiting most from these qualities. Angling, non-powered boating, riverside walking and picnicking are the most suited activities to this river. In addition, the environment of Albert Town is most protected by such activities. The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated. For these reasons, motorised boating on the upper reaches of the Clutha River has been restricted."

#277

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:30:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 4:07:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:36:41  
**IP Address:** 115.189.103.71

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Giles Wynn-Williams

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have major concerns about commercial and recreational jet boat and especially jet ski traffic increasing on the Clutha River in that section of Clutha River from the Lake Wanaka mouth to the Albert Town bridge.

I have serious concerns about safety of swimmers and recreational persons floating down that section of the river and I consider the needs of these people are being usurped by commercial interests. I am really concerned about the noise of jetboats and jetskis which is hugely reflected off the Deans bank and hammers ratepaying residents who live close to the opposite side of that section of the Clutha River at Albert Town.

I am totally against the bylaw change proposed that will create an unrestricted speed limit from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge from 10am - 6pm over the Summer and 10am - 4pm in Winter. This naïve proposal does not even mention any 5 knot regulation for the Albert Town Island swimming area and will clearly make the river considerably more dangerous especially near the children's swimming hole which gets intensive use throughout the summer, thereby providing locals with a very safe "swimming pool" (with adult supervision as required) and this at no cost to the Council !

I am firmly of the view that the Albert Town section of the Clutha River should remain peaceful and safe for local residents, swimmers, fishers, snorkelers, kayakers, paddle boarders, rafters, bikers, and walkers.

---

#278

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 5:10:03 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 5:49:14 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:39:11  
**IP Address:** 202.154.157.157

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Maree Horlor

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Firstly may I say how spectacularly unintelligible the information in Map 8/ 9 and the corresponding schedule 2, table 1 are. I am stunned by how poorly the information is passed cross to the reader. I've been staring at these pages, and the similar sections in the 2014 bylaw for an hour, and I still can't figure out what is being said.

That aside, can I say that I think allowing boats the ability to continue at high speed from the lake on down the river is a poor choice (is that what the map says??). On roads it is accepted that slowing the traffic down. either occasionally or permanently, increases the safety of non-motorised traffic. I haven't looked for info about boats, but I hope that the planners suggesting these changes have and have found proof that high speed on rivers populated with swimmers, boaters, people in inner tubes, etc is safe. I would like to be able to make a more factual submission, but can't. Please consider making your maps reflect the content of the bylaw.

---

#279

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 3:54:35 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 6:29:41 PM  
**Time Spent:** 02:35:05  
**IP Address:** 122.57.79.27

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Chris Norman

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I have been living with my young family in Alberttown since 2006 and we have utilised the river for swimming at the Lake Outlet, Deans Bank and the Alberttown swimming hole & jetty by the old stone cottage usually from about Labour weekend to the end of March.

Since about 2008 as my children have been old enough, we have floated down the river between the outlet and the Alberttown bridge on tyre tubes, kayaks and more recently paddle boards as well as swimming down the river in wetsuits. Since starting these activities we have noticed year on year that there are more and more people travelling between the outlet and the bridge by various passive means. Yesterday (29th October) when swimming at the swimming hole, I witnessed 3 groups floating down the river within 40 minutes. There are few rivers both NZ or overseas where there are so many passive river users and it is fast becoming a right of passage for locals and non-locals alike.

Most of the time this is OK, but in recent years in the peak of summer it has been getting dangerous, particularly over the Christmas break where many holiday makers are hyped up and set to make the most of their motorised toys. I reported an incident several years back to deputy harbourmaster Craig Blake when watching my children standing on a sand bank about 4 metres off the river bank a jet boat dropped people off near the swimming hole, turned around and sped off at full speed passing between my children and the river bank. This was a very close call and I am sure bravado almost caused a tragedy.

Increasing the speed limit on this small stretch of popular water is lunacy. Having been jet boating with both friends and commercial I understand that it is easier to have speed so that the boat is planing, but considering there is vast tracks of water away from passive water users I do not see the need why that motorised craft need to travel at speed on this section of water. Common sense would suggest that this particular stretch of water is free of motorised craft, only to be patrolled by the harbour masters. Jet boats and jet skis can put in below the Alberttown bridge and go for as down as Lake Dunstan if they like.

Please do not change the speed limit on this section of river, extend the low speed zone for the entirety of the river from the Outlet to the Alberttown Bridge, or better still make this a non motorised section of the river. Allowing faster speed limits on this section of the river will lead to serious injury and deaths, which would not only effect the victims and their families but would also sit very heavily on the shoulders of those who proposed and approved this ill thought and unnecessary change to the Safety Bylaw.

---



#280

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 6:45:54 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 6:48:01 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:07  
**IP Address:** 139.130.17.250

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Wanaka Lake Swimmers Club Incorporated

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jackie Boyd - Club President

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The Wanaka Lake Swimmers Club was established in late 2010 to promote safe open water swimming in the district.

We are not for profit and do not organise events. We provide swimming companionship and open water skills training.

We start our seventh season at on October 23, 2017. We base ourselves at the swim buoy line in Roys Bay, near Stoney Creek, and host a weekly Sunday swim at 8.30am from October through to the end of March.

We currently have about 80 members, many of whom are training for Challenge Wanaka, the Ruby, Breca Wanaka, and other triathlon and open water events.

We have members who like to swim “off piste”. They arrange these swims on dates and times and at places to suit themselves.

One of our members’ favourite “off piste” swims is the Clutha River, between the Outlet and the Albert Town Bridge. Members have been swimming and drifting here for many years – including before the club was formally constituted. We don’t keep records of when or how many times these swims happen. Members talk about swimming in the Clutha and it is clear members do it frequently.

When we know our members are going to do the Clutha swim, we advise they go in groups, with visible kayak or paddleboard support, wear bright caps and consider towing bright flotation bags. We advise them to check when jet boats are on the river and encourage them to keep to the sides. Confident and adventurous swimmers enjoy the rapids and the fast flowing water. Swimmers may wear flippers so they can move more quickly if they hear a boat coming. There is a risk of conflict with motorised craft. Our members swim in the Clutha at their own risk.

The club supports the proposed 5 knot speed restriction between the Outlet Camp and Albert Town Bridge. At the moment, the 5 knot restriction is to the first rapid.

The club does not support uplifting the proposed 5 knot speed restriction between the hours of 10am – 6pm in the summer and 10 am – 4pm in the winter for the following reasons:

1: From a swimmer’s perspective, all the passive users are in the water during these times in the summer. Swimming is less likely in the winter but other passive users will be on the river in the winter.

2: We are concerned about the safety of all passive users such as swimmers, drifters, kayakers, paddleboarders, tubers and other people in or near the water.

3: We believe this particular area (Outlet to Albert Town) will only see more passive use over time because of Wanaka’s continued population growth.

4: We notice the Outlet Camping Ground and Albert Town Camp Ground are quite popular with visitors and we believe over time even more visitors will be using this stretch of water for passive recreation.

# #281

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 2:16:57 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 7:39:38 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 131.203.125.3

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Carl McNeil

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

2017 Navigational 'Safety' Bylaw

As an Albert Town resident of 15 years, parent and regular recreational user of the Deans Bank stretch of the Clutha River I wish to oppose the proposed 2017 Navigational 'Safety' Bylaw. Specifically, my opposition to Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River.

Safety  
Having spend a good amount of time on this stretch of the river over the past 25 or so years I have no doubt that allowing unrestricted access by Jet boats on this stretch will inevitably result in serious injury and most likely death.

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

During peak summer months this stretch of the river sees a near constant stream of holiday makers enjoying the river. These users are primarily young people and children peacefully and leisurely floating this stretch of the river. Our own family enjoys swimming at the Albert Town “swimming hole” regularly during the summer.

All manner of unpowered craft and flotation devices are used by these river users. A good number also swim, dive and float semi submerged and are often separated from larger more visible central groups. As a bystander on the bank it is at times difficult to make out individual bodies in the water - a task made almost impossible while traveling at high speed and afforded a lower and more restrictive vantage point though the perspex windscreen of a boat.

It is blatantly obvious that increased Jet boat activity will substantially increase the likelihood of serious incident or collision with these passive users and or / other powered craft.

### Speed Kills

As a powerboat owner and waterskier of over 25 years I can unequivocally state that while it may be true that a jetboat is logically quicker to manoeuvre under full speed than at 5 knots, it is not more maneuverable - an important distinction and common misconception. The statement that a jet boat under speed is somehow safer makes no account for the reaction time required to evade disaster if a craft traveling at 70kph rounds a corner to bear down on a group of partially submerged swimmers. It will simply collide with them quicker, at greater impact and causing far more damage - we've been attempting to educate Kiwi motorists of the correlation between speed and fatality for more than 50 years.

It is farcical to even suggest that craft moving at high speed are in any way safer than craft moving at 5 knots. An impact at 5 knots will bring about a very different outcome than an impact at 50 knots.

Safety at reduced speed is the sole reason that the Maritime safety authority requires reduced speed of 5 knots in the vicinity of the shoreline, wharves, recreational users, swimmers etc.

The implication that when in the midst of and trying to avoid a collision with Kayakers, rafters, paddle boarders, bunches of kids lounging on lilows and black inner tubes or semi submerged swimmers - at times unexpectedly appearing from around blind corners and emerging from broken water - that it is somehow safer to travel at high speed rather than low is ridiculous in the extreme.

Of this, Harbour Master Marty Blacks “Expert Opinion” seems highly doubtful.

It would be irresponsible and negligent for any elected official or public servant to ratify such a potentially dangerous schedule. Moreover, when serious injury or death occurs as a result of what is clearly an ill conceived, lazy and negligent bylaw there will be good reason to hold our elected officials and planners culpable.

The only responsible solution for the stretch of river below the Outlet Campground to the Albert Town bridge is to either ban powered craft altogether OR impose a permanent 5 knot restriction.

### Noise Pollution and Disruption

For an area that promotes itself as a “lifestyle Reserve” it is insane to even imagine that increased jet boating activity would be contemplated or encouraged along such a reputable, peaceful and beautiful stretch of river.

The Deans bank track is enjoyed by sightseers, walkers, runners, cyclists and anglers in great numbers - It would seem obvious that a large part of the “enjoyment factor” that these users seek is the peace and quite and natural intrinsic values of this stretch of river. Increased Jet boat noise, wash and disruption is in direct conflict with the intrinsic values this area offers and these users seek to enjoy. In fact it would appear that the proposed changes to Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata- Au River are in direct conflict with at least 6 specific clauses in the councils own current operative district plan. With regard to Albert Town specifically:

4-44 The special qualities of the Clutha River - its large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility - make it particularly suited to those recreational activities requiring and benefiting most from these qualities. Angling, non-powered boating, riverside walking and picnicking are the most suited activities to this river. In addition, the environment of

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Albert Town is most protected by such activities. The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated. For these reasons, motorised boating on the upper reaches of the Clutha River has been restricted.

As an Albert Town resident I find the noise created by Jet boats so close to a residential area absolutely unacceptable, unpleasant, stressful, upsetting, unsafe and unnecessary.

### Conflict with passive / Unpowered River Uses

The proposed amendments and inclusion of "Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River" make a mockery of Councils own district plan and the clear and ratified wishes of the wider community.

Increased speed and volume of high speed powered craft will inevitably lead to conflict, displacement and dissatisfaction between river users and this has been the observed and recorded experience in the past.

Again, to quote the current Operative District Plan - District Wide Issues

4-38 On the Clutha River, multiple use of the river by various users has been tried in the past with speed and time limits for motorised craft. However, there may be no potential for multiple use of this river in a way that is acceptable to all parties. Jetboating, even with speed and time restrictions, may inevitably adversely affect such a nationally regarded fishery or the experience sought by users of that significant waterbody. The complex speed and time limits also create uncertainty for river users and enforcement difficulties for the Council.

### Management by Negligence

Harbour Master Marty Black has again used the complete nonsense reasoning that a flawed or difficult to enforce bylaw should be justification for total uplift. This is negligent, lazy and flawed reasoning and a fine example bureaucracy at its very worst

His suggestion that "this is what the community wants" is either mistruth, misinformation and sheer wishful thinking - I can absolutely assure mr Black and Council that the vast majority of river users and Albert Town residents are vehemently opposed to what is a half assed, misinformed and totally out of touch proposal.

It would seem high time that our Harbour Master was held accountable and replaced with someone competent and driven enough to actually perform the duties for which they were employed.

Carl McNeil  
Albert Town

---

#282

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:01:46 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:25:09 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:23:23  
**IP Address:** 122.61.113.7

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kevin C & Patricia A Murphy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We would like to strongly oppose the safety bylaw that would lift the restricted speed limit on the Clutha River between the Outlet Camping ground and the Albert Town Bridge. On many occasion I have had to get out of the way of speeding jet boats and jet skis. They seem to have a cavalier attitude to passive river users of which there is a growing number due to the increase in population in Albert Town and surrounding areas. Personally we would like to see motorized craft taken off this section of the Clutha River, between the Outlet Camping Ground and the Albert Town Bridge,altogether. The passive user and jet boats are a dangerous mix and we see it is only a matter of time before there is a fatal accident.Over the past 35 years we have witnessed many near misses. please take action to alleviate this situation. Kevin and Patricia Murphy QLDC Ratepayers

---

#283

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:13:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 8:39:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:26:01  
**IP Address:** 203.173.140.246

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Kirsten Roy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As residents of Albert Town with a small child we visit the river most days. In summer we often swim and play at the swimming hole and at shallow areas along the rivers edge. In winter we walk the tracks most days and enjoy many stops along the way. It's always such a relaxing, peaceful experience.

It would be a real shame to lose the peacefulness of this beautiful river walk due to removing the water speed restrictions - that will no doubt lead to an increase in boating / motorised craft activity. I would like to know that speed restrictions stayed in place so my children, and everyone else's, can continue to safely swim in the river in future.

---

#284

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 4:59:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:19:46 PM  
**Time Spent:** 04:19:57  
**IP Address:** 122.57.186.127

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John Terence Darby

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---



**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a kayaker of some 65 years and a former Canoe and Kayak instructor I am aware of the need for rivers and parts of rivers to be easily available for the purpose of instruction and practice. Having faced jet boats tackling rapids and parts of rivers coinciding with teaching young kayaker's, I am familiar with the reaction of young learners (and even older ones) to this type of situation-which is most often panic leading to negative outcomes. Further I have noticed interactions of fast boats to kayaker's on Lake Wanaka and sadly it is by and large one of indifference. This same behaviour of indifference and lack of concern for passive users, whether they be kayakers or fisherfolk I am sure will continue if speed limits are lifted in this area.

I believe it is important that this part of the Clutha, from the Outlet to the Red Bridge should be reserved for more passive users of the lake and this includes fisherfolk as well as those who wish to learn to kayak. I notice that Paddlewanaka have recently applied for and received consent to run kayaking trips down this part of the river. As such speeds of boats greater than 5km are not compatible with such a venture.

Further, as one concerned with a number of conservation issues over many years, I have become more and more aware that conservation should not just be confined to species or assemblages of species of plants and animals, but also to "places". "Special places" may be found in a woodland, or alongside a river or stream, they may be on mountains or valleys and are often secret to those who know them. Above all, they are places that one can relax and find peace from a boisterous noisy world, they are places where one may just fish, relax, think and enjoy in all season and times. We need to treasure them and keep them for future generations. The birth of the Clutha, in my opinion, is one of these special places.

---

#285

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:28:05 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:30:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:02  
**IP Address:** 203.173.150.47

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

The Swift Fly Flshign Company

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **No**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

### Swift Fly Fishing Opposition to the Proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw

The Swift Fly Fishing Company wishes to oppose Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River.

The Swift Fly Fishing Company employs 6 full time permanent staff in Reece Crescent Wanaka. Swift produces high quality handcrafted fly rods for export to discerning anglers around the world. We manufacture here in Wanaka and our renowned New Zealand brand is inspired by and encompasses the natural beauty of the Wanaka region. This association is an important part of our brand story.

During the summer months our small studio workshop and showroom is visited by many international tourists, most are affluent, all are enthusiastic water users - most are fly anglers.

Almost without exception we are asked to recommend a "nice piece of local water" -Inevitably we send our guests to explore the section for the Clutha river from the Outlet to Albert town knowing that this is a pristine, beautiful and peaceful stretch of water.

Deans bank is a renowned fishery the world over - it has featured in Angling literature since at least the 1920's. Our company uses this stretch of water to develop, prototype and test new fly rods, to demonstrate equipment and to hold fly casting classes and tutorials.

The directors of the company have a number of concerns with regard to the proposed amendment Schedule 2 - Speed Uplifting and Access Lanes as it relates to the Clutha/Mata-Au River.

Degradation of an area with high intrinsic natural values.

Allowing and encouraging increased jet boat traffic within the proposed area will ruin a unique and beautiful stretch of river, an area that is enjoyed by many recreational and 'passive water users. This is exactly the type of high impact, highly disruptive and intrusive activity that most visitors to the river find distasteful, off putting and degrading of their Wanaka experience.

#### 2. Incompatibility with Wanaka's "Natural Reserve" and outdoor recreation positioning.

Increased Jet boating on the Deans bank stretch of the Clutha would seem to be in direct conflict with the towns Civic, recreation and tourism goals - and the clear direction the community has signalled to council in the strategic plan.

#### 3. Who benefits?

There seems to be no clear benefit to any group with regard to this proposal, at least no benefit that has been articulated by its proponents. As far as the Swift company Directors can ascertain there is only downside: Disenfranchised ratepayers in Albert Town, adversely affected accomodation providers, upset and displaced passive recreational users and what is apparent to all existing users, a major safety issue.

#### 4. Clearly the major concern with this proposal is the clear threat of a major accident.

It is ridiculous to think that given the increased passive recreational use of this stretch of the upper Clutha that also adding increased high speed jet boat traffic into the mix will not result in disaster. It is inevitable.

The only responsible long term and sustainable solution for this particular stretch of river is to either remove powered craft altogether, or restrict the speed limit to 5 knots at all times.

If council actually wanted to increase the intrinsic natural value of this area, create something special that added value to the unique Wanaka experience and enhance the Values of "Wanaka Inc" for the benefit of all - ratepayers and the broader business community alike - it would remove powered craft from this stretch of river altogether. There are literally hundreds of kilometres of unrestrained jet boating water on the Clutha and in the Wanaka area already.

Unfettered Jet boating on this stretch of pristine river so close to town does nothing but sully the precious Wanaka brand.

The Directors and shareholders of the Swift Fly Fishing Company Ltd

#286

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:49:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:57:54 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:10  
**IP Address:** 103.233.22.117

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Mark Feeney

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Unacceptable noise pollution to an area of outstanding beauty that is used by a large number of walkers cyclists and fisherman.

Concerned about the environmental effects in the riverbanks.

Concern about the safety to other river uses such as swimmers and kayakers.

The are already so mxng other waterways jetboats have access to.

---

#287

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:15:22 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:32:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:17:07  
**IP Address:** 122.61.113.7

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rose Murphy

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I strongly oppose an the lifting of the speed restrictions of jet boats and jet skis on the Clutha, Mata-Au, from the Lake Wanaka outlet to the Albert Town bridge due to concerns for safety and for the environment.

Firstly, concerns are for the environment. The noise pollution caused by jet boats is significant. Many locals, as well as visitors to the area use the adjacent tracks for walking and cycling and the river is a popular spot for fly fishing. This area is beautifully peaceful, motorised water craft contradict this.

More importantly, lifting the speed restrictions would be extremely dangerous for all river users. Throughout summer there is an increasing volume of swimmers, kayakers, paddle boarders and divers enjoying the entire stretch of river from the outlet to the Albert Town bridge. Lifting the speed restrictions would be irresponsible as there is high risk of injury of fatality.

I am in favour of the section of the Clutha river from the Lake Wanaka Outlet, downstream to the Albert Town bridge, to be power craft free at all times.

Regards, Rose Murphy, River User

---

#288

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:16:58 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:43:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:26:15  
**IP Address:** 124.197.31.112

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Judy Cheng

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I don't support the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017 to the extent that it proposes to uplift the speed restriction on the top reach of the Clutha River from the Outlet to the buoy making the first rapid (about 2km downstream) from 10am to 6pm (summer) or to 4pm (winter).

Clearly and obviously, increased speeds from speedboats and jet skis will make passive use of that stretch of river (for example, swimming, kayaking or floating down on inflatables) much more dangerous. I am a regular swimmer/floater down the river over summer, and would rather not be hit by a fast moving boat.

I note that the suggestion by Queenstown harbour master Mr Black that he supports the proposal because the present speed limits are not obeyed (as reported here: <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/97284109/clutha-outlet-navigational-bylaw-change-concerns>) is difficult to understand. If a bylaw that has been put in place for strong policy reasons (ie to address safety concerns of users of the river) is not being enforced, shouldn't it be enforced?

---



#289

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:50:32 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 10:43:24 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:52:51  
**IP Address:** 124.197.31.112

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Callum Kennedy

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

As a property owner in Albert Town, and a regular swimmer and kayaker of the river between the outlet and the Albert Town bridge, I am concerned about how a speed uplift would affect this use.

My primary concern is the possibility that someone is hit one day. I am less concerned about noise. Having witnessed jetskis and jet boats being used recklessly in the Albert Town area, including a jetski trying to jump a 5 knot buoy, I am concerned that any removal of speed limits will be seen as condoning this behaviour.

Any suggestion that the speed limit cannot be enforced is a nonsense. I can point you at an organisation that could help you set up speed cameras if you like.

---

#290

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 30, 2017 9:40:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 30, 2017 11:46:34 PM  
**Time Spent:** 02:05:45  
**IP Address:** 125.239.132.43

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Wayne Perkins

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Dear Sirs

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaws

Since the original submissions were made in 2013/14 many of the passenger carrying vessels on Lake Wakatipu have entered into Maritime NZ's 'Maritime Operator Safety System' (MOSS) which has significantly higher thresholds of primary passenger safety than what the proposed 2017 Navigation Bylaws propose.

Our Maritime NZ approved 'Marine Transport Operator Plan' (MTOP) has identified many areas of very real concern that could lead to

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

death or injury of our passengers or others on Lake Wakatipu.

It is a shame that a more user friendly format has not been created to allow for a detailed submission to be submitted in relation to what we perceive to be the dangerous anomalies in the 2017 Navigation Safety Bylaws.

1/. Interpretation; 'Commercial Vessels' is incorrect in insinuation, they are passenger carrying vessels with human beings on board and the bylaws need to reflect the attitude distinction with the attendant care of duty by the Local Authority to those vessels.

2/. Intoxication; needs a measurable clarification.

3/. 9.3; It is totally irresponsible to allow fleets of 'racing yachts' to come within centimetres of passenger vessels at full race speed with the passenger vessels being the vessel that has to give way or stop.

This should be a minimum of 50 metres of distance as we have experienced many horrific close calls and have suffered many emergency stops as a result with attendant minor injuries. Modern yachts are now capable of in excess 100kmh you need to recognise this and future proof the bylaws.

Maritime NZ has recognised this situation on Lake Wakatipu and in our approved MTOP we now slow down when within 100 metres of racing yachts and stop completely when within 50 metres whilst maintaining our original direction.

4/. 28.1 There are no 'No Swimming' signs in the heart of Queenstown Bay and as a result all of the passenger vessels have to cope with people swimming whilst attempting to berth.

5/. 42; The access lanes in Queenstown Bay have been identified in our MTOP as the most likely area where we are going to have a significant high speed impact or collision resulting in death or serious injury to our passengers.

Maritime NZ have recognised this and our safe operating procedure is now to never enter the access lanes whilst high speed vessels are conducting manoeuvres.

Council needs to reinstate the four sets of signage that were removed by Richard Vallily (Town Secretary) in 1983. If necessary we are prepared to pay for the reinstatement of those signs.

6/. 46; The proliferation or doubling of moorings over the last 3 or 4 years has resulted in the total inaccessibility of many jetties at night when they become literal 'boat traps'. All consented moorings should be chain and not floating rope.

7/. There is no provision for impeding the safe navigation of a passenger vessel. There have been literally hundreds of incidents over the years where passenger carrying vessels have been deliberately impeded in their passage by swimmers, powerboats and yachts.

Several of these have resulted in passenger injuries and as a result of our MTOP we now have to bring this to your attention. The Earnslaw with hundreds of passengers onboard will ultimately end up sideways on the beach in Queenstown Bay without some sort of significant bylaw protection.

8/. Our second major safety concern where we are most likely to cause death or serious to people other than our own passengers is Kite Surfing at the entrance to Queenstown Bay. This inevitably occurs when we have gale force westerlies on the lake with up to 4 to 5 metre waves, gusty 100kmh spindrift squalls and very low continual visibility.

Whilst we can operate very safely in those conditions using our GPS/Sat Nav, R/T and Radar we cannot see people who fall off their boards and collapse their shutes in those conditions. Quite simply Kite Surfing should be banned at the entrance to Queenstown's increasing busy port and should be relocated to Sunshine Bay.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

Yours Faithfully

Wayne Perkins

021 549 551

[wayne@milliondollarcruise.co.nz](mailto:wayne@milliondollarcruise.co.nz)

[www.milliondollarcruise.co.nz](http://www.milliondollarcruise.co.nz)

---

# #291

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 9:23:11 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:23:58 AM  
**Time Spent:** 01:00:47  
**IP Address:** 203.86.203.231

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Central Otago Whitewater

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

John Gordon Rayner

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Central Otago Whitewater (COW) supports proposed bylaw 36.4 retaining the prohibition of powered craft on that part of the Kawarau River located below the Arrow River. COW has advocated for protection of the Kawarau River since the mid 1990s and in particular has actively opposed a number of applications lodged by commercial jet boat operators since 2001 to uplift the speed limit on the Kawarau River downstream of the Arrow River confluence to allow jetboats to operate down to the Bungee Bridge.

COW supports the submissions by Whitewater NZ Inc in relation to the exemption provisions in proposed bylaw 54 and speed uplifting provisions in proposed bylaw 51.

COW refers to proposed bylaw 35.1 and proposed schedule 2 detailing the speed limit restrictions on the upper reaches of the Clutha River. The Clutha River is regularly used for kayaking and other recreational nonpowered users. Motorised craft including jetboats and jetskis generally compromise the enjoyment and safety of nonpowered river users and also compromise the natural values of the river environment. Although the nature of the river currently allows for safe passage of both motorised and non-powered users at current volumes of usage, COW is concerned that this balance could be lost if there were a significant increase in the use of the river and the river corridor by motorised craft.

Accordingly COW proposes

- (a) the speed limit on the Clutha River between the outlet of lake Wanaka and the Cardrona River confluence be kept at 5 knots; and
  - (b) the time limits specified in schedule 2 of the proposed bylaw be instituted; and
  - (c) jetskis should be banned on the Clutha River between the outlet of lake Wanaka and the Cardrona River
-

#292

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 29, 2017 1:40:17 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:26:36 AM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 203.97.93.222

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Jet Boating New Zealand

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Eddie McKenzie

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Submission on the Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Private Bag 50072  
QUEENSTOWN 9348



## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Submitter: Jet Boating New Zealand  
C/- Eddie McKenzie  
11 Biggar Street  
INVERCARGILL 9812  
Phone 03 211 3581  
Cell 027 201 2111  
Email eddie.mckenzie@opus.co.nz

Jet Boating NZ wish to comment on the Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017:

Jet Boating NZ generally support the QLDC Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017 except where we have made comment as follows:

### Part 3 – Carriage and wearing of life jackets

#### Maritime Rule Part 91.4: Personal Flotation Devices

Not Life Jackets as referenced in the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017.

Jet Boating NZ submit that all reference to Life Jackets be changed to Personal Flotation Devices (PFD) as per Maritime Rule Part 91.4

#### Clause 19.4

Jet Boating NZ submit this clause be deleted.

Clauses 19.1-19.3 & 20.1 cover all recreational vessels in all circumstances and therefore no need to single out one type of recreational vessel. This is in line with Maritime Rule Part 91.4.

### Part 5 – Rules relating to specific Locations

#### 35 Clutha River

##### Clause 35.1

Jet Boating NZ submit that this clause is contradicting Schedule 2 – Speed upliftings and access lanes.

Clause 35.1 to read:

The proper speed of vessels must not exceed 5 knots on the Clutha River between the Outlet Camping Ground (marked by a 5 knot buoy) and a 5 knot buoy positioned downstream of the Albert Town Bridge (GPS -44.68,169.19) from 4pm to 10am the following day in the winter and 6pm to 10am the following day in the summer, NZ Daylight saving times.

New Clause 35.2 to read:

The person in charge of any vessel must not exceed 5 knots in the Swimming Area at Albert Town marked by the 5 knot buoys (GPS coordinates?). Refer to Schedule 2, Map 9

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

This is more consistent with the operative QLDC District Plan and the proposed QLDC District Plan 2015. The operative and proposed District Plans do not have any restrictions on the Clutha River except that there are to be no more than 6 jet boat races per year. Refer – Chapter 21 Rural, Table 9 of the proposed QLDC District Plan 2015.

### Schedule 2 – Speed Upliftings and Access Lanes

#### Table 1 – Speed Upliftings

Jet Boating NZ generally agree with Table 1 – Speed Upliftings as it is consistent with the operative and proposed QLDC District Plans.

The Rees River Duration requires the dates to be changed to when the 5 knot speed restriction is uplifted. The dates listed currently are when it is not uplifted. The Duration Dates should read “1 November to 30 April each year”.

The Clutha River Duration to have “NZ Daylight saving times” after . . . . summer

This would better define the Winter and Summer periods

The Hunter River Duration to have “each year” after . . . . 30 April

#### Map 3 – Kawarau Dam

Jet Boating NZ submits that the colour of the access lanes be changed to green to be consistent with Map 4. The yellow/orange colour has been used on all other maps as the 5 knot speed restriction colour.

#### Maps 8 & 9 – Clutha River

Jet Boating NZ submits that the colour purple labelling be changed to “Daylight Speed Uplifting Zone”

This would better match what is proposed in Table 1.

Jet Boating NZ wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Eddie McKenzie

Jet Boating NZ

#293

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 11:46:18 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 12:56:04 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:09:46  
**IP Address:** 101.100.128.136

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

**An individual**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

**I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Samuel James Murphy

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

**No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

My understanding of the proposal is that it allows for increased speed for boats on the Mata-au awa (Clutha) between the Outlet Camp ground and the Alberttown bridge. I do not approve of any measures that allow for increased speed for any motorized vessel on this section of river.

Even given the current restrictions 100s of river users are put at risk every summers day through the reckless behaviour of a few boat users. In my 25 years of enjoying the MAta-au I have personally been in a number of terrifying situations and near misses with boats travelling too fast to be in control and certainly too fast to see all swimmers in the water. The proposal for speed uplifts is reckless and further endangers peoples lives.

The proposal does not seem to contain adequate measures to prevent nuisance by motor-boat users. It should exclude any use of powered craft on all rivers after 6pm and modify clause 26 to prevent boats from causing wakes that are both a nuisance to people and cause damage to the riverbanks and to river eco-systems. My suggestion would be limit specify physical limits to wakes produced (ie. wake crest height).

Ngaa Mihi,  
Sam

---

#294

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 12:11:19 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:03:16 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:51:57  
**IP Address:** 122.58.200.39

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

New Zealand Federation of Freshwater Anglers Inc.

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Rex Neville Gibson

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

31 October 2017

Queenstown Lakes District Council

Private Bag 50072

Queenstown 9348

Re: proposed NAVIGATION SAFETY BYLAW AMENDMENTS 2017

Concerning; the uplifting of the current speed restrictions on the Upper Clutha River - notably the section of river from the Outlet to the Albert Town Bridge.

The New Zealand Federation of Freshwater Anglers Inc. is strongly opposed to the proposal to uplift the current speed restrictions in the area stated above.

The Federation's Executive would like to make the following points:

1. The area receives extremely high numbers of passive users, primarily people fishing but lesser numbers of rafters, swimmers, kayakers and those who enjoy drift snorkelling, etc.
2. These users are often visitors to the area and are frequently sent specifically to the Outlet area by local retailers. It is a convenient and accessible place for people unfamiliar with the greater Wanaka region. It is thus an important part of the region's tourism.
3. The area has "iconic" status amongst fisher folk, with photos of the late Queen Mother fishing there still appearing in various publications. It is one of the "bucket list" destinations for many trout fishermen from outside the immediate Wanaka area.
4. Fishing in this section of the river is largely only possible by wading out from the banks. This is because of their steepness and the overhanging vegetation. The need to have room for a back cast also contributes to this.
5. This proposal raises major health and safety issues for people subject to the wash of boats travelling through. Maintaining one's balance, even when only knee deep in the water is difficult for inexperienced or elderly anglers when confronted with speedboat wash. Drownings in the Clutha are not new; we submit that this proposal will significantly increase the risk.
6. This region includes Deans Bank which is a major spawning and "wintering" area for the region's trout. It is also a major attraction internationally through its constant mentions in local and international fishing publications. These "trout tourists" appreciate the lack of noise pollution from vehicles (of all sorts including jet boats). This relatively natural solitude, so close to a town, gives the Deans Bank area unique tourism experience qualities.
7. Compliance with speed restrictions should not be an issue. All boats are now required to have identification and most members of the public carry cell phones or cameras. The best solution however, in the eyes of NZFFA would be to remove all powered boats from the region between the outlet and the Albert town bridge. The positioning of a "speed camera" type device could be a major asset (It is the 21st Century!) to enforcement.
8. The writer has 26 years' experience fishing the area and speaks on behalf of the President and Executive of the New Zealand federation of Freshwater Anglers Inc. This federation speaks on behalf of the freshwater angling clubs of New Zealand.

Yours faithfully,

Rex N. Gibson QSM

M.Sc.(Distinction), Dip.Ed.Man., Dip.Tch.

Regional Spokesperson

Executive

New Zealand Federation of Freshwater Anglers

#295

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:19:16 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:30:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:20  
**IP Address:** 49.224.102.19

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Jane and David Ellis

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

We are strongly opposed to the proposed changes to the Proposed 2017 Navigational Safety Bylaw

Our riverside property on the Clutha River has been in family hands since the mid 1950's. Over the last 60 years we have observed significant changes. From being a small community of a few houses Albert Town has almost become a suburb of Wanaka. There has been an immense increase in permanent population with numbers increasing at least tenfold during the summer and holiday periods. The river from the outlet to Albert Town has also seen a significant increased use from fishermen, kayakers, rafters, paddle boarders, snorkelers and swimmers. During the summer holidays there are endless streams of people of all ages sailing and swimming past our property.

For the past 60 years our family has used the river to swim in over the summer months. We have been concerned about the combination of motorised and non motorise activity for some time. There used to be speed restrictions on the swimming hole bend on the southern end of our property and in front of the Laing's old farm cottage but these have been largely ignored over the past two decades. These restrictions were placed in an era of very low usage. Our guess would be a 20 fold increase on usage since this time. This is a health and safety issue. For a speeding motor boat a sole swimmer is not easily identifiable. We are very concerned this combination of increased motorised river traffic without speed restrictions will result in a dreadful fatality. Ironically this was recognised many years ago when numbers were much lower.

We would like to see motorised craft prohibited from operating between the outlet and Albert Town bridge. The majority of the river users walkers, swimmers, non power boat sailors and fisherman should have their say regarding the experience they wish to have and the authorities should also take their safety into serious consideration.

We have heard the Harbour Master's personal opinion that a full speed jet boat on plane is more manoeuvrable and therefore safer where swimmers are present. We do not doubt this statement but it assumes the river has no other uses except power craft. Do we have to wait for a terrible accident like the one at St Bathans a number of years ago before sense and safety prevails.

We constantly witness commercial operators attempting to increase the thrill factor on what is quite a dull jet boat experience by increased speed and driving close to river banks.

Motorised craft impact beyond those in the river. The noise of the craft is significant. For those biking and walking alongside the river the solitude is broken destroying the experience of the majority for the gain of a few. Riverbank damage from boat wash is also an issue.

Our thoughts are best expressed in the Operative District Plan which has identified the special qualities of the Clutha River:

4-44 The special qualities of the Clutha River - its large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility - make it particularly suited to those recreational activities requiring and benefiting most from these qualities. Angling, non-powered boating, riverside walking and picnicking are the most suited activities to this river. In addition, the environment of Albert Town is most protected by such activities. The Council considers there is an incompatibility between motorised craft and passive activities on the upstream stretch of the river. Downstream of Albert Town, the Clutha River is large enough and the pressures for use less intense, so that a wider variety of uses can be accommodated. For these reasons, motorised boating on the upper reaches of the Clutha River has been restricted.

---



#296

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:44:21 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:46:14 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:53  
**IP Address:** 122.57.119.187

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Glenda Turnbull

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I would like to keep the bylaw as it currently is, I feel this would mean the Clutha River would be safer for passive users.

#297

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:21:04 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 2:24:01 PM  
**Time Spent:** 04:02:57  
**IP Address:** 121.73.134.216

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Kawarau Jet Services Holdings Limited

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

James Gardner-Hopkins (Counsel)

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Text of KJet's submission follows. Please advise an email address where a pdf version can be sent. Kind regards, James

...

SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES

# Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

## DISTRICT COUNCIL NAVIGATION SAFETY BYLAW 2017

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name: Kawarau Jet Services Holdings Limited,  
C/- the address for service specified below

### 1 Scope

1.1 This is a submission in opposition (in part) to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2017 ('Proposed Bylaw').

1.2 The particular parts of the Proposed Bylaw opposed are:

a Clause 36.4; and

b Clause 54.6(b).

### 2 Issue

2.1 Clause 36.4 prohibits powered vessels from operating on the Kawarau River below the Arrow River. Clause 54.6 limits any exemption that can be granted by the Harbourmaster to 14 days only.

2.2 Together, the two clauses if adopted in their current form prohibit any commercial jet boat operation on the Kawarau River below the Arrow confluence for either public ferry services or adventure tourism. Both are activities which Kawarau Jet Services Holdings Limited ('KJet') wishes to undertake. Both would require resource consents, but if the Proposed Bylaw is adopted in its current form, even if KJet were to obtain resource consents, it could not operate because of the Bylaw.

### 3 Submission – unlawful and/or invalid

3.1 KJet considers clauses 36.4 and 54.6(b) to be unlawful and/or invalid, and therefore vulnerable to being set aside, quashed, or amended by way of judicial review or challenge under Bylaws Act 1910, including on the grounds that:

a The Council has no evidence before it that it is necessary to prohibit all powered vessels beyond the Arrow confluence. Powered vessels can be managed safely on that part of the Kawarau River. KJet has evidence and experience in that regard.

b The Bylaw is being used to address amenity and preserve exclusivity of the Kawarau beyond the Arrow confluence for an ulterior and unlawful purpose, ie amenity (not safety), and so is ultra vires s33M(1) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 ('MTA').

c The Bylaw is inconsistent with the provisions of the District Plan (and Proposed Replacement Plan), which do not prohibit powered vessels on the Kawarau beyond the Arrow confluence, and so is also ultra vires s 33M(2)(d)(ii) of the MTA.

d Any commercial activity on the Kawarau River beyond the Arrow confluence would require a resource consent discretionary activity. Health and safety would be a key (likely determinative) consideration in determining any application, and health and safety is a core aspect of the purpose of that the Resource Management Act 1991 (s 5(2)). The resource consent process (including, potentially, any appeals to the Environment Court):

i would be publicly notified and thus enable the community to express any concerns and have their views heard;

ii provides a robust process for independent expert evidence (including on safety matters) to be evaluated; and

iii allows specific conditions to be imposed as part of any consent that is granted, including in relation to health and safety matters.

So there is a significant "safeguard" in respect of safety under the resource consent process.

e The Council's failure to obtain evidence and specifically consider the provisions of clauses 36.4 and 54.6(b) is unreasonable and in breach of KJet's legitimate expectation that the Council would consider the issue, KJet having:

i raised the issue in both the 2014 bylaw review, but having never been notified by the Council of the outcome of that process;

ii filed, in 2016 (and without knowledge of the 2014 bylaw), an application for resource consent to operate commercial jet boats on the Kawarau River beyond the Arrow confluence to the Bungy Bridge. It did so in reliance on the 2009 Bylaw, which enabled permanent exemptions to be granted, only to subsequently discover that the Council had amended its 2014 bylaw to prohibit the proposed activity. An exemption request was actually made and discussed with the Council's legal counsel, who also wasn't aware of the adoption of the 2014 bylaw;

iii submitted again on the issue, in 2016, in respect of the 2016 amendments to the bylaw, which included amendments to the exemption provisions of the bylaw;

iv never received any formal notification from the Council about the outcome of those submissions;

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

v made various follow-up enquiries of the Council in respect of the bylaw's progress; and  
vi engaged with Council on an ongoing basis in respect of an independent safety study to support its Bungy Bridge consent application – which the Council knew KJet could not ever implement without a change to the Council's bylaw.

3.2 KJet also wishes to pursue an application for resource consent for a scheduled public ferry service, which is intended to include a regular service past the Arrow River to the Bungy Bridge; but it is pointless expending further time and effort in support of that part of the application if the Proposed Bylaw is not amended to either remove the restriction or enable exemptions to be granted.

4 Decision sought:

4.1 K Jet seeks:

a deletion of clause 36.4;

b if clause 36.4 is not deleted, then deletion of clause 54.6(b);

c if neither clause 36.4 or clause 54.6(b) are deleted, then the inclusion of an additional clause 54.6A that reads as follows:

Notwithstanding clause 54.6(b), the Harbourmaster may grant an exemption to this bylaw for a longer period than 14 days where:

(a) the activity has been authorised by way of an appropriate resource consent; and

(b) the Harbourmaster is satisfied that the conditions of that resource consent adequately protect public health and safety.

4.2 K Jet wishes to be heard in support of its submission at a public hearing.

4.3 In light of the significance of the issues raised to KJet, including its existing investment in resource consent processes, as well as the Council's previous unreasonable treatment of it (including a failure to notify it of changes to the bylaw, and previously seeking to limit KJet's hearing time to 5 minutes only), KJet puts the Council on notice now that the principles of natural justice require it to be given a reasonable time to be heard on this matter. KJet considers, allowing for questions, that 45 minutes to an hour should be allowed.

4.4 KJet also seeks, under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1981, all information held by the Council relating to safety on the Kawarau River beyond the Arrow confluence that the Council took into account before notifying the Proposed Bylaw.

That information is sought urgently, so it can be taken into account by KJet in presenting its submission on the Proposed Bylaw to the Council. If the Council did not take any such information into account that should urgently be advised to KJet.

KAWARAU JET SERVICES HOLDING LIMITED:

By its Counsel, James Gardner-Hopkins

31 October 2017

Address for service:

C/- James Gardner-Hopkins,  
Barrister, Woodward Street Chambers  
By email: james@jghbarrister.com

#298

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 3:46:47 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 2:31:02 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 121.72.244.174

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Whitewater NZ (Inc)

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Dr Douglas Alexander Rankin

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Do you approve: Yes, in principle, but suggest a few minor changes for clarity of meaning and sense

Please explain:

Background

1. Whitewater NZ (Inc) (Whitewater NZ ) has submitted previously and extensively on changes that were proposed to the Navigation

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

Safety Bylaw (NSB) 2014. Whitewater NZ thanks the Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) for informing us and involving us in the consultation on the proposed 2017 NSB .

2. Of particular concern in the past were changes to Rule 19.5 of the NSB 2014 requested by some parties that would have permitted powered vessels to operate on the Kawarau River below the Arrow River confluence. We objected strenuously to those proposed changes at hearings held by the Queenstown Lakes District Council. Whitewater NZs view on this matter, and that of the kayaking, rafting and paddling community, has not changed since that time.

3. Such a change in the Bylaw could have seen powered craft, such as jet boats, utilising a reach of the Kawarau River, which is currently utilised by 'floating' non-powered craft boaters, such as kayakers, canoeists, rafters, catarafters, river bugging enthusiasts, pack rafters, river boarders and the like, on part of a river run known as the Chinese Dogleg white water run. This could introduce commercial and private jet boating operations and a real safety hazard into an area where there is currently none; namely the risk of a collision between powered craft and a non-powered craft with potentially serious consequences, such as a death(s) on the river. Such activities could also lead to exclusion of current users from the resource, or restrictions on their access to the resource and/or loss of its values, because of the intrusion and danger posed by jet boat traffic to non-powered users and possible extensive use of the river by jet boating and bungy operations.

Current proposal with respect to Rule 36.4

4. Whitewater NZ notes that in the proposed bylaw there is no intention to change this current bylaw rule. The new rule 36.4 has identical wording to the old rule 19.5.

Whitewater NZ Position

5. Whitewater NZs position is that it fully supports the retention of bylaw 36.4 rule as it stands. Whitewater NZ does not want to see the rule altered in any way, and especially not in a way that would permit jetboating below the Arrow confluence.

Relevant consent application

6. Whitewater NZ, as an objector, is aware of a consent application by Kawarau Jet Services Holdings (KJet), which is currently still active and awaiting consideration, to permit commercial jet boating below the Arrow River confluence and down to the bungy bridge. To permit or activate this consent, if it were to be granted, the old or proposed NSB would need to be changed, as at present such an activity would not be possible, as jet boating below the Arrow confluence would not be permitted.

7. Therefore, Whitewater NZ has every expectation that KJet will, as they have done before, ask for a revision of the NSB, in one form or another, to permit such an activity in order to facilitate the granting of the consent(s) they seek. Whitewater NZ still objects to such a consent(s) and any consequent changes to the NSB 2017 that would be required to facilitate it.

Whitewater NZ position

8. By being retained in its current form rule 36.4 of the proposed bylaw recognises the long standing access that non-powered craft have had to the exclusion of powered craft on the Kawarau River below the Arrow River confluence. This has been done for reasons of safety, the protection of non-powered craft white water users use of the river, and the protection of associated user values of the river. The white water and other values and use of the Kawarau River below the Arrow River confluence are recognised by the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997. Whitewater NZ asks that the proposed bylaw be approved, and that rule 36.4 be retained in that bylaw in its current form, so that these values can be retained, that no hazard or restriction on future use is created by, for example, permitting commercial jet boating in such an area, and that the bylaw is consistent with the recognition provided by and intent of the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997.

Current proposal with regard to section 54 Exemptions

Changes and concerns

9. In section 54 Exemptions changes to the bylaw are proposed where the Council as well as the Harbourmaster may grant an exemption. A lot of power is conferred on these parties with the ability for them to make decisions on matters without informing or considering affected parties. This concerns Whitewater NZ.

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

10. Although the intention is that the power to grant the exemptions is limited to particular provisions in the proposed bylaw (Appendix 5 Table of changes ) this is not made clear in clause 54.2. Whitewater NZ assumes that exemptions can only be sought from specified clauses 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 28 and Part 5 of the bylaw and the following discussion is predicated on this premise.

11. It is noted that this new bylaw would prevent any temporary speed upliftings by way of exemption. Such exemptions have been granted in the past.

12. Whitewater NZ strongly supports the removal of the exemption for such an uplifting, as it is important that river users are fully notified of any such temporary upliftings. This is especially important in order to maintain a safe river environment and especially one where there are 'no surprises', where, for example, non-powered river users suddenly find powered vessels in their environment (and the safety hazard they pose) where they have never been before.

13. Whitewater NZ note that there is no imperative that exemptions only be granted in exceptional or extraordinary circumstances, as might be implied by the meaning of the word exemption - freedom or release from some liability or requirement to which others are subject. Just granting an exemption because someone can apply for one provides no hurdle or threshold and seems a little disrespectful of the rules that have been created, presumably for good reasons.

14. Rules and bylaws are adopted for reasons such as assisting with ensuring the safe and orderly conduct of boating activities on waterways. As it is currently written clause 54.1 means an exemption can be granted simply so long as an application is made.

15. For example, although rule 36.4 states 'No powered vessels may operate on that part of the Kowarau River located below the Arrow River', under Clause 54.2 an exemption to Part 5 of the bylaw could be granted to allow powered vessels to operate below the Arrow River. Current river users would not need to be notified and could be exposed to a serious safety hazard. However, it seems counterintuitive that such an exemption could even be considered. After all it is contrary to an established rule which is presumably there for a reason.

16. Rule 36.4 is presumably included for reasons of public health and safety as well as other reasons discussed earlier (para 8). Given clauses 54.4 and 54.5 in the proposed NSB 2017, where the effects of an exemption on public health and safety must be considered, or revocation of an exemption may be made if public health and safety has or might be adversely affected, it seems wrong that such an exemption should be either even considered or allowed.

17. Knowingly granting an exemption and exposing current river users to a safety hazard such as risk of collision with powered craft where powered craft are currently prohibited, and where current users expect this (prohibition) to be the case, seems foolish in the extreme. However, exemptions of this nature have already been made, with KJet getting temporary upliftings and permission to run jet boats down below the Arrow confluence on a number of occasions in the recent past.

18. Part of the reason for KJet obtaining these exemptions, as Whitewater NZ understands it, has been to demonstrate that powered craft can safely negotiate the Kowarau River down through Smith's Falls to the bungy bridge, with a view to being able to do this commercially. It is also Whitewater NZ's understanding that the exclusion of powered craft below the Arrow River has in part been the result of a jet boat driver drowning at Smith's Falls in the past.

19. However, commercial jet boating down through Smith's Falls to the bungy bridge would have serious impacts on the current white water users of the river and ignores the obvious public safety hazard such operations would pose. It seems inappropriate that exemptions could be granted that could lead to undermining the current users' values of the Kowarau River, on a permanent basis, and for example a change to the bylaw that would permit powered craft to travel down to the bungy bridge.

20. The question has to be asked, what is the purpose of a rule if an exemption can be made to that rule that ultimately might see the rule being permanently removed? Arguably this might suggest that the rule was not needed in the first place, whereas this is not the case. Amongst other things the rule is needed to protect the safety and values of users utilising the resource, whose values are recognised under the Water Conservation (Kowarau) Order 1997.

### Whitewater NZs position

21. In order to address Whitewater NZ's concerns outlined in paragraphs 9-20 Whitewater NZ would ask that the Clause 54.1 be modified to read:

'The Council or the Harbourmaster may only grant an exemption under this bylaw under exceptional or extraordinary circumstances and on receipt of an application made prior to the commencement of any activity in contravention of the requirements of this bylaw and after due notification of affected parties.'

22. Whitewater NZ also asks that clause 54.2 be modified to read:

## Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017

'The Council or the Harbourmaster may only exempt by written approval, any person, vessel or class of vessels from clause 8, 12, 14, 17, 19, 28 and Part 5 (but excluding rule 36.4) of this bylaw.'

Current proposal relating to Part 5 – Rules relating to specific locations

23. Whitewater NZ notes that personal craft such as canoes and kayaks and river bugs and pack rafts are now considered vessels . However, in clause 32.1 reference is made the absolute need ('must ensure') for such craft to keep to the starboard (right) side of the river channel on a river. This rule is potentially extremely hazardous to such non-powered river users; as such a part of a river channel may have extremely dangerous or hazardous features in it. In addition, such a rule is unnecessarily restrictive on such users activities on a river, where they move around and will want to make use of and enjoy hydraulic features in different parts of a river.

24. It is likely that Part 5 is largely applicable to powered craft and so we suggest that the rule is modified to reflect this.

Whitewater NZ position

25. Whitewater NZ asks that clause 32.1 be modified to read:

'Subject to the more specific rules below, a person in charge of a powered vessel on a river must: .....'

Current proposal relating to section 51 Speed Upliftings

26. Whitewater NZ strongly endorses the need for public notification and consultation with affected parties and the general approach to considering and granting speed upliftings for powered craft on waters, and no exemption of upliftings within this bylaw.

27. However, Whitewater NZ notes that the proposed NSB has removed the need to publically notify any speed uplifting once granted and only refers to the specification of conditions in the interests of navigation safety, rather than in the wider public interest, such as the endangerment of persons using the waters, and that are the subject and necessary consideration of the application . As mentioned previously, it is important any such upliftings are publically notified so that river users are not surprised by changes in speed limits, and the presence of powered craft in areas where they previously have not been.

28. Given that the (presumably lack of ) endangerment of persons using the waters that are the subject of the application, is a matter that the council has to be satisfied on before granting an uplifting, it is felt that clause 51.3 needs to be slightly modified to address these matters.

Whitewater NZ position

29. Whitewater NZ asks that clause 51.3 be modified to read:

'The Council may grant an application in accordance with clause 51.2 for a specified period or periods and subject to such conditions as Council may specify in the interests of navigation safety and other river users safety, and provided the Director and the public are is notified.'

30. Otherwise we want proposed section 51 to remain as it is. The same applies to other sections where we have made no comments.

D A Rankin  
Conservation Officer/Board Member  
Whitewater NZ

31 October 2017



#299

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 2:33:08 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 3:29:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:56:00  
**IP Address:** 122.56.204.59

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Queenstown Water Taxis Ltd

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Neville Kelly / Deborah Kelly

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **Other**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

Part 9 - Structures and Moorings, 47 Mooring permits

1. Would like to see moorings on chains only and to be at least 50 mts away from any jetty structure.
2. Jetty structures to be a floating structure to allow for the high and low levels of the lake.

Part 5- Commercial Activities

Clarification on the wording of this part - do all motorized vessels have to have consent to operate on our waterways along with the appropriate maritime documents.

Appendix 6 - Proposed Maritime Fees and Charges

Clarification on the fee structure and how they are going to be effectively enforced.

---

#300

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 3:16:58 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 3:34:31 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:17:32  
**IP Address:** 103.198.184.235

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Grahm James Berry

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017?

No

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The outlet to Albert Town Stretch of the Clutha is ideally suited to passive , non motorised, and under 5 knots craft.

As a family , like many locals , we use that part of river a lot while below the bridge is not as suitable for non motorised family recreation.

We walk, bike and picnic the outlet track and paddle board and swim the river. It is one of our favourite and special places. One of the best places on a windy day.

We are reminded how crazy it is to allow motor boats on this stretch of river, conflicting with the unique passive recreation activities there, when we have visitors with us and a noisy, threatening craft goes by, ruining the experience for all. Visitors always comment along the lines of; "what the..." or "what are the council thinking allowing individuals to have such a detrimental impact on this place when they can boat below the bridge for miles".

---

# #301

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 4:17:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 4:21:38 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:08  
**IP Address:** 122.56.205.0

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as:

An individual

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Peter Marshall

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? Yes

**Q12** Please explain your decision

I said yes on the assumption that they are going to lift the 5knt speed limit. Having fished many rivers with jet boats the quicker they got by the better. The fishing did not degrade in fact the opposite. There is too much of only one user syndrome.

Lets all get on and let the boaters enjoy the river as well.

#302

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 4:43:02 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 4:51:46 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:43  
**IP Address:** 122.57.117.52

---

Page 1

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

**Q2** Please select the statement that applies to you: **I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing**

---

Page 2

**Q3** Name of organisation

The Weaving House

---

**Q6** Would you like to include your name as part of this feedback? **Yes**

---

Page 3

**Q7** Full name

Amy Pearl

---

Page 4

**Q11** Do you approve of the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017? **No**

---

**Q12** Please explain your decision

The onslaught of consumer behaviour on one of our townships most iconic places, a special place for all New Zealanders for whom we are guardians for - a place of peace and of human & natural purpose not mechanical interaction is unacceptable- it will be impossible to enforce if there are no limits to speed - restrictions are required - This is no place for the behaviour I've observed under current laws. The proposal is prosperous - our natural heritage & the safety and peace of our local population far more important than unrestricted use of a few users who have the run of our beautiful lake. Looking forward to discussing this at a later date.

---