

Orange = opposed to Clutha uplifting. 299

Green = support Clutha uplifting. 12

Yellow = addresses other topic. 13

Grey = no substantive submission. 3

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (ATTACHMENT A)

| Sub # | Submitter | Agree with review? | Appear | Summary of comment |
|-------|------------------------|--------------------|--------|---|
| 1 | Louise Johnson Sincock | No | No | Lives on Clutha river – noise. Uses for kayaking and swimming and walking along river edge in peace. Likes to watch fishing, paddle boarders, and flotation devices along river. Boats at speed will destroy the reason they live there. The annual race shows the disturbance they will have daily. |
| 2 | Geoffrey Costello | No | No | Clutha river – for all to enjoy, used for swimming, kayaking, fishing rafting etc. used river for above purposes for 40 years. Concerns over danger with speed increase. Area will be spoiled if speed uplift occurs. |
| 3 | Christine Joy Thomson | No | No | Clutha river – lots of lake where people can speed. Iconic for kayak, paddleboard, tubers, floaters and picnickers. With speed limit people abuse the speed, has concern for above users of river. |
| 4 | Jan Grant | No | No | Clutha River – uses to swim, sail and walk dogs. Does not want to have motor boats going fast. Concerns over safety. |
| 5 | Zenda Badger | No | No | Clutha river – used for cycling, fishing and walking. Many people would be at risk if speed uplifted. Whole lake for speeding boats. Increasing boat domain puts other users at risk. Likes tranquil river walks and swimming in the river. At moment it is a last “haven” where nature and the natural environment can be enjoyed. |
| 6 | Susan Adams | No | No | Clutha River – safety concerns. Used for swimming, floating and kayaking. Boats should not have priority. |
| 7 | Diana | No | No | Clutha River – plenty of other areas for boats in Wanaka already. this areas |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | should be preserved as safe place for families, beginners and those wanting to swim, kayak, |
| 8 | Jaime Hunter | No | No | Clutha River – Safety concern. |
| 9 | John Barlow | No | Yes | Clutha River – increased growth increases use, causes danger. Safety. Wants to ban motorised boats completely above albert town bridge, and 5 knot speed down to confluence. |
| 10 | Brian Knapp | No | No | Clutha river – endangers other river users |
| 11 | Karolyn Knapp | No | No | Clutha river – not wide enough for boats and other users. Fast boats are danger. Deans bank attracts people for fishing. Environment will be ruined by noise. |
| 12 | Disa Evans | No | No | Clutha River – uses to paddle board. Keep speed same, makes safe for all users |
| 13 | Rosalind Goulding | No | No | Clutha river – used by numerous passive users. Use is high by these users. Jet ski and boats are in conflict with this user group. Noise. Fast boats shatter peace and tranquillity. Harms wildlife. |
| 14 | Peter Macdonald Rhodes | No | No | Clutha river – area is egg laying and hatching ground for trout. Used by fishermen as it is established trout fishing area. Only stretch that allows public access from walking track. |
| 15 | Keith Murray | No | No | Clutha river - Agrees clause 35. Used by non-powered users. Concern for safety, accident or fatality. Disagrees schedule two – speed uplifting. |
| 16 | Ian Kennedy | No | No | Clutha river – family uses area for swim, kayak, and floating. Powered boats cause danger and intrusion to use, particularly around the Albert Town swim spot. Prefer total ban of power craft on this stretch. |
| 17 | Craig Andrew Adams | No | No | Clutha River – user conflict. Floating, swimming, kayaking, multi-sport, rafting, wading, fishing are all at odd with unlimited speed. Stronger education and enforcement is needed. Valuable source of food. noise pollution, |
| 18 | Glynis Woodrow | No | No | Clutha River – impacts quiet enjoyment of walking and biking tracks. Noticed increase of non-powered craft on river. Safety concern. |
| 19 | Neil Woodrow | No | No | Clutha River – safety concern of non-powered craft. Noise. Disruption to users of track and residents. Proposed change is more confusing, suggests complete ban of powered craft instead. QLDC could offer concessions to the two tourist operators in this instance. |
| 20 | Graeme Sinclair | No | No | Clutha River – residents shouldn't have to listen to noise. Shouldn't have to watch for boats when swimming snorkelling or any other non-powered use. Plenty of |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|----|--|
| | | | | other areas boats can speed on the lake. Pollution concerns. |
| 21 | Katharine Wynn-Williams | No | No | Clutha River – swimming area special place for families to gather and play. Already too many noisy fast boats in area. Boats cause disturbance and nuisance. Danger concerns. |
| 22 | Perry Brooks | No | No | Clutha River – dangerous to other users. Uses river to swim, fish and kayak. Concern even for those sitting on bank edge. Says not being able to police speed is no reason to remove speed. |
| 23 | Helen May James | No | No | Clutha River – uses river to camp at camping ground and to fish. River used by swimmers, has danger concerns. |
| 24 | Bruce Hebbard | No | No | Boat ramp charges – a person using the boat launching area for fishing, walking or bbq/picnic should not be charged. Prefers parking fee ticket dispenser to pay the fee. Should be available for one launce, and valid for 487 hours to allow overnight stay somewhere on the lake. Would be displayed on windshield of towing vehicle. Clutha river – disagrees with change. QLDC need to give better resourcing to allow harbourmaster to enforce speed limit. |
| 25 | Justine Marra | No | No | Asking us to explain the consultation that this document has been through to become a bylaw. Asking why the harbourmaster is commenting on consenting issues- suggests it is outside his mandate. Current consent holders are not at top of pecking order – their consents would need looked at as they will have limitations by old bylaw. Consent holders are holding whole community to ransom over this. suggests QLDC is outside its mandate under the RMA to consider all users. |
| 26 | Annika Hackerschmied | No | No | Clutha River – danger concerns. Should remain peaceful and safe for residents, swimmers, kayakers, fishers, snorkelers, paddle boarders, rafters, bikers and walkers |
| 27 | Steven Bartrom | No | No | Same as above |
| 28 | Jane Evelyn Guise | No | No | Clutha River – lots of people use area for non-powered recreation. Open speed causes danger. |
| 29 | Kristine Mary Vollebregt | No | No | Clutha river – would like to see 5 knots at all times in this stretch and no powered craft in Albert Town swimming island area. |

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | Would be better respect for area so special. Tranquillity is a rare commodity. Must be protected for humans & Myriad of life living in and round river. Safety concerns for non-powered users of river. Noise. |
| 30 | Jocelyn Toomey | No | No | Clutha River – used by many recreational users. Danger concerns. Other rivers boats can speed in area. Majority of users should be safe. |
| 31 | Chris White | No | No | Clutha River – should be available to all to use safely. no speed limit makes it unsafe for non-powered users of the river |
| 32 | Luke Wilson | No | No | Clutha River – Danger concerns. Uses it for paddle boarding. Concern for injury. |
| 33 | Anthony William Marino | No | No | Clutha River – concern of danger to non-powered users. Used by many non-powered users. Keen fisherman, important fishing destination. Wake is nuisance. Current commercial users are always mindful of other river users. |
| 34 | Pip Harker | No | No | Clutha River – peaceful family area. No place for fast noisy boats. Families should be able to use without concern for boats. |
| 35 | Bronwyn Bain | No | No | Clutha river – ambience of river walk. Bird life disruption, soil erosion, paddle boarders and canoe unhinged and fishing disturbed. |
| 36 | Carol Brooks | No | No | Clutha River – iconic destination for many users (walk, bike, kayak, fishing, and swim) beautiful and peaceful. Real asset to region. Uplift has no regard for safety. |
| 37 | Kenneth Alexander Warburton | No | No | Clutha River – heavily used by swimmers, children, paddle boarders and anglers. Danger concerns |
| 38 | Nadia De Blaauw | No | No | Clutha River – safety concerns for non-powered users. Environment degradation. No speed limit prioritises boats over unpowered users. Proposed bylaw contradicts district plan (sec 4.6.2) |
| 39 | Vanessa Oatley | No | No | Clutha River – dangerous. Excessive noise for residents. |
| 40 | Allan James Easte | No | No | Clutha river – already seen disregard to other water users. Bought property to enjoy calm and quietness of walking by river. Noise. |
| 41 | Claire O'Connell | No | Yes | Clutha River – used by many non-powered craft, has been like that for 15 years. Does not like the idea of uplifting speed. Enjoys peaceful float/swim. |
| 42 | Robert Gareth Roberts | No | No | Clutha River – busy stretch of water for anglers, paddle boarders, kayakers, and swimmers. Danger concerns. Spoil ambience of majority of users. |
| 43 | Stefan Austin | No | No | Clutha River – recreates and works on river as kayaker. Puts students and himself at risk. Concern over fatality. |
| 44 | Peter Eley | No | No | Clutha River – safety issue. Speed requires training and understanding. Used by |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | many users. Current speed limit works. There is 192km2 of lake with no speed limits. |
| 45 | Jeanie Ackley | No | yes | Clutha river – would like to see it power free. Safety concerns. Has great recreational potential. There are safe swimming holes in this zone for children. Promotion of premium environment. Wildlife. Fishing. Shared by campgrounds, walking and cycling. Tranquillity and natural environment. Great boat ramps at each end of this stretch of water. |
| 46 | Sarah Sellar | No | No | Clutha River – uses it for kayaking. Essential for skill level. Safety concern. Makes her sad if law prevents her doing what she loves. |
| 47 | Anna Kate Hutter | No | No | Clutha River – safety concerns for passive users. Simpler is better 5knott rule alerts boats to passive users and vice versa. |
| 48 | Keith C Hutton | No | No | Clutha Rive – noise. Spoil world rated reputation of fly fishing. Safety concerns. Powered craft can use number of other waterways, wants this one left safe and peaceful. |
| 49 | Deidre Hutton | No | No | Clutha River – use by many different users. Concern over danger. Noise for houses near river and picnic spots along river. Camp ground affected by noise. Ruin fishing reputation. |
| 50 | NZ SUP | No | No | Exception to requirements to carry or wear lifejacket. 22.1 clauses 18, 19, 20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most common cause of fatalities is separation from board. A PFD is a second line of defence. If QLDC allow paddle boarders to go without a PFD it is vital they wear a leash. - Concern over lack of definition of wetsuit. - Concern bylaw will put paddle boarders at risk. - Suggests removing the word paddle board from 22.1 clauses 18,19 and 20 do not apply to xxx - 22.1 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. - Concern over word “lifejacket” instead of PFD as used in the NZ Maritime law. |
| 51 | Toni Maguire | No | No | Clutha River – should be for quiet use of all, not commercial gain of a few. Noise and environmental pollution, family use for multiple non-powered purposes. Like |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | to listen to river flowing and bird singing. Erosion concern. |
| 52 | Babu Blatt | No | No | Clutha River – favourite spot for locals for multiple activities. Safety concerns. Experience to treasure and look after. Prefer to see river free of all powered craft. |
| 53 | Nick leach | No | No | Clutha River – like QLDC to consider impact of increased boat use. Uses river for multiple non powered activities. Watched recent international jet sprint, whilst fun for a day, does not enjoy the sound. Safety concerns. More river below the bridge for boats to enjoy. |
| 54 | Ian Bruce Cole | No | Yes | Elected member of fish and game. Long standing member of Clutha fisheries trust which he is now chair of. Clutha river – concern over population growth. Outstanding natural features facilitating number of passive activities. Concerns over danger and safety. Peaceful tranquil setting. Modern technology should remedy policing issues. Believes not enough community consultation has taken place. Current proposal need simplified. Extend 5 knot to Albert Town Bridge, and then there is a clear landmark. Ample opportunity to boat below the bridge. Health and safety issues. |
| 55 | Iain Miller | No | No | Sees no benefit to public amenity of a change to current limits |
| 56 | Martin Robb | No | No | Clutha River – does not want power boats in this section of river as will compromise safety of swimmers, fishers and other recreational users. Likely to adversely affect river banks. |
| 57 | Anna Scott Walker | No | No | Clutha River – should be motor free. Has children who frequent river. Imperative for everyone's safety including those who use it for non-powered activities. |
| 58 | Katheryn Collins | No | No | Clutha river – lots of people including his family use for non-powered activities. Like grandchildren to continue to experience same pleasures without having to worry about speeding boats. Erosion concerns. Jet boating should be banned or limited to 5 knots in this section. |
| 59 | Michael baker | No | Yes | Clutha river – impact on environment and fisheries. This is a protected area. Safety concerns. No emergency facilities close by. Would like to keep river for kids to float and swim in. |
| 60 | Sarah Baumanis | No | Yes | Clutha River – popular swimming spot. Shame to loose freedom to swim in peace in nature. Boats scare the fish away. Great spot for families to cool off in summer safely. Boats have other places they can use. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| 61 | Andrew Thompson | No | No | Clutha River – high use area for non-powered activities. Boarders' residential houses. All motorised craft should be banned from this area. |
| 62 | Erin Murdie | No | No | Clutha River – cause significant disruption and danger to swimmers, floaters, fishing, eco life and to the serenity of area. Noise. Walking track is a pleasure at moment. |
| 63 | Alan Robert Richardson | No | No | There is no way the QLDC have ability to police river now, let alone with the new regs. River use is high and doesn't mix with jet boats. |
| 64 | Karen Birkby | No | No | Clutha River – suggests no motor boats of any kind. |
| 65 | Richard Birkby | No | Yes | Clutha river – safety. Noise. Fishing. Suggests total ban on powered craft or year round 5 knot speed limit. |
| 66 | Kansas Davis | No | No | Used by many different non-powered activities. Danger concerns. |
| 67 | Marian Krogh | No | No | Clutha River – beautiful area. Great place for non-powered activities. Speed boats will ruin this. |
| 68 | John Langley | No | No | Support status quo for Clutha River. Uplifting will increase risk to non- powered users. Noise. |
| 69 | Carl Murphy | No | No | Clutha river 0 uses for swimming and fishing. Already been a drop in fish numbers in last 5 year. Section of river is a spawning river, so will make it worse. |
| 70 | Raymond John Gregg | No | No | Clutha River – would like to see it remain 5 knots due to use by non-powered activities. Noise close to residential area. |
| 71 | Helen Clarke | No | No | Clutha River – does not want to see speed increase in this stretch. |
| 72 | Erika Jane Burke | No | No | Clutha River – we need to keep it as safe as possible for other river users. |
| 73 | Jo Murphy | No | No | Clutha river – suggests no motor craft on this section. Safety concerns. |
| 74 | Abby Gallagher | No | No | Top section of Clutha River from Albert Town to lake should be free of motor crafts |
| 75 | Louise Freeman | Other | No | Clutha River – Safety Concern |
| 76 | Lynette Graham | No | No | Albert Town section of Clutha River – Safety concerns. Motor boats & jet skis to be removed or speed restrictions put in place |
| 77 | Ian Turnbull | No | No | Clutha River – Concerns with motorised vehicles on the water |
| 78 | Scott West | No | No | Clutha River – Safety concern. And concerned about noise pollution |
| 79 | Nick Johnson | No | No | Outlet to Albert town – negative impact of unrestricted motorised boats. 5 knots would be more appropriate in this area |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|----|--|
| 80 | Adam Wood | No | No | Clutha River between Outlet & Albert Town bridge – Safety concerns for swimmers. High speed motorised boats are a concern. Concerns for noisy jet boats for walkers along outlet track. Jet boats and jet skis should be using Lake Wanaka. Rejects comments made by harbourmaster in regards to the removal of speed limits |
| 81 | Charlotte Dempster | No | No | Albert Town area speed limit safety concerns. Concerns of noise pollution along outlet track. Rejects comments made that it's too difficult to enforce speed restrictions |
| 82 | Craig Smith | No | No | Wants to motorised crafts from Outlet to Albert Town bridge – Safety concerns |
| 83 | Jonathan Homer | No | No | Speed Limits to be put in place – Safety concerns |
| 84 | Mary Gilmour | No | No | Noise concerns for biking along river. Safety concerns for downriver to Albert Town bridge. Doesn't want boating traffic, which is getting dangerous, or want boats with noisy engines |
| 85 | Sam Metcalfe | No | No | Is a swimmer, doesn't want boats to be able to go fast long Clutha River. |
| 86 | Al Taylor | No | No | Clutha river, Outlet to Albert Town – safety concerns for water users and quiet area for walkers |
| 87 | Rod Walker | No | No | Clutha river – Safety Concerns, wants to leave current situation as is. Does not want high speed activity on water |
| 88 | Megan Tracy Van | No | No | Clutha River, outlet to Albert Town – safety concerns. Does not want to see what happened at Deans Bank happen to this area. Suggested lower reaches below Clutha river for boats to travel at higher speeds. Raising speed limits is irresponsible and dangerous |
| 89 | Philippa Jane Clearwater | No | No | Opposed to no speed restrictions between outlet and Albert Town bridge. Noise disruptions to river users and outlet track users. Happy with 5 knot restriction to stay in place |
| 90 | Jeanette Hatten | No | No | Clutha River - Outlet to Albert Town Bridge - Opposed to no speed limits. Would cause a wash and disturbance/wake along water edge. Safety concerns for swimmers. Disruptive to fisherman |
| 91 | Alistair Moore | No | No | Clutha River - Outlet to Albert Town Bridge. Removing 5 knot speed limit will cause conflict between users and accidents. Issue with engine & exhaust noise. Suggests area could be off-limits to power boats and to use downstream from the Albert Town bridge |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-------|-----|---|
| 92 | Andrea Oddone | No | Yes | Dangerous for swimmers and others |
| 93 | Richard Key | No | Yes | Clutha River - Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – Safety concerns for swimmers. Environmental Impact with riverbank erosion. Tranquillity will disappear, noise concerns and bigger wakes from motor crafts. Rejects comments from Harbourmaster about it being hard to enforce speed limits in the area. Should provide the harbourmaster with more resources to enforce. |
| 94 | Yvonne Ludlow | No | No | Safety concerns if speed limits lifted |
| 95 | Patrick Perkins | Yes | No | Clutha River - Outlet to Albert Town Bridge. Commercial Operator on river. Sees no reason for having any restriction from Albert town bridge downstream as area is not built-up as residential. Keep 5 knots from outlet to 5 knot buoy. Remove times and speed limits from below Albert Town bridge. Suggests boats doing 5 knots creates more noise & wake |
| 96 | Geoffrey Blackler | No | No | Clutha River - Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – Would like all powered crafts to be banned along this stretch – Safety & noise concerns. Vessels would disturb walkers and fisherman |
| 97 | Richard Owen Boyd | No | Yes | Opposed to uplifting speed limits on upper Clutha river. Safety concerns, increase in noise pollution, conflict with trout fishing, opposes suggestion the speed limit is hard to enforce. |
| 98 | Geoffrey Stewart Hatten | Other | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – safety concerns if 5 knot limit is lifted |
| 99 | Daniel Clearwater | No | No | Objection to uplifting speed limit – safety & noise concerns. Wants 5 knot speed limit at all times between outlet and Albert town bridge. Visual concerns of boats going fast through area |
| 100 | Jane Hawkey | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – safety & noise concerns. Wants complete ban of motorised vessels in this area |
| 101 | Alan Cutler | No | Yes | Opposes uplifting of speed limits on Clutha river and removal of time restrictions on below Albert Town bridge. Advocates greater recognition of ONF status of river. Conflicts with motorised crafts and fishermen & swimmers. Disturbs track users. Motorised crafts have unrestricted use of Lake Wanaka & Shotover river gorge. Proposed outlet to confluence 5 knot limit, jet skis banned from outlet to confluence, and existing time limits between outlet and red bridge be retained |
| 102 | Jeffrey William | Yes | Yes | No major issues with currently shared 5 knot area downstream of 5 knot buoy so |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| | Donaldson | | | agrees time restriction should be applied to full length of river |
| 103 | Niamh Tones | No | No | Safety concerns & noise pollution are eroding Clutha's attraction. Speed should be restricted to max 5 knots with no motorised craft in areas with families and swimmers |
| 104 | Richard Sidey | Other | No | Wants 5 knot zone extended from Outlet to Albert Town bridge – Safety & noise concerns |
| 105 | Jo Haines | No | No | Opposes lifting of speed limits and wants current speed limit extended from Outlet to confluence – Safety concerns from swimmers. Noise concerns for track users. Time restrictions should be kept as they are |
| 106 | Inga Booiman | No | No | Concerns for the nature |
| 107 | Pedro Pimentel | No | No | Opposes no speed limits near Albert town bridge. Outlet to Albert Town Bridge should be slow zone. Safety concerns |
| 108 | Roger North | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – safety concerns |
| 109 | John Highton | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – safety concerns for swimmers, noise pollution for track users. Would like powered boats excluded from this area. Concerns for safety of fisherman at outlet, Hogans & Deans Bank. Same should apply to Lake Wanaka, would like areas set aside to exclude powered boats, such as Paddock Bay. This should also be a 5 knot area |
| 110 | Graeme & Andy Oxley | No | No | Opposed to uplifting 5knot speed limit between Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – safety concerns, special mention of camping ground adjacent. |
| 111 | Anthony Joseph Clarry | No | No | Against issuing consents for high speed private & commercial boat traffic from lake Wanaka to Albert Town bridge. Safety concerns |
| 112 | Lennon Bright | No | No | Albert Town area - Concerns as fisherman scaring off fish, safety concerns for swimmers and erosion of the banks caused by boat wakes. Noise concerns from house |
| 113 | Lakeland Wanaka Michael Donald | Yes | No | Agrees with uplifting time restrictions. Opposed to 5 knot restriction around outlet. The noise & wake is more nuisance travelling at 5 knots. |
| 114 | Ian & Nichola Greaves | No | Yes | Opposes uplifting of 5 Knot speed limit. Suggests 5 knot speed limit between outlet & Albert town Bridge or prohibiting boats all together. Safety & noise concerns. Concerns for recreational values of area |
| 115 | Marc Walker | Other | No | Thinks current rules above Albert Town bridge are fine as they are. Disagrees with the current rules for below the bridge, suggests there should be no time |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------|-----|---|
| | | | | restriction |
| 116 | Kim Kelly | No | No | Noise pollution for users of the outlet track |
| 117 | Roger Bruce Munro | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge restrictions should stay as they are at present – Safety concerns |
| 118 | Jono Donald | Yes | No | Agrees with changes – All river users can use the area with no concerns. New by-law won't increase boating traffic |
| 119 | Johanne | No | No | Opposes no speed limit from outlet to Albert town – Safety concerns |
| 120 | Test submission | | | |
| 121 | Ana Aliscia | Other | No | Outlet to Albert Town Bridge – Safety concerns if speed restriction is uplifted |
| 122 | Andrew McLean | No | Yes | Opposes uplifting of speed limits from outlet to Albert town bridge – Safety Concerns for non-motorised boat users. It has impact on outlet track users & fisherman with noise pollution, wash alarming fish. Has environmental impact, pollution from engines, sediment stir up from motors, bank erosion from wake and more algae and exotic weeds. Goes against NZ's clean green image |
| 123 | Gary Dickson | No | No | Opposes uplift of speed restriction between outlet & Albert Town bridge. Would like 5 knot speed limit kept. Need to educate and add more signage |
| 124 | Beth Campbell | No | No | Keep speed restrictions as they are – If changed will have impact on native birds, human safety, increased noise & human pollution |
| 125 | Lee Exell | Yes | No | N/A (Put OK in explanation) |
| 126 | Wayne Hudson | No | No | Upper Clutha – Opposes higher speeds – Increased danger and noise |
| 127 | Gail Harper | No | No | Opposes higher speed – Creates surges in river flow, possibly knocking down children along banks. Safety concerns in water. Concerns about river bank eroding. |
| 128 | Bridget Gould | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town - Opposes speed limit uplift – Safety concerns |
| 129 | Jon Sedon | No | No | Would like to restrict speed between outlet and Albert Town Bridge – Safety concerns and noise pollution |
| 130 | Sarah Fairmaid | No | No | Would like motorised boats restricted from use between outlet and Albert town – Safety concerns |
| 131 | Jane Mawson | No | No | No explanation given |
| 132 | Robert Yule | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town - Opposes speed limit uplift – Safety concerns |
| 133 | Kay George | No | No | Does not support community. Pollution, other options for jet boats, environment, |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|--|
| | | | | future planning. |
| 134 | Rachael Moore | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town bridge, opposes speed limit speed limit uplift, should be kept at 5 Knots – Safety concerns and concerns for area being kept in tact |
| 135 | Jean Kenney | Yes | No | Would like to see the section of river from outlet to Albert town permanent slow zone |
| 136 | Jennifer Parr | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town - Opposes speed limit uplift – Safety & noise pollution concerns |
| 137 | Megan Davies | No | No | Clutha River – Safety & noise pollution concerns. Harmful to high quality area. |
| 138 | Sarah Allen | No | No | Does not want speed limit removed from outlet to rapid area. Concerns for safety of swimmers, animals, non-motorised crafts and fisherman. Would like to see the 5 knot limit enforced all day to increase the consistency of speed and reduce confusion |
| 139 | Kate Young | No | No | Outlet to Albert Town - Opposes speed limit uplift – Safety concerns |
| 140 | Marie Jean Lewis | No | Yes | Would like the 5 knot speed limit to apply to past the Albert Town bridge as far as Cardrona. Noise pollution and water disturbance from high speed boats are a detractor for fisherman who come specifically to the peaceful area |
| 141 | Jenny Maybin | No | No | Concerns it will cause traffic increase on the Clutha River. Concerns for noise pollution, shore erosion and safety for swimmers |
| 142 | Alycia Walker | No | No | Safety concerns for recreational activities if speed limits were increased |
| 143 | Andrew Penniket | No | Yes | Supports 5 knot restriction between Outlet and Albert Town. Opposes unrestricted speed limits for boats, would be dangerous and diminish peacefulness of river track |
| 144 | Rob Jewell | No | No | Opposes speed uplifting between Outlet to Albert Town Bridge. Maritime fees & charges blanket approach provides no flexibility for number of users on lake. Suggests using Department of internal affairs fees for the use of boating facilities which is used in Lake Taupo |
| 145 | Jethro Robinson | No | No | Opposes speed uplifting on Clutha River. Amenity value diminished by noise pollution, & high-speed vessels. Would like the 5 knot speed limit at all times between Outlet and Albert Town |
| 146 | Bie van Den Borne | No | No | Would like Outlet to Albert Town permanent slow zone |
| 147 | Jan Dobbie | No | No | Opposes speed uplifting on Clutha River. Safety concerns and noise pollution. Would like to see no-powered crafts from 1 st Oct to 31 April. If not 5 knots at all |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | times from outlet to albert town and no powered crafts in Albert town swimming area |
| 148 | Megan Williams | No | No | Opposes proposed changes – Safety concerns and serenity of area. Also not good for environment. Suggests spot checks to assist with enforcement or a hotline for river users to call in. Would like any further resource consents to commercial operators to be put out to public consultation. |
| 149 | Denis Dobbie | No | No | Opposes speed limit uplifts – Safety concerns. Questions why we are changing the by-law to be different to most area in NZ where you cannot go over 5 knots if you are within 200 metres of shore |
| 150 | Albert Town Community Group | No | Yes | Wants QLDC to a). refuse amendments to schedule 2. b). add new clause prohibiting motor craft in Clutha between Lake Wanaka and Albert Town bridge. C). add clause restricting speed to 5 knots from Lake Wanaka to Albert Town bridge at all times. Safety concerns. Popular multi use section for passive users. Prefer no motorised craft. Wants to see evidence that faster boats are easier to manoeuvre. Harbourmasters mention of resource consents at top of pecking order, but in RM990262 and RC940300 it clearly states the community would be at the top. Consents can and do change, in accordance of sec 128. Mentions district plan and speed uplift does not align with that. safety concerns for accident. |
| 151 | David Vass | No | Yes | Member of Otago conservation board. Opposes speed limit uplift of Lake Wanaka to Albert Town and lifting of time restrictions on the albert town to red bridge section. Safety concerns, quotes Southland regional council navigation Safety factsheet. Lifting 5 knot limit only benefits power boats |
| 152 | Matthew Davidson | No | No | Opposes lifting speed limit in Clutha River. Dangerous for swimmers. It will encourage more jet boats to come through area and the amenity values will be destroyed. The fisherman's track walk will have its reputation diminished. Wants 5 knot limit extended past the swimming area and inside the island to be out of bounds for motorised boats. Concerns with "Peace & quiet" faster boats mean more noise and wave wash destroying the areas tranquillity. Taking away restrictions makes it hard to enforce and will increase in nuisance complaints. The area is great for angling as there are fewer boats and more fish and it's less affected by didymo. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| | | | | <p>Disagrees with part-time speed limit on hunter river – Specifically for trout fishing, it's too small to share with jet boats.</p> <p>Wants more public notice for commercial operators submitting applications to use the Clutha.</p> <p>Wants smaller waterways to be 5 knots as well with the increase in small jet boats and jet skis using them, example Motatapu River & Albert Burn</p> |
| 153 | Dr Michael Arthur Turner | No | Yes | New changes will reduce safety for passive uses of Clutha River. Will increase noise nuisance. Submission made by councillor for Otago Fish & Game and member of Upper Clutha Angling Club |
| 154 | James Helmore | No | No | Recreational opportunities and safety will be compromised by uplifting speed limit |
| 155 | Wulf Solter | Other | No | Thinks Outlet to Albert Town should be permanent slow zone. Safety concern. |
| 156 | Sarah Heath | No | No | Thinks no motorised crafts should be allowed on Clutha river between Outlet & Albert Town Bridge – Concerns with boat noise & wave pollution |
| 157 | Hilary Robinson | No | No | Clutha River between Outlet & Albert Town should have 5 knot limit – Safety concern |
| 158 | Sarah Ellmer | No | No | Concerns with removing speed limit from outlet to Albert town bridge – Health & safety, increase in noise pollution will effect residents, campers and track users. |
| 159 | Otago Fish and game | No | Yes | <p>Some aspects of proposed bylaw create additional risk. Speed limit uplift – creates un necessary conflict between boats and passive activities. Requests 5 knot limit to be kept in place. Wording of the Clutha speed uplifting in schedule 2 table 1 of the pNSB is not clear. Map 8 indicates an access lane will be put in at outlet Wanaka, however it is not referenced in pNSB. Asks to put any decision be placed on hold till the effects of current and potential water traffic can be assessed. pNSB is incongruous with the district plan. Particularly section 4.63 pg 4-44.</p> <p>Clutha river holds special qualities such as large volume, uncontrolled outlet, clear water, outstanding fishery, natural peaceful surrounds and accessibility. This makes it particularly suited to non-powered activities.</p> |
| 160 | Giles Wynn-Williams | no | No | Clutha River – increased traffic concern. Safety of swimmers and recreational persons. Noise. No mention in pNSB of any restriction around the Albert Town Island swimming area. At moment it is a safe place for children. Should remain safe and peaceful for all users. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-----|--|
| 161 | Maree Horlor | No | No | Poor information in map 8/9 and the corresponding schedule 2. Does not want speeding boats in Clutha river between Wanaka outlet and Albert Town. Wants proof that high speeds in swimming and non-motorised traffic is safe so she can make a more factual submission. |
| 162 | Chris Norman | no | No | Clutha river – Family uses river to swim, float, paddleboard and kayak. Noticed increase in passive users. Has seen near misses with the speed limit in place, has safety and fatality concerns if no speed limit among passive users. Suggests no motorised craft down that stretch at all. |
| 163 | Wanaka Lake Swimmers Club Incorporated | Yes | No | Has 80 members. Meet for weekly swims. One member's favourite off piste areas to swim is Clutha River from Outlet to Albert Town. But many members use this stretch. Passive users still use in winter. Safety concern for passive users. With population growth, more passive users will be on the river. |
| 164 | Carl McNeil | No | Yes | Clutha River – safety / fatality concerns. Hard to see people in water, if speed is increased they will struggle to see swimmers. Concerns over reaction times. Reaction times are reduced with speed, while arguably easier to manoeuvre, the reaction times counter this. Suggests banning powered craft in this location. Noise pollution and disruption. Peaceful location. District plan conflicts. Not being able to enforce should not mean a total uplift. |
| 165 | Kevin C & Patricia A Murphy | No | Yes | Clutha River – would like to see a ban of motorised craft between outlet and Albert Town. Passive4 users and motor crafts are a dangerous mix. Fatality concerns. |
| 166 | Kirsten Roy | No | No | Clutha River – resident of Albert Town. Visit river most days with small children. Swim and play in the swim hole and shallow areas along river edge. Walks tracks too. Relaxing peaceful experience. Would be a shame to lose this. Safety concerns. |
| 167 | John Terence Darby | Other | Yes | Kayaker and instructor. Beginners and advance first reaction when confronted with motor craft is panic, which leads to negative outcomes. Indifference between kayak and boats. Concern for fishing people. Outlet to red bridge should be reserved for passive users. Conservation issues, keep it special along with the preservation of species and plants. Relaxation place. we need to treasure these and keep them for further generations. |
| 168 | The Swift Fly Fishing | No | no | Clutha River – often asked where a nice quiet spot to fish is. Deans Bank used to |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------|----|-----|--|
| | Company | | | test fly rods and hold fly casting classes. Concern of degradation of an area with high intrinsic natural values. Incompatibility with Wanaka's natural reserve and outdoor recreation positioning. No benefit to any group with this proposal. Concern over accident. Suggest removing powered craft in this area completely. |
| 169 | Mark Feeney | No | No | Noise pollution. Used by large number of bikers, walkers and fishermen. Concerned about the environmental effects on river banks. Safety concerns to swimmer and kayakers. |
| 170 | Rose Murphy | No | No | Clutha River – safety and environmental concerns. Noise. Fly fishing spot. Peaceful. Motorised craft contradict this. suggests between Outlet and Albert Town to be power craft free. |
| 171 | Judy Cheng | No | No | Clutha River – danger concerns. Does not understand why we do not enforce 5knot speed now. |
| 172 | Callum Kennedy | No | No | Clutha River - Property owner in Albert Town. Regularly swims and kayaks Outlet to Albert Town. Safety concerns. Says he knows a company that can help us put in cameras for speed enforcement. |
| 173 | Wayne Perkins | No | Yes | Maritime Operator Safety (MOSS) System has higher thresholds of passenger safety than the pNSB proposes. Safety concerns. Interpretation “commercial vessels” is incorrect in insinuation. Intoxication needs measurable clarification. 9.3 is irresponsible to allow fleets of racing yachts to come within centimetres of passenger vessels at full speed with the passenger vessel that has to give way or stop. 28.1 there are no “no swimming” signs in the heart of Queenstown Bay therefore boats have to cope with people swimming whilst attempting to berth. 42 access lanes in Queenstown Bay have been identified in their MTOP as most likely area where there is potential for accident, Maritime NZ have recognised this and their SOP is to not enter access lanes while high speed vessels are conducting a manoeuvre. Wants 4 signs reinstated that were removed by town secretary in 1983 and is happy to pay for them to be reinstated. 46 doubling of moorings over last 4 years have resulted in inaccessibility of many jetties at night. All consented moorings should use chain not rope. No provision for impeding the safe navigation of passenger vehicles. Kite surfing at Queenstown bay is a safety concern – should be banned at the entrance to Queenstown bay as they cannot |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| | | | | see them if they fall of or collapse their kite. |
| 174 | Central Otago Whitewater | Other | Yes | Supports 36.4 retaining prohibition of powered craft on Kawarau below the Arrow River. Supports exemption provisions in 54 and speed uplifting provisions in 51. 35.1 schedule 2 does not support speed uplift on Clutha due to the compromise of enjoyment and safety of non-powered users. Compromises natural values of the river environment. Suggest keeping 5 knot, time limits suggested in schedule 2 be instituted and jet skis be banned on Clutha between Outlet and Cardrona River. |
| 175 | Samuel James Murphy | No | Yes | Opposes uplifting speed limits at Outlet to Albert Town. New bylaw should exclude use of powered craft on any rivers after 6pm and modify clause 26 to prevent boats from causing wakes which are a safety concern and can cause damage to riverbanks and eco-system. Suggests to limit the physical size of the wakes created – example the wake crest heights |
| 176 | Jet Boating New Zealand | Other | Yes | <p>Part three – carriage and wearing of life jackets. Submit that all reference to life jacket gets changed to Personal Flotation Device, as per Maritime rule part 91.4. Clause 19.4 submits this clause is deleted, clause 19.1 – 19.3 & 20.1 cover all recreational vessels in all circumstances. No need to single out one type of recreational vessel.</p> <p>Part 5 – rules relating to specific locations. 35.1 should read as “The person on charge of vessels must not exceed 5 knots in the swimming area at Albert Town marked by 5 knot buoys (GPS coordinates) Refer to schedule 2, map 9” this is more consistent with QLDC district plan.</p> <p>Speed upliftings – agrees with table one as it is consistent with District plan.</p> <p>The Rees river duration requires dates to be changed to when the 5 knot speed restriction is uplifted. The dates listed currently are when it is not uplifted. Clutha river need day light saving time added after the word “summer”. The Hunter River duration to have the words “each year” written after the words 30 April.</p> <p>Map 3 – submits the colour of the access lanes to be changed to green to be consistent with map 4.</p> <p>Maps 8 & 9 – proposes the colour purple labelling be changed to “daylight speed uplifting zone” this would match what is proposed in table 1.</p> |
| 177 | New Zealand | No | No | Opposes uplifting speed limits at Outlet to Albert town. It's an important part of |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-----|--|
| | federation of Freshwater Angles Inc Rex Neville Gibson | | | regions tourism. Will affect fisherman not being able to wade out into water. New proposal raises health & safety concerns for passive users. The wash from high speed boats is a safety issue, possibly drowning could occur. Will increase noise pollution. Compliance with speed restrictions should not be an issue; they suggest removing all boats from outlet to Albert town bridge. Suggests installing a speed camera to assist in enforcement. |
| 178 | Jane & David Ellis | No | Yes | Opposes changes to by-law near Outlet to Albert town – has health & Safety concerns for passive users. Would like motorised crafts prohibited from this area. Concerns for noise for track users. Quotes 4.44 of the District Plan – Special qualities of the Clutha River. |
| 179 | Glenda Turnbull | No | No | Leave by-laws as is – Safety concerns for Clutha River users |
| 180 | Kawarau Jet Services Holdings James Gardner-Hopkins (Counsel) | No | Yes | Opposing clause 36.4 powered vessels prohibited to operate on Kawarau below Arrow river and clause 54.6(b) limits any exemptions granted. Together both clauses prohibit KJet using this area of the Kawarau River. Believes both clauses are unlawful under Bylaws Act 1910. Council has no evidence to prohibit vessels in this area. Inconsistent with District Plan. If KJet were to apply for resource consent, under the new by-law, they would not be successful. Seeks deletion of Clause 36.4, if not deleted, then deletion of clause 54.6(b) replaced with a clause that allowed for an exemption to be given for longer than 14 days. Wants council to provide reasonable time at hearing to allow for questions & discussions (45-60 mins) |
| 181 | Whitewater NZ Dr Douglas Alexander Rankin | Other | Yes | Approves new by-law with minor changes –. In the past there has been objections to rule 19.5 of current by-law, allowing jet boats to use the Kawarau river below arrow river confluence which they objected to. The new by-law has included this rule again under 36.4. They support this rule and don't want it altered. KJet have requested use of this area as a commercial operator and Whitewater are anticipating they will request for this rule to be revised in their favour. Whitewater still objects to any alterations to the rule and any consents issued. Motorised crafts on Kawarau below the Arrow river confluence will be a safety concern and Whitewater recognises the water conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997 to support their objections to any changes to this rule. They have concerns regarding exemptions that can be made under section 54. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-------|-----|---|
| | | | | Have noted 54.2 temporary speed limit uplifting, it is important rivers users are fully noted of any temporary upliftings in order to maintain safety. Concerns under 54.1 anyone can request for exemption upon application. Exemption should only be given under exceptional circumstances. Refers again to KJet. Questions what the purpose of a rule is if anyone can apply for an exemption to the rule. Would like a change to pat 5 - Rules to specific locations - Wants it modified to state powered vessels and not include personal craft (see clause 32.1) Requests clause 51.3 modified to read that the public are notified of any grants to uplift speed limits. |
| 182 | Neville Kelly & Deborah Kelly | Other | Yes | Part 9 – Structures & Moorings – Would like to see mooring on chains & to be 50m away from jetty structure. Jetty structures to be floating structure to allow for high & low level lake. Part 5 – Commercial activity – Wants clarification of wording, do all motorised vessels have to have consent to operate on waterways with appropriate documents. Appendix 6 – fees & Charges – clarification on fee structure and how they going to be enforced. |
| 183 | Graham James Berry | No | Yes | Albert Town to Outlet suited to passive users not motorised crafts. Motorised crafts are noisy & unsafe in the area |
| 184 | Peter Marshall | Yes | No | Agrees with lifting the 5knot limit – suggests it's better for fishing, faster oats does not degrade fishing quality |
| 185 | The Weaving House Amy Pearl | No | No | With no speed limits thinks there will be an “onslaught of consumer behaviour” Concerns for the natural heritage and safety of the local population |
| 186 | Neil Harrison | Other | No | Part 4 section 26.1 - 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. |
| 187 | Tim Sikma | No | No | It is a family area, noise, safety |
| 188 | Anna van Riel | No | No | Ruin family activities(kayaking etc.)/environment. Safety |
| 189 | Mark Watson | No | No | Safety for swimmers and kayakers, users can speed below Cardrona confluence |
| 190 | Ali Hanan | No | No | Safety for swimmers and kayakers, damage to environment (ecosystem). Rich |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|----|--|
| | | | | people vs. locals |
| 191 | Lyn Williamson | No | No | Family activities ruined – made dangerous. Damage to fishing area |
| 192 | Florence Micoud | No | No | Noise, damage to ecosystem, safety. Should be banning boats not increasing speed |
| 193 | Stephen Edward Waddington | Other | No | Faster boats will collide with passive drifters |
| 194 | Deborah Anne Richards | No | No | Family activities ruined. Noise. Pollution. Safety |
| 195 | Paul Johnson | No | No | Contravenes Item 51.2.f in Part 10. Proximity to camp grounds, swimmers in danger, lack of manoeuvrability of boats, blind spots and narrows leads to death |
| 196 | Natalie Norman | No | No | Non-motorised transport and swimmers will be in danger. Section below Albert Town bridge is more appropriate to increase speed |
| 197 | Sophie Ward | No | No | Safety for river users at risk. Popular place for numerous users. Should be increasing enforcement for speed, not removing restrictions. There are other places boats can speed |
| 198 | Richard Vorstermans | No | No | Objects to speed uplift |
| 199 | Sharon Beattie | No | No | Families use this area – they will be in danger. Bylaw says speed is difficult to enforce but we should increase fines, put more resource into enforcement, and enlist the public to assist. |
| 200 | Marianna Brook | No | No | Family area – safety. They have already experienced boats speeding – it was noisy and dangerous. Hours proposed are when people swim. Greater investment in enforcing is better way forward. Ideas for enforcement: 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. |
| 201 | Sarah Allen | No | No | Lives in danger. Hidden tree trunks and rocks that users could hit if boats speed past. Speeding boats have other places to use – e.g lower half of river or two large lakes |
| 202 | Sarah Ann Millwater | No | No | Family activities (kayaking) ruined if speed increased. Tough for locals – expensive area to live and they cannot go on holidays so they partake in outdoor activities on the river for free. Keep speed low for safety. |
| 203 | Raewyn Calhaem | No | No | Safety in danger for kayakers, paddle boarders, float/swimmers, fishermen. If they |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|---|
| | | | | are going faster they have less time to react and spot users. |
| 204 | Joel Thomas Hanlon | Yes | No | Wants speed uplifted |
| 205 | Linda Holland | No | No | Unsafe for people floating down river. Ruins peacefulness |
| 206 | Morgan Varaine | No | No | Would ruin tranquillity for many non-boat users. Should be looking at enforcement capability instead |
| 207 | Naomi Carleton | No | No | Not safe for families, paddle boarders, kayaks etc. Other parts of Clutha that can be used to speed. Dangerous |
| 208 | Raewyn Helen Paterson | No | No | Dangerous for non-motorised recreational users |
| 209 | Anna Simmonds | No | No | Disturbance to Grebe nesting sites and other birdlife – previously nested in willows near Deans Bank. Dangerous for swimmers. Noise pollution. Natural resources more important than Economic resources |
| 210 | Carol Sawyer | No | Yes | Will ruin peacefulness. Boat owners are the minority. |
| 211 | Stephen Wallace | No | No | Will make area unsafe and ruin natural beauty |
| 212 | Chris Hadfield | No | No | Many users. Current system works well. |
| 213 | Doug Hall | No | No | He finds that currently boaters do adhere to the speed restrictions on most occasions which has had no effect on fishing conditions. Increased speeds would decrease number of anglers drawn to spot. Increased danger of accidents for many users. Upper Clutha has many bends which reduces visibility of oncoming boats. If similar driving of boats on lakes occurs, more signage and policy of poor driving needs to take place. HSWA Act 2015 states control is achieved through elimination. |
| 214 | Tanja Schwindt | No | No | Dangerous to numerous users. Noise pollution |
| 215 | Doug Peddle | No | Yes | Dangerous for recreational users, noise pollution will impact locals, campers, walkers etc. |
| 216 | Jen Corish | No | No | Exactly same as above |
| 217 | Shane Woonton | No | No | Same as above |
| 218 | Julie Lott | No | No | Same as above |
| 219 | Lee Rowley | No | No | Same as above |
| 220 | Fiona Waite | No | No | Dangerous already for swimmers and children using area – imagine how dangerous without no speed restrictions. Will make the river off limits for swimmers |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| 221 | Nick Davison | Yes | No | Faster speeds will mean boats pass through quicker so there will be less noise |
| 222 | Kelly Graham | No | No | Copy and pasted – same as 30 |
| 223 | Evelyn Vallillee | No | No | Copy and pasted – same as 30 |
| 224 | Phil Greeks | No | No | Increase risk of accidents to non-powered craft and swimmers floating down river. Peace of river impacted. |
| 225 | Lorraine Mary Knowles | No | No | Plenty of other rivers boats can speed on. This river needs to be kept free for recreational users. Speeding boats need to adhere to the speed restrictions if they want to use it |
| 226 | Clare Mitchell | No | No | Recreational area for users and dogs. Safety would be compromised. Noise pollution |
| 227 | Melanie Cusens | No | No | Swimmers and children safety is more of a priority than faster boats |
| 228 | Renae Lee Brunton | No | No | Copy and pasted – same as 30 |
| 229 | Aimee smith | No | Yes | River used by novice users. Removing speed limits will attract larger boats which will increase danger for novice users. |
| 230 | Ansley Easterlin | No | Yes | Removing speed limits would be for the benefit of corporate entities – this is an American attribute and we should not be like them. |
| 231 | Ian Gosling | Other | No | Removing speed limits is insanity and a liability for any council that would approve this. Safety implications. |
| 232 | Thomas Schattovits | No | No | Speed uplift would reduce safety and level of enjoyment for non-motorised users. Popular place for tourists and visitors that use it, for teaching their children river safety. It is also free and they have a low environmental impact. |
| 233 | Lucy Robins | No | No | Uplifting speed restrictions would affect serenity of those that live close to the river and safety of river users. Noise pollution. Questions whether boats should be allowed at all on this stretch of river at all. |
| 234 | Linda Jane Montgomery | No | No | Lifting speed restrictions would endanger existing river users. Frequently used by floaters. |
| 235 | Mount Aspiring College | No | No | HOD of Outdoor Education at school. Numerous camps and classes that use the section of Clutha River. River used for teaching numerous sports. Perfect river conditions for teaching as it is relatively safe. This proposed stretch of river has varying conditions (downstream there are less eddies and faster flow and Hikuwai reserve is long and straight). Uplifting speed restrictions would diminish safety – especially at the first right hand bend where the school groups practice). Boats |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | can speed downstream. |
| 236 | David Cassidy | No | No | (potentially same person as above). This stretch of river (from outlet to Albert Town) is used for many activities. This river is beautiful, benign and safe. Uplifting speed restrictions is a threat the recreational values of families. Increased danger. It will further reinforce negative aspects that come with power boats – speed hazards, wake damage/disruption, noise pollution. |
| 237 | Rory Sweetman | No | No | They use this area to drift down with their family. Given recent death at St Bathans, there should be no change in the interest of public safety. |
| 238 | Rebecca McGoun | No | No | Only place they can float down the river safely |
| 239 | Shannon Van Walt | No | No | They float down the river and boats go down fast enough and their speed and proximity makes them flip |
| 240 | Iris Ursula Abaecherli | No | No | As a fisher, paddle boarder and walker she opposes faster boats |
| 241 | Murray Jones | No | No | Popular space for noisy jet boats and skis. They are a risk to non-powered boats and swimmers. They will also create a lot of wash and noise. She supports the river being powered-craft free from the Outlet to the last house in the Albert Town section of the river |
| 242 | Peter Degerholm | No | No | Concerned about noise and danger to other river users including swimmers and kayakers |
| 243 | Mark Winter | No | No | Her children swim in this stretch. Fast boats are frightening and dangerous. Also scared about the erosion of banks between the Outlet and Albert Town bridge |
| 244 | David Purton | No | No | Noise pollution, safety for swimmers and canoers will be compromised, erosion of banks, birds will be threatened and distressed. Many users use this stretch of river for its tranquillity |
| 245 | Ian Hall | No | No | Council places interests of commercial jet boats ahead of locals and recreational users of river. The river should be maintained for recreational users. Local use of river by young ones jumping in safely will be endangered. The commercial Go Jets operation from the Albert Town bridge is already causing significant and unwelcome disruption to the tranquillity of the area. Proposed change will be strongly opposed by locals. |
| 246 | Josiah Roe | No | Yes | They are a tourist that has visited the river for years and jet boat access is loud, noisy and there's too damn much of it. |
| 247 | Lindsey Turner | No | No | The river is regularly used by families (including kayakers, floaters and boarders). |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|----|----|---|
| | | | | Removing speed limit is dangerous. Removing speed limit because they can't enforce is ridiculous. No speed limit will result in someone being killed. This sounds like another way for council to make money by not having to monitor the area and letting commercial operators into the area. If anything, motorised craft should be banned from river if not abiding by speed limits. |
| 248 | Susan Marion Grant | No | No | Increasing speed and activity will affect locals and others passively enjoying river (snorkelling etc). Jet boats should enter below Albert Town bridge and be restricted to 5 knots down to the Red bridge at Luggate |
| 249 | Heather Thorne | No | No | Uses the walking tracks daily and family uses it regularly for swimming, fishing and camping. Jet boats only thing ruining quietness at the moment. The speed limit is exceeded by some boats and an increase in speed would ruin the special place. Plenty of other rivers and lakes people can speed. They can already hear boats honing and they live quite some way from the river. |
| 250 | William Richards | No | No | Purpose of the 5 knot speed limit is not just noise abatement, it is for other users (walkers, fishermen who fly fish at Deans Bank, swimmers, picnickers etc). The jet boats already cause significant wash, using this river at full speed would make it hazardous. Jet boats go so fast that they would be on top of fishermen and swimmers (especially in choppy water) before they could react – this is exacerbated where there are trees and bends which obscure site lines. He is surprised that the Harbour Master would agree to this he is safety conscious. The comparison chart between the old and new bylaw stating there is no major change to the speed limits is misleading |
| 251 | Peter Cousins | No | No | Their children regularly use this stretch for activities. This stretch should be kept natural – not like the Shotover that is broken by noise of boats |
| 252 | Janine Joseph | No | No | Because of the danger to swimmers and noise pollution |
| 253 | Simon John Buchler Darby | No | No | Current speed allows peacefulness. Currently commercial and recreational jet boats launch from Albert Town bridge ramp and operate downstream from there which is appropriate as it is not populated. If speed restrictions are uplifted then commercial users will be far more likely to launch from the Outlet Camp boat ramp which is currently peaceful. No evidence to support claim that speeding boats do less damage than idling boats – if they are doing damage, should they be allowed at all? This stretch is used by many recreational users – speeding boats presents |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|-----|--|
| | | | | danger and diminishes peaceful experience. This change seems to be for the financial gain of commercial users |
| 254 | Julian Pettit | No | No | Unrestricted use would lead to increased noise and safety issues for children who swim and float in this area |
| 255 | Deborah Kolb | No | No | They use this river for many uses. Removing speed limit sounds dangerous and will increase danger for other users. Noise will increase – he can already hear it and he lives far away. Keep the river 5 knots max down to the last house on river in Albert town |
| 256 | Larry Nathan Weathington | No | Yes | Given the number of jet boats using this stretch, it is already a danger waiting to happen – there have been many near misses and this proposal will get someone killed. It's no longer safe or enjoyable for non-motorised users. The noise and traffic is ruining this spot and they avoid the river now. 100's of kms that people can jet boat on – they want this stretch of river motor free year round |
| 257 | b c foster | No | No | Noise is undesirable and there are no restrictions for this. Users will be at risk. Area renowned for fly fishing – don't spoil it for the sake of a greedy few |
| 258 | Thomas Martin Fisher | No | No | Powered boat traffic is already noisy, intrusive and dangerous. It is a peaceful haven for users. Power boat enthusiasts can use the lake |
| 259 | Joanna Williamson | No | No | Quiet place for fishing and floating, speed boats will destroy it |
| 260 | Bridget Frances Spain | No | No | |
| 261 | Nicola McDonald | No | No | No Speed limit on Clutha is dangerous to swimmers and non-boat activities |
| 262 | Patricia Wrigley | No | No | Clutha river should be for non-powered craft only. Risk to swimmers if allowed. |
| 263 | Vickie Moses | No | No | Clutha River – no restriction on speed is unsafe |
| 264 | Matt Constantine | No | No | Clutha River – no restriction on speed is unsafe |
| 265 | Morgan Weathington | No | Yes | Clutha river - no restriction on speed is unsafe. Used for fishing. |
| 266 | Pioneer Rafting | No | No | Clutha river – disruption to fishing, non-motor crafts, trail users. Noise. |
| 267 | John Cornelius Borscht | No | No | Clutha River - no restriction on speed is unsafe. Noise. Pollution. |
| 268 | Rachel Sarah Bell | Yes | No | Think she means no to agree – Clutha river – pollution, disruption to environment. |
| 269 | Emma Bilious | No | No | Clutha river - no restriction on speed is unsafe, Noise, pollution. Bylaw supports only one user group at the expense of all other users. |
| 270 | Chrissi Pettit | No | No | Clutha River – unrestricted speed limit is nonsense |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|-----|--|
| 271 | Paul Van Der Kaag | Other | Yes | Agrees bylaw needs updating, but with some changes to be in line with maritime NZ. Should use maritime floatation device definition. Believes hotworks / hazard substance is duplicate as covered in maritime NZ commercial safety management systems. |
| 272 | Rod Macleod | No | Yes | Clutha River – proposal is counter-productive, fly fishing disruptions, noise, safety. |
| 273 | Susan Jones | No | No | Clutha River – lives by the river and enjoys the peace and quiet. |
| 274 | Sambo Stewart | Yes | No | Safety and environmental benefits out way the current bylaw. New bylaw will have less noise, less wake, less erosion and easier for community. |
| 275 | Jim McQuillan | No | No | Inability to police not good enough justification. Clutha river – will get degraded, noise, power boats disrupt fishing and walking, plenty of other areas to do boating activities in area. |
| 276 | Neal Kaler | No | No | Clutha river – no motor boats, too heavily used by swimmers, kids and fishermen. |
| 277 | Alix Wilson | No | No | Believes current bylaw is sufficient. Clutha river speed limit removed impacts some groups which is unfair. Already areas unrestricted further down the river. |
| 278 | Simon Stewart | Yes | No | Private boats do not adhere to 5 knot limit and become abusive when reminded. Lower speeds produce bigger wake. Fishermen prefer boats to go by quicker than slower. |
| 279 | Scott Matthew Downham | No | No | Clutha river – does not agree with lifting speed restrictions. |
| 280 | Graham Walmsley | No | No | Clutha river – used by swimmers, waves from boats cause risk to children at water edge, concern over casualty, noise. |
| 281 | Sandra McTavish | yes | No | Believe he means no – Clutha river – safety of all users should be considered, the best way for this is a speed limit for jet boats. Especially as river gets busier. |
| 282 | Deborah Ann Richards | No | Yes | Clutha river speed – noise, walkers, fishermen, swimmers and basic kayakers all use this area. Picnic location, jet boat waves cause disruption to fishing also cause people to stumble when wading. Speed will decrease response time to swimmers and fishermen. Need an area people can enjoy river safely. Comparison chart between old and new bylaw speeds is misleading. |
| 283 | Andrew Nicholson | No | No | Clutha River – removal of speed limit is a safety issue for swimmers, kayakers and fishermen. Noise. Erosion. |
| 284 | Eric Morgan | No | Yes | Regular visitor – too many boat traffic on Clutha, there is other areas to do this activity. |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|---|
| 285 | Catherine Rezaei | No | No | Clutha river – speed limit removal. Lives alongside river, concern over increased boat numbers. Already seen close encounters with boats and swimmers. Removal of speed will encourage bad behaviour. dangerous. Concern for fishing. Other areas are safer for jet boats to go fast elsewhere. All residents should be able to use this waterway. Realises hard to police speed but thinks most will abide by rules if they know about them. |
| 286 | Bex Thornton | No | No | Clutha river – treasures peace and tranquillity. Frequent unpowered user of river. Noise. Pollution. Kids swim in river, do not want them to be at risk. Why remove rule just because no one is abiding by it. |
| 287 | Zach Black | No | Yes | Does not want jet boats disrupting recreational activities. |
| 288 | Jan Caunter | No | No | Clutha River – enjoys peace and quiet along river – area used by swimmers and dogs, removal of speed limit is dangerous, noise, river peace was what attracted them to the area. |
| 289 | Neil Sloan | No | No | Clutha river - Busy with users already, kayakers become vulnerable, can't manoeuvre quickly and wake is disruptive. Danger to swimmers, noise, scenery disturbed, fishing disturbed. Wildlife concerns. |
| 290 | Scott Bewley | No | No | Clutha River – safety, environment and noise concerns. Kayak safety concern. Other places jet boats and jet skis can go. |
| 291 | Michael John Roberts | No | No | Clutha river – balance interest form all users. Power boats should not have dominance. Power boats can go other places. Safety issues for swimmers & fishing. Air, noise and water pollution concerns. |
| 292 | Nick Stewart | Yes | Yes | Thinks will be a great outcome. Has seen people close to drowning if jet boat wasn't present. |
| 293 | John Robertson | Yes | No | More rivers open for people to boat on and use the better. Great way to see scenery country has to offer. |
| 294 | Nichola Woolford | No | No | Clutha River – no speed limit encourages bad behaviour. noise. |
| 295 | Cherilyn Walthew | No | No | Detrimental to safety. |
| 296 | Astrid Geneblaza | No | No | Spoil peaceful environment. |
| 297 | Peter Wilson | No | No | Clutha River – congestion, safety, believed QLDC have not notified affected parties properly. Noise. |
| 298 | Kim Badger | No | No | Clutha river – family use for paddle boarding. Jet boat creates wake, used for swimming. Children safety. Speed should be same as swim lanes in lake. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----|-----|---|
| 299 | Malcom Lawrence Sincok | No | No | Deans bank – used for kayaking, swim training. Wants kept so public can enjoy nature as it should be. |
| 300 | Anna Ritchie | No | No | Outlet – Cardrona mouth – used for swimming by children. Lots of other areas where speed is allowed. Safety concerns |
| 301 | Denise Bunn | No | No | Outlet – own property in area, use river amenities. Walk, cycle, enjoy views, tranquillity, trout watch. Fishing, swimming, snorkelling, floating down river all positive aspects. Popular swimming spot by bridge. Fishing, peaceful nature and quiet river activities all ruined by speed uplift. Other areas can be used for speeding. QLDC need to consider ratepayers. Will destroy character of river. |
| | | | | |
| 302 | Dave Vass | NO | N/A | Refer to app 1 The Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017, 35.1 ((Clutha River, page 19) and Maps 8 & 9 (pages 43 and 44), both of which state that the section of the Clutha from Lake Wanaka to Albert Town is to become a 5 knot zone. As I understand it, this is the opposite of the proposal by the QLDC, which is to uplift the remaining 5 knot restrictions so they no longer apply here. |
| 303 | John Wedlake | NO | NO | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Congestion – multiple users on this section, allowing powerboats increases danger. 2. Increased danger – low lake levels reduce river flow, when this happens the river split into three sections, speed limit deters boat users going over rapid at the top. if speed limit is removed more boats will enter this narrow waterway. Increased risk of collision. Links road speed with boat speed with relation to accidents. 3. Noise – Speed will spoil beauty of natural environment. Higher speeds means louder boats. |
| 304 | Colin Fraser | | No | |
| 305 | Jane Forsyth | No | No | Speed uplift is inappropriate and unsafe. Passive users should be protected all of the time. Why is this change needed? Suspected that the two commercial jet boat operations at Albert Town Bridge has something to do with it – these boats should not be more important than the natural values of the river or needs of the community. Influx of people moving here due to the ongoing housing development |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|-----|--|
| | | | | therefore potential for conflicting or unsafe river use is likely to increase. Her preference is for the part of the Clutha river (from the Outlet to the last houses downstream of the Albert Town bridge or perhaps the Hawea confluence) would be a ban on powered craft except for emergency use. Power boat users would not be disadvantaged with this as they can access the Clutha from Albert Town Bridge to the Red Bridge and beyond and can access Lake Wanaka from other boat ramps and launching places. |
| 306 | Real Journeys Limited (Fiona Black) | No | Yes | This submission has addressed particular sections of the Bylaw. Main points: There should be a “unless in an emergency” provision (Section 13). The river does not have a tide (Section 13). There should be a reporting component to report damage or light outage (Section 13). Vessel bunkering needs to be excluded as Real Journeys requires the carriage of dangerous goods and it is not necessary to seek the Harbour Masters approval (Section 18. They have attached a table with the dangerous goods they carry). Incorrect use of the word “Sea” (Section 43.2 (d)). They contend clause 45.1 and would like it to be amended as a vessel cannot be in survey if the operator does not have a MTOC. The MOTC can be held by the vessel operator – not the vessel owner. Commercial crafts are not in survey as such, but a commercial rafting operator must hold a certificate as per Section 41 of the Act. The maps from pages 36-48 should not be labelled as Schedule 3 as it details how to measure the length of a vessel. Furthermore, the speed uplift tables should reference the maps. |
| 307 | Otago Regional Council (Warren Hanley) | N/A | Yes | ORC are currently creating a navigational safety bylaw which applies to all waters in the Otago region. Until they fully understand the regions requirements they are not in a position to comment on some parts of the bylaw (e.g. speed uplifting) but ORC may be in a position to comment further on such matters at the hearing. They would like both councils bylaws to be consistent but don't want to hold back QLDC bylaw. One matter they are investigating is life jackets and whether there is an exception for those in the cabin of the vessel (particularly children). The Deed of Transfer requires QLDC to report to ORC on 6 month basis. This reporting could take form of a meeting between harbour masters to identify common approach. Re. the bylaw – Flag B is in definition section but doesn't appear anywhere else. Clause 22.1 – are there areas 5 miles offshore? |

| 308 | Upper Clutha Angling Club (G. O Poole) | No | Yes | Passive recreational users and powered craft users have increased significantly. Existing speed restrictions on power craft are already an issue. Lifting speed restrictions is dangerous, create noise pollution, create boat wave wash and disrupt anglers. There should be a long term strategic plan to meet needs of all community. This strategic plan should include accessing capacity of the waterways to absorb commercial activities, designated areas for passive users, imposing 5 knots, restricting powered-craft from outlet downstream to last house. |
|-----|--|----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 309 | Kirsty Barr | No | No | The document was very confusing. Lifting the speed would lead to an erosion of safety. Saying it is difficult to enforce the current 5 knot restriction is no basis for change. It would erode the enjoyment current users have in this area. Create noise and pollution. To further liberalise the speed is a mistake. |
| 310 | NZVA Wildlife Society (Melanie Leech) | | Yes | Uplift of speed will be at the expense of our native wildlife and its habitat. They oppose Schedule 2 and would like the current speed limit of 5 knots retained. The uplift of speed would attract more power boat users, which would increase noise, wash and visual disturbance on wildlife. The proposed area provides a habitat and breeding site for at least 9 species which will be negatively affected by uplift in speed (including 2 threatened/vulnerable – refer to appendix in submission). Power boating is direct cause of physical impacts on the water. This bylaw is in breach of the QLDC's district plan 2016. They recommend QLDC strengthens the regulations particularly during breeding seasons. |
| 311 | Errol Carr | No | Yes | Huge loss of recreational amenity. Huge stretch of river downstream powered craft can use. The current speed can easily be monitored with fines and other penalties; it's up to QLDC to ensure we have a budget for the harbour master to use. Also add signage, buoys and additional enforcement action. Dramatic increase of use all through the day. Important to retain accessible areas for passive use so people are not disturbed by fast moving craft, noise and wave wash. Benefit for commercial users should be at an expense of our precious quiet places. |
| 312 | Jim and Frances Cowie | No | Yes – on the 15 th Wanaka | The bylaw must be rejected for safety reasons. The regulations are confusing and poorly constructed. Not being able to police users is an abdication of QLDC's responsibility and failure to resource harbour master. The area in question should |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------|----|-----|---|
| | | | | be a powered craft free area, |
| 313 | Gina Dempster | No | Yes | Motorised craft already has a negative impact on enjoyment of river as it is risky and uplift in speed will be dangerous. The Wanaka waterways patrol are good. They are in favour of making the river power craft free – they can go downstream. |
| 314 | Abby Gallagher | No | No | Top section of Clutha River from Albert Town to lake should be free of motor crafts |