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Proposed Plan Change 7 has been developed to respond to emerging resource management issues, to give effect to relevant national direction, to implement recommendations from the Hinds Drains’ Working Party, and to implement recommendations in the Waimakariri and Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) Zone Implementation Programme Addenda (ZIPA).
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Submission points

Point 19.1

Submission

I was born and live in a New Zealand that reflects the current state of our environment, biodiversity, and human habitation.

In many cases, we cannot wind back the clock - without creating adverse consequences.

Just as we must accept - insofar as they are irreversible - the landscape scale land alteration, habitat loss and other impacts of modern life - so must we also embrace the introduced species that are widely valued in our society.

Recreation is such an incredibly important part of modern human life. It is important for the mental, physical, social, cultural and spiritual benefits that it brings.

Freshwater sport fishing is a hugely beneficial recreational activity - that has few if any negative consequences. It is an integral part of our modern Kiwi culture, heritage and lifestyle.

It is part of the legacy that all living Kiwi’s were handed, by our forebears.

And it is part of the legacy that we must protect and hand on, to our children and our
grandchildren - to all future generations of New Zealand.

Much of the concern around protecting our waterways - both in terms of water volume, and water quality - has been driven by those who seek to protect our freshwater fishing resources. Without their efforts - our waterways would likely be in an even worse state than they are now.

I submit - on behalf of myself, my family, and all current and future generations of New Zealander’s who value our recreational freshwater angling resources - it is imperative that:

(1) ECAN embrace the protection of particularly both trout and salmon .. alongside indigenous fish .. in any plans and policies.

(2) trout and salmon are specifically excluded from any definition of “invasive, pest or nuisance fish species”, for the purposes of Plan Change 7 - and any other ECAN plans and policies.

To further illustrate my point - here goes something I wrote:

OUR SACRED LEGACY

Ko ta tatou tuku taonga tapu.

We all come from somewhere.

We cannot hope to wipe away the grievances and wrongs of the past. For they are where they truly belong .. in the past.

And to do so .. would likely create new grievances and wrongs.

We would do well .. to focus on our greatest duty .. which is to carry The Sacred Baton of the Past (and The Future) .. as it was handed to us .. through our time.

It is a sacred responsibility .. but it is not a race.

We should study The Sacred Baton .. as it was handed to us. It’s history .. it’s age lines .. it’s faults. Also, it’s strengths .. character .. and great beauty.

We should carry it carefully .. lovingly .. with a great sense of duty .. for it is taonga. It represents the hopes .. dreams .. aspirations .. and triumphs .. of our ancestors. Also, their struggles .. their suffering .. and their failures.

The Sacred Baton represents Everything. Including our impact on our planet .. Earth .. our home.

And all of it’s flora and fauna.
We cannot create a new Baton .. for that would destroy the old one .. and desecrate our past.

We can only make the best we can of the old one. The one that is handed to us. We must protect what we value of it .. and vest in it our own triumphs .. and failures.

We can only etch old, existing lines deeper .. ease them out, and .. or .. impart new ones.

Our aim is to protect, improve and enhance The Sacred Baton .. for it was our Inheritance .. and it is our Legacy.

At the end of our time .. we must pass The Sacred Baton to our Tamariki .. who must, in turn, carry and protect it for their Tamariki .. our Mokopuna .. and so on.

In the end .. The Sacred Baton is all we have.

We are all in this together.

It is all we can leave behind.

Stewart Hydes

August 2019

Relief sought

4.102

Structures enable the safe passage of indigenous and designated recreational sports fish, while avoiding as far as practicable, the passage of any invasive, pest or nuisance fish species (specifically excluding trout and salmon) by:

1. the appropriate design, construction, installation and maintenance of new in-stream structures; and
2. the modification, reconstruction or removed of existing in-stream structures.

Section: Section 4 Policies
Sub-section: Section 4 Policies
Provision

4.102

Structures enable the safe passage of indigenous fish, while avoiding as far as practicable, the passage of any invasive, pest or nuisance fish species by:

a. the appropriate design, construction, installation and maintenance of new in-stream structures; and
b. the modification, reconstruction or removed of existing in-stream structures.