

**Submission on Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan**

By **Gregg, T**

Submitter Identification number: **PC7-516**

Wishes to be heard: **No**

Would consider making a joint submission at the hearing: **No**

Submitted on: **08/09/2019**

This submission was submitted via Environment Canterbury's online submission portal. The Submissions portal generates pdf files of submissions (as attached). However, some of the information that appears in the pdf files is not consistent with information the submitter entered into the portal, specifically, where submitters have ticked:

- "I wish to be heard in support of my submission" ; and
- "If others make a similar submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing".

Additionally, the submissions portal has generated submitter and submission point numbers that are not consistent with the numbering applied in the Summary of Decisions Requested. Submission points in the Summary of Decisions Requested (SODR) are numbered using the following format:

PC7 – Submitter ID #.Submission point #

**The correct submitter identification number and submitter information is specified above. This will be the number referred to in the SODR.**

# Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan

## Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

*Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

To Environment Canterbury - Tavisha Fernando  
Date received 8/09/2019 12:17:14 PM  
Submission #35

### Address for service:

Gregg Tom / 35  
2 Wittys Rd Avonhead Christchurch  
Phone: 021 337854  
Mobile: 021 337854  
Email: tomasgregg@gmail.com  
Wishes to be heard? No  
Is willing to present a joint case? No

**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).**

- Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  
- No
- Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that  
(a) adversely affects the environment; and  
(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition  
- Yes

## Submission points

---

### Point 35.1

#### Submission

I am sure that the policy drafters for the proposed provision 4.102 (protection of indigenous fish) did so with the best environmental intentions. However, they appear to have done so without due regard for the consequences on the fresh-water fishing activities of New Zealanders (and visitors) holding legitimate fishing licences under the extensive and enforced requirements to engage in this activity.

My SUBMISSION is that the provision does NOT take into account the very serious impacts on the current trout and salmon fisheries in the waterways covered, and I suspect that is an unintended consequence of the provision 4.102 in its current format and hence the provision needs to be abandoned in order to avoid this unintended consequences. It is also possible to see that, with the proposed provision in its current form, the restrictions could be implied to cover ALL waterways in the region.

The recreational benefits of fresh-water fishing for trout and salmon are very well documented. Also, fresh-water fishing for trout and salmon is very well regulated and provides great benefits to New Zealand. The management of the activity is controlled via regulations covering the length of seasons, the ways in which such fish can be legally caught, the requirement for a licence to cover the seasons or times when a license-holder can fish within the regulations, and the management and signposting of agreed access points to waterways.

**My submission, therefore, is that this provision 4.101 be abandoned/excluded from the regulations, as unnecessary and leading to serious damage to the recreational use of waterways by licensed and controlled recreational fishers.**

?Tom Gregg

Christchurch

#### Relief sought

Please remove the current provision 4.102

**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.