

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

By **Richardson, J**

Submitter Identification number: **PC7-540**

Wishes to be heard: **No**

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

Submitted on: **11/09/2019**

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 11/09/2019 12:08:03 PM
Submission #64

Address for service:

Richardson James / 64
13 McCombs Street
Email: email.jdr@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
- No

Submission points

Point 64.1

Submission

I am very concerned that this policy, if adopted, would result in structures that enable the safe passage of "indigenous fish" but block the passage of salmonids.

This would affect the ability of these highly valued fish to migrate up waterbodies and connected tributaries to spawn. It would further limit the ability of these fish to move and exist freely in waterbodies, no doubt reducing numbers in places cherished by anglers and visitors for their availability of sports fish and the recreational opportunities they afford.

These waterbodies include (but are not limited to) a large number of easily accessible and highly valued recreational fisheries throughout the Canterbury Region, including in the south: Lakes Benmore, Clearwater and Heron, sections of the upper Ahuriri River, tributaries of the Upper Rangitata River, and the Grays and Twizel rivers; and to the north: Lakes Coleridge, Pearson, and Taylor, and sections of the Rakaia, Selwyn, Hororata and Clarence rivers.

Even more worryingly, it appears the policy could be interpreted to apply to any waterbody throughout the region.

As a keen Canterbury angler, I am supportive of providing for fish passage for valued freshwater species that includes indigenous fish **as well as** trout and salmon.

Relief sought

4.102

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

1. the appropriate design, construction, installation and maintenance of new in-stream structures **which give appropriate consideration of, and seek as much as possible to preserve, if not enhance, the natural amenity, recreational**

- value and cultural value of the waterbody; and
2. the modification, reconstruction or removal 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 removal of existing in-stream structures.