

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

By **Moody, N**

Submitter Identification number: **PC7-545**

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 9:57:23 PM
Submission #73

Address for service:

Moody Nick / 73
11 WOODBRIDGE ROAD Cashmere CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND 8013
Phone: 0275386220
Email: mrnicholasmoodie@yahoo.com.au
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 73.1

Submission

I oppose this blanket approach to having structures which enable the safe passage of indigenous fish but may PREVENT the safe passage of trout or salmon. All fish are entitled to pass up our waterways, regardless of whether they are endemic, native or valued introduced sports fish like trout and salmon.

New Zealand is arguably the BEST country in the world for trout fishing, and Canterbury has wonderful natural fisheries. The fish which we share with Australia, like whitebait, and which are part of the mahinga kai of Maori, and the fish which we share with Europe, and are part of our European mahinga kai, are equally valuable.

They all belong, and have a place here, just like the people of many races who call Canterbury home. Trout are a part of my cultural heritage, and our pakeha mahinga kai, and connection with these lands, and are also a valued connection to our ancestral lands. Trout and salmon belong here just as much as cows, sheep, dogs, cats and pakeha do.

There are exceptional situations, where trout need to be excluded from the habitat of non-migratory galaxiids, to conserve rare populations. But this is not an excuse to start to exclude them from general waterways by the design of structures. Places such as the Ashburton Lakes, Lake Coleridge, and the Ashley, Selwyn and Ahuriri Rivers are valued trout fisheries. All Canterbury waterways are precious for their trout, salmon, and native fishes.

Trout, salmon and native fishes have co-existed for 160 years already, and they can and should co-exist moving forwards.

Relief sought

4.102

~~Structures enable the safe passage of all indigenous fish, while avoiding as far as practicable, the passage of any invasive, pest or nuisance fish species, both indigenous fishes and valued introduced sports fish, by:~~

1. ~~the appropriate design, construction, installation and maintenance of new in-stream structures; 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 removed of existing in-stream structures.