

## Attachment D – Overview of submissions

### Overview of matters raised by submitters in favour of the proposal<sup>1</sup>

- 1 Many of the 342 submitters who were in favour of the changes noted that the amendment would make the Upper Clutha River significantly safer in the busy Summer period for swimmers and other passive recreational users. A number of submitters noted that the Upper Clutha River contained popular locations for passive recreational activities by families and children. Submitters considered that the proposed amendment would significantly reduce collision risks between powered vessels and swimmers, kayakers, and passive users of the river. Some submitters described personal experiences involving near misses between powered vessels and passive river users. Submitters argued that the amendment was a fair compromise that would appropriately address navigation safety risks while balancing the interests of different river users.
- 2 Some submitters indicated that the proposed amendment would be more consistent with policies and rules in the Queenstown Lakes District Plan, which refer to the incompatibility between powered vessels and passive recreational users in the Upper Clutha River. Another matter raised was whether existing resource consents authorising access to the Upper Clutha River should be reviewed and the conditions modified having regard to the navigational safety risks in the area. Others referred to matters not closely related to navigation safety such as the peace and tranquillity of the environment, concerns regarding erosion, wash, wildlife, water quality and preventing pollution.
- 3 Approximately 61 submitters supported the proposed amendment but also noted their support for the Bylaw to go further towards reducing risks from powered vessels. This included 16 submitters who wanted the Upper Clutha River to be made completely free of powered vessels all year round. A further 14 submitters wanted the timeframe restricting powered vessels on the Upper Clutha River to be extended for longer (for example, 1 November – 30 April). Other submitters supported extending the geographical area of the prohibition to cover the last residential home just below the Albert Town Bridge. In addition, 37 submitters preferred some level of speed restriction on powered vessels operating in the Lower Clutha River.
- 4 Some submitters referred to operational matters relevant to implementation of the proposed amendment. These include the Council carrying out more enforcement to deter non-compliance, offering more guidance, public education and appropriate signage around the Clutha River to give effect to the changes.

### Overview of matters raised by submitters opposed to the proposal<sup>2</sup>

- 5 Of the 309 submitters who opposed the amendment, approximately 133 submitters preferred the status quo and considered there was no need to change. These submitters argued that the Clutha River was there to be used by all and that there is insufficient justification in terms of navigation safety risks for restrictions to be imposed on powered vessels. A number of those opposed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Given the large volume of submissions this overview is not intended to be an exhaustive representation of every matter raised in submissions.

<sup>2</sup> Given the large volume of written submissions this overview is not intended to be an exhaustive representation of every matter raised in submissions.