

CHBDC District Plan Review

Further Submissions from Jet Boating New Zealand

Presented by Brian Eccles

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. I represent Jet Boating NZ. We are an Association with 2,400 members. These members have a common interest in using watercraft powered by the waterjet propulsion system first invented by Sir William Hamilton.
- 1.1.2. Our membership is diverse. Many use waterjet propelled craft to enable access to favourite fishing spots or favourite locations for hunting deer, pigs or shooting game fowl. Others simply seek to enjoy engaging with our magnificent rivers.
- 1.1.3. We operate under two pieces of legislation.
 - 1.1.3.1. Transport act. Within CHBDC's territory, jurisdiction for **navigational safety** lies with HBRC and their navigational safety bylaws.
 - 1.1.3.2. RMA - "Activities on the Surface of Water" for **environmental effects**
- 1.1.4. JBNZ encourages responsible use by our members and the wider jetboating community. We are well recognised for our leadership in this space.

2. Effects of powered craft on flora and Fauna

- 2.1.1. JBNZ members have access to the middle and lower reaches of most rivers.
 - 2.1.1.1. This is despite many attempts to brand our use of the river as incompatible with flora and fauna. There is no evidence to support these beliefs
 - 2.1.1.2. An early study was inconclusive as to whether a boat travelling in shallow water across a salmon reed may impact survival. To be cautious JBNZ supports exclusion of upper reaches during the peak spawning period.
 - 2.1.1.3. No effects-based studies have proven adverse effects on shore nesting birds or for that matter any flora and fauna.
 - 2.1.1.4. Conflict of use is a concern for some river users, especially anglers who expect almost wilderness like peace and solitude.
 - 2.1.1.5. There are noise standards for rural zones.

3. Lower Tukituki history of use

- 3.1. JBNZ has successfully run events on the lower Tukituki over many years (above Red Bridge to confluence with the Waipawa river). We seek to repeat that system on the rivers outlined in the submission.
 - 3.1.1. Such events required a public notice from the Harbourmaster.
 - 3.1.2. Only one event per year has been held
 - 3.1.3. Under the old plan the flow had to exceed 23cumecs at Shag Rock. Please note that having adequate flow proved difficult and many events had to be cancelled.
 - 3.1.4. The events were run with the support of Fish and Game
 - 3.1.5. Each year we had 20 to 30 boats participate and up to 75 people were given the opportunity to enjoy a connection with the river.
 - 3.1.6. No complaints were ever received.

4. JBNZ submissions

- 4.1. **JBNZ only seeks occasional use on these proposed sections for organised group outings and where a public notice required by HBRC will inform the public of our activity. To do this we must firstly comply with the district plan before we can apply to the harbourmaster. That's the driver behind our submission.**

5. Further submission

- 5.1. We submit that the proposed use is entirely consistent with the proposed policies and objectives for surface of water activities.
- 5.2. All around NZ we have managed access to similar rivers. The restricted status of the middle reaches of the Tukituki and Waipawa rivers are an exception we seek to remedy.
- 5.3. We are somewhat surprised that the planner's recommendation is a role over of the previous plan.
- 5.4. We understand that the mechanisms for managing motorised craft operating on the surface of the water are complex and take considerable effort to understand.
- 5.5. We ask you as hearings commissions to hear our story and understand our position before making your decision.
- 5.6. We are only an amateur organisation. I am doing this because I have a passion for ensuring more New Zealanders the wonderful experience of engaging with NZ's diverse river environments.
- 5.7. The concept of rolling out experts to describe effects-based studies to prove the potential adverse effects for these rivers is different to other rivers in NZ is beyond our capability.
- 5.8. Respectively I suggest that the planner's recommendation is possibly about taking the "easy option". I ask you as commissioners to ensure that the considered option is taken.
- 5.9. Our submission sought the exclusion of commercial surface of water activities. We did this to be responsible because such activities have a higher frequency and thus a higher impact. Commercial in itself is not an issue. It's only that the frequency and intensity is likely to be many times higher than the occasional recreational use.

6. Proposed amended submission

- 6.1. JBNZ is prepared to amend the submissions to simplify the decision required.
 - 6.1.1. Withdraw the proposed Tukituki changes (above the Waipawa confluence) in favour of just the Waipawa – our preferred resource**
 - 6.1.2. Add frequency constraints for the Waipawa section. Limit to 3 JBNZ organised events per year, but with no “spawning” restrictions as proposed.**
(Fish and Game inform me there is an open fishing season all round on this section)
 - 6.1.3. Delete the commercial use standard.**
- 6.2. These changes would:
 - 6.2.1. Give clarity to the Harbourmaster on how many events they can approve.
 - 6.2.2. Limit angler concerns for conflict of use (events must be publicised – this has worked very well for the lower Tukituki)
 - 6.2.3. Limit potential effects on flora and fauna to less than minor
(any flood, even minor, will have more impact)
 - 6.2.4. Make the commercial exclusion irrelevant.



Amended submission

Proposed District Plan Submission

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act, 199

To: Central Hawke's Bay District Council PO Box 127, 28 - 32 Ruataniwha Street, Waipawa 4210 www.chbdc.govt.nz districtplan@chbdc.govt.nz 06 857 8060
1. Submitter details Brian Eccles Jet Boating New Zealand brian.eccles@jbnz.co.nz 17 Roger Renall Ave, Lansdowne, Masterton 5810 Mob. 0274410820
2. This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for Central Hawke's Bay
3. I could I could not – gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick relevant box) If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete point 4 below:
4. I am I am not – 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. (Please tick relevant box if applicable) Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
5. I wish I do not wish – to be heard in support of my submission in person (Please tick relevant box)
6. I will I will not – consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)
7. Do you wish to present your submission via Zoom? Yes No
8. Please complete section below (insert additional boxes per provision you are submitting on): See below.
We do not want our contact details withheld

Amended submission

Submission Details

<https://eplan.chbdc.govt.nz/draft/#Rules/0/225/1/7628/0>

<i>Provision to which our submission relates:</i>	<i>Our position on this provision is:</i>	<i>The reasons for our submission are:</i>	<i>The Decision we want Council to make:</i>
ASW-11	Support	No comment	
ASW – O1	Support	No comment	
ASW – P1	Support	No comment	
ASW – P2	Support	No comment	
ASW – R1	Support in Part	<p>No comment: “On Horseshoe Lake or Lake Whatuma”</p> <p>On the second section referring to “Any River Upstream of the Confluence of the Tukituki and Waipawa Rivers” we submit that potential effects on spawning can be mitigated by excluding motorised activity during the same period that the fishing season is closed. For the rest of the year there are no proven adverse effects on trout habitat and the habitat and indigenous fauna and submit that motorised craft should be permitted, subject to performance standards.</p> <p>The sections we seek to identify are:-</p> <p>a) Tukituki River above the confluence with the Waipawa River.</p> <p>b) Waipawa River above the confluence with the Tukituki River.</p> <p>No comment: “All Other Rivers and Lakes”</p>	<p>Replace the second section with these new sections: (Retaining the note about remote controlled craft)</p> <p>Tukituki River main stem above the Waipawa River confluence Retain as written Activity Status: PER Where the following performance standards are met:- 1) Non-commercial 2) Excluding July, August and September Activity status where compliance not achieved: DIS</p> <p>Waipawa River main stem from the Highway 50 bridge to the Tukituki River confluence Activity Status: PER Where the following performance standards are met:- • Up to 3 JBNZ organised events per year</p>
ASW – R2	Oppose	While we support the permitted status for recreational use, we submit that commercial use should be subject to a performance standard.	<p>Remove the N/A for conditions Add “Non-commercial”</p>



Amended submission

ASW – AM1	Support	No comment	
ASW – M1	Support	JBNZ support the use of Navigation and Safety bylaws for the purposes outlined.	
ASW – M2	Support	JBNZ support the role of the Harbourmaster in enforcement of the bylaws.	
ASW – AER1	Support	No comment	
ASW – AER2	Support	Typo.	Change AWR to ASW?
ASW – AER3	Support	No comment	

Updated submission 14th March 2022