

Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board

11 July 2024

Report for Agenda Item | Rīpoata moto e Rāraki take [1]

Department: Strategy & Policy

Title | Taitara: Review of Navigation Safety Bylaw 2018

Purpose of the Report | Te Take mō te Pūroko

The purpose of this report is to:

- a) Update the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board (**the Board or WUCCB**) on the steps undertaken to progress the Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC or Council**) Navigation Safety Bylaw 2018 (**the bylaw**) review,
- b) Discuss known issues associated with the current bylaw and navigation safety,
- c) Identify and describe options available to address known issues,
- d) Consider the advantages and disadvantages of the available options, and
- e) Identify a preferred option to address known issues and other minor corrections.

This report seeks the Board's approval for officers to continue with the bylaw review process with the intention of presenting a draft bylaw for adoption by Council on 19 September 2024.

Executive Summary | Whakarāpopototaka Matua

QLDC is required to review its bylaws every five years, and in some cases every ten years. The bylaw is now coming up for its five-year review. The district's waterways can present many challenges for users due to their depth, speed and temperature. They attract many local, national and international visitors. Council has a responsibility to manage navigation safety under the Maritime Transport Act 1994 (**MTA**) so everyone can safely enjoy our lakes and rivers.

The bylaw applies to all the district's navigable waters and the foreshore. It regulates a range of activities, including:

- the use or management of vessels,
- placing and maintenance of moorings and maritime facilities,
- nuisances arising from the use of vessels and people on the water,
- reserved areas,
- sporting, training, ceremonial, or other customary events,
- vessel traffic and anchorages, and
- life jacket use.

The bylaw also prescribes offences and penalties for contraventions of its provisions.

Officers have identified six main issues that have been addressed through the review. These issues were identified on the basis of complaints and concerns received, discussions with QLDC

Harbourmasters and regulatory staff, commercial operators, community groups, and recreational users.

This paper addresses a range of options and includes a series of preferred options officers consider to be the most effective and efficient means for Council to fulfil its obligations under the MTA. A series of other smaller scale amendments are also recommended to address minor errors, incorrect references or other inaccuracies in the bylaw. The preferred options have been informed by a range of stakeholders, including elected members, QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff, Maritime New Zealand (**MNZ**), commercial waterways operators, recreational users, and the general public.

Table 1 identifies the key issues and preferred options recommended by officers. This report provides a comprehensive analysis of these issues, the available options, and their advantages and disadvantages with respect to the degree to which they provide for the effective and efficient implementation of QLDCs roles and responsibilities under the MTA.

Table 1 - Overview of key issues and preferred options

| Issue | Officers preferred option(s) | Report section |
|---|--|--|
| Lifejacket use | Status quo – no amendments to the current bylaw requirements. | Section 16 |
| Ski lanes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the location of some ski lanes, Remove some problematic ski lanes, Formally identify the existing Sunshine Bay ski lane, Improve the identification of ski lanes by way of more accurate GPS coordinates, Update ski lane identification maps, and Apply non regulatory mechanisms to improve compliance. | Section 17 Attachment A |
| Albert Town Bridge – Recreational jumping | Mitigate the navigation safety risk associated with this activity by amending the bylaw to ensure vessels are separated from swimmers through the identification of vessel traffic lanes. This option would also include the introduction of a \$500 infringement fine for non-compliance. | Section 18 Attachment B Attachment C Attachment D |
| Vessel identification | Amend the bylaw to introduce new vessel identification requirements and include a \$150 infringement fine for non-compliance. | Section 19 Attachment E |
| Events on the water | Amend the bylaw to expand the scope of existing provisions so the Harbourmaster: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> needs to be notified of all events, has additional discretion to approve or refuse events applications, and can continue to approve or refuse events which already require an approval¹ | Section 20 |

¹ events which require an uplift of speed restrictions, and/or need to temporarily reserve an area and/or suspend a designation of permanent access lanes or reserved areas

| Issue | Officers preferred option(s) | Report section |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | Amend the requirement to give public notice of any event requiring approval of the Harbourmaster by removing the need for a newspaper advertisement and associated time constraints. | |
| Safe Use of The Wave, Hāwea | No specific additional regulatory intervention. Investigate the use of additional signage and/or education. | Section 21 |
| Other miscellaneous amendments | Undertake minor changes to address identified minor errors, incorrect references to other documents, or other inaccuracies. | Section 22 Attachment F |

In addition to the recommended options set out in Table 1 above, officers note that QLDC undertakes case by case enforcement action in accordance with its Enforcement Strategy and Prosecution Policy 2021². This ranges from education through to escalated enforcement. This action complements the effectiveness and efficiency of each recommended option set out in this report. QLDC continuously evaluates initiatives to increase compliance. Work is undertaken through a variety of engagement tools. Council's regulatory staff will consider feedback received through the bylaw review process to improve compliance. However, operational methods for improving bylaw compliance, education and enforcement are not within the remit of the bylaw review itself.

Recommendation | Kā Tūtohuka

That the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board:

1. **Note** the contents of this report;
2. **Approve** officers to continue with the bylaw review process with the intention of presenting a draft bylaw for Council to endorse for consultation with the community.

Prepared by:



Name: Luke Place
Title: Principal Policy Advisor


21 June 2024



Name: Isabelle Logez
Title: Monitoring, Enforcement and Env. Manager

21 June 2024

Reviewed and Authorised by:



Name: Michelle Morss
Title: General Manager Strategy and Policy

24 June 2024

² <https://www.qldc.govt.nz/media/4v5kg35t/enforcement-strategy-and-prosecution-policy-2021.pdf>

Context | Horopaki

Bylaws – Scope and limitations

- 1.1. Bylaws are made under the Local Government Act 2002 (**LGA**) for one (or more) of the following reasons:³
- protecting the public from nuisance
 - protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety
 - minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places
- 1.2. The MTA empowers regional councils to make navigation safety bylaws⁴ to ensure maritime safety. This power has been delegated to QLDC from Otago Regional Council (**ORC**). The MTA specifies a range of further powers to ensure maritime safety. Further, the MTA provides navigation bylaws unique powers to enforce using infringement fines.

Basis for the review of the bylaw

- 2.1. The bylaw was made in March 2018. The LGA sets out that a bylaw must be reviewed within five years of the date it is first made⁵. If it is not reviewed within 5 years there is a two-year grace period⁶ within which the bylaw is still valid, after which it is automatically revoked. A review done in the two-year grace period invokes a subsequent five year review requirement. The bylaw has passed the five-year review date (which in this case is March 2023), and will automatically expire if not reviewed prior to March 2025. The current progress for the bylaw review is set out in **Figure 1** below.



Figure 1 – High level overview of the bylaw review process.

Identification of key issues

- 3.1. Officers identified six main issues for the bylaw review. These include:
- lifejacket use,
 - events on the water,
 - the location and use of ski lanes,
 - board tethering to ensure safe use of ‘The Wave’ on the Hāwea River,
 - vessel identification, and
 - Council’s role in relation to people jumping recreationally off the Albert Town Bridge.

³ LGA Section 145

⁴ MTA Section 33M

⁵ LGA Section 158

⁶ LGA Section 160A

- 3.2. These issues were identified on the basis of complaints and concerns received, discussions with QLDC Harbourmasters and regulatory staff, commercial operators, community groups, and recreational users.

Early engagement activities

- 4.1. To understand community views, Council undertook a period of pre-engagement between October and November 2023. Feedback was sought on the six key issues. Feedback was also invited on any other aspect of the bylaw. During this feedback period, 67 responses were received, 51 via a Let's Talk survey and 16 by email.
- 4.2. In October 2022 Council undertook informal public consultation in relation to the district's ski lanes. This consultation was undertaken independent of the current review process on the basis of observed user conflicts within the district's ski lanes. During this engagement 160 responses were received. This feedback has also been considered as part of this review.
- 4.3. Officers conducted a public workshop with elected members on 16 April 2024. The purpose of this workshop was to collect elected member feedback to narrow the reasonably practicable options to address identified issues. This feedback has guided officers in the preparation of preferred options.
- 4.4. Officers have shared advice on recommended options with Kāi Tahu, MNZ (and Waka Kotahi NZTA in the case of the Albert Town Bridge). Feedback received has been considered in the development of the recommended options.
- 4.5. Further advice will be sought from MNZ on a full draft bylaw ahead of requesting approval of a draft bylaw from Full Council.

Analysis and Advice | Tatāritaka me kā Tohutohu

Sections 5 – 11 of this report explore each of the key issues, options, and recommended option in turn.

Lifejacket use

- 5.1. Issue discussion
- 5.1.1. The MTA⁷ empowers MNZ to create rules relating to lifejackets. National maritime rule 91.4⁸ sets the legal framework for lifejackets. It places a responsibility on skippers to ensure correctly sized lifejackets⁹ are available for each person onboard a vessel. Skippers are required to ensure lifejackets are worn in situations of heightened risk¹⁰. Part 91 also sets standards for the type of lifejackets required¹¹. The standards of Rule 91 can be enforced locally by harbourmasters and regional council enforcement officers.

⁷ Section 36(t) and (tb) of the MTA

⁸ <https://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/media/rhwkcqt1/part91-maritime-rule.pdf>

⁹ Lifejackets are also known as personal flotation devices or buoyancy aids

¹⁰ When crossing a bar, in rough water, during an emergency, and by non-swimmers

¹¹ New Zealand standard NZS 5823:2001

- 5.1.2. Section 33M(1)(i) of the MTA provides for navigation bylaws to specify additional lifejacket regulations relevant to localised conditions, but they cannot be less prescriptive than Part 91. As such, councils have some discretion regarding lifejacket requirements.
- 5.1.3. The district has many lakes and rivers that attract year-round use from residents and visitors. Given this, lifejacket use is considered important to maintain high levels of navigation safety, and it is important that the bylaw's lifejacket rules are fit for purpose.
- 5.1.4. The current bylaw's lifejacket provisions essentially replicate those contained within Part 91.4. Key points of difference include that:
- a) every person must wear a lifejacket on a recreational vessel 6 metres or less in length while the vessel is making way,
 - b) every person who is 10 years old and under must wear a lifejacket on a recreational vessel greater than 6 metres in length at all times,
 - c) every person must wear a lifejacket on a recreational jet boat while the vessel is making way, and
 - d) any person on a surfboard or paddleboard is not required to wear a lifejacket if a full wetsuit is worn at all times.
- 5.1.5. Key messages obtained during early engagement with regard to lifejackets included:
- a) overall support for existing provisions
 - b) more enforcement and education
 - c) a different approach for paddle boarders
 - d) Re-consider thresholds relating to vessel size
 - e) distance to shore as a possible trigger
 - f) clarity over definitions (i.e. 'making way' and 'underway')

5.2. Options

- 5.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue and the abovementioned feedback. These options are described in **Table 2**:

Table 2 – Options for addressing lifejacket issue

| Option | | Description |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---|
| A | Status quo | Maintain the current provisions without any amendments. |
| B | Compulsory at all times on all craft | <p>Introduce additional obligations by requiring skippers to ensure any person on every type of vessel of any size wears lifejackets.</p> <p>This option would remove the 6 metre vessel length threshold and expand the quantum of vessels subject to lifejacket requirements.</p> <p>This option would likely result in more people being required to wear lifejackets.</p> |

| Option | | Description |
|--------|---|--|
| C | Geographical based requirements (considering a more permissive approach for paddle boards/other similar 'play' type craft depending on their distance from shore) | Determine lifejacket use on the basis of a vessel's location. This could be in relation to its distance from shore or any other specific risk-based location requirements. This option would likely result in fewer people being required to wear lifejackets. |
| D | Amend vessel size thresholds | Amend the specific vessel length threshold which triggers the need to wear a lifejacket. While a specific vessel length is not proposed as part of this option assessment, a more restrictive approach would see the length threshold increased (likely resulting in more people being required to wear lifejackets), while a less restrictive approach would see the length threshold decreased (likely resulting in fewer people being required to wear lifejackets). |

5.3. Recommended option and analysis

5.3.1. The recommended option for addressing this issue is option A – Status Quo.

5.3.2. Current MNZ advice is that lifejackets should be worn on recreational craft 6 metres or less in length. MNZ analysis illustrates that most recreational boating fatalities involve vessels 6 metres or less in length¹² and that many fatalities could have been prevented if a lifejacket was worn. MNZ also recommend that non-swimmers and children wear lifejackets at all times. This evidence supports the bylaw's current lifejacket provisions (in particular, those relating to vessel size thresholds).

5.3.3. Officers have considered a framework which could enable paddleboarders or those on unpowered vessels intended for 'water play' to be excluded from wearing lifejackets based on locational attributes. MNZ consider that lifejackets should be worn on all recreational craft 6 metres or less in length, except on a board being used in surf, if a person is secured to the board by a leash.

5.3.4. Officers acknowledge that a less restrictive framework (such as in options C or D) may be more convenient and flexible for waterway users on vessels intended for 'water play'. A more flexible rule framework may also provide efficiencies in terms of monitoring and enforcement.

5.3.5. Officers have considered the application of a 200 metre from shore lifejacket threshold. This approach could align well with existing speed restrictions which limit vessel speed to 5 knots within 200 metres of the shore¹³ or when 50 metres of any other person in the water¹⁴.

¹² https://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/public/researchers/recreational-research/#rec_fatality_2015_20

¹³ Clause 9.1(b)

¹⁴ Clause 9.1(a)

However, this more permissive approach may have unintended adverse consequences for navigation safety, noting that 200 metres is a long distance from shore for a person in distress, or where a strong offshore wind could quickly push them further from shore. In addition, it is noted that the district's waterways are unique in terms of their depth, speed and temperature. These attributes do not support a more permissive lifejacket regime.

5.3.6. On balance, it is recommended that the existing lifejacket provisions are fit for purpose. Council does not have any reported events which suggest the lifejacket provisions are failing to achieve officer's navigation safety expectations, and the provisions are well supported by MNZ evidence on waterways fatalities. As such, it is considered that that option A (status quo) is the most efficient and effective means to ensure Council meets its roles and responsibilities under the MTA.

6. Ski lanes

6.1. Issue discussion

6.1.1. Ski lanes refer to an 'access lane' with the purpose of enabling powered craft (including jetskis) towing water skiers to leave or approach the foreshore at speeds exceeding 5 knots. Ski lanes are contained within Table 2 (Upliftings for Water Ski access lanes) of Schedule 2(3) of the bylaw. The bylaw identifies 10 ski lanes in Lake Whakatipu, seven in Lake Wānaka and one at Lake Hāwea.

6.1.2. It is important to note that the existence of a ski lane in a location, prevents the area from being used by recreational swimmers. Judicious placement of ski lane locations is therefore important to ensure equitable enjoyment of lakes and rivers.

6.1.3. Each ski lane is identified by two orange and black foreshore poles. Typically, their extent is also identified by buoys 100 metres offshore. Signage is included in and around the foreshore detailing how ski lanes are/are not to be used.

6.1.4. Currently, the bylaw provides one GPS point for the general location of ski lanes. A review of these GPS points has shown they do not align well to the physical location of ski lanes.

6.1.5. The bylaw specifies that:

- a) no person may swim in any access lane¹⁵,
- b) no person in charge of a vessel may operate a vessel in a manner that obstructs or impedes the passage of any other person¹⁶,
- c) no person within an access lane may proceed in any manner that is dangerous¹⁷, and
- d) if one or more persons are using an access lane no person may enter, remain in or use the lane for any other purpose¹⁸.

6.1.6. Ski lanes are typically located in easily accessible and high amenity areas with good water conditions that promote safe ski activities. They may also be located in close proximity to

¹⁵ Clause 42.2

¹⁶ Clause 42.3

¹⁷ Clause 42.4

¹⁸ Clause 42.5

vessel launch areas, picnicking spots, water sports clubs and popular swimming areas. Together, these conditions can create user conflicts that can also lead to navigation safety issues.

- 6.1.7. Key messages obtained during early engagement with regard to ski lanes include:
- a) The majority of respondents considered existing ski lane locations to be inappropriate.
 - b) There are conflicts between users and congestion during peak times.
 - c) Compliance and safety issues were noted.
 - d) Ambiguous markings (signage and buoys).
 - e) Some feedback related to specific ski lanes – targeted changes to improve usability and safety.
 - f) Ski lanes not working due to a lack of understanding
 - g) Appropriate to review locations including Frankton, Bobs Cove, Wilson Bay.
 - h) Safety and education programmes are important.
 - i) Rops Bay – short term restriction is useful.

6.2. Options

- 6.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address ski lane related issues and the abovementioned feedback. These options are described in **Table 3**.

Table 3 – Options for addressing ski lane issues

| Option | | Description |
|--------|--|--|
| A | Status quo | Maintain the current provisions and ski lanes without any amendments. |
| B | Amend or remove specific ski lanes to address known issues Update ski lane identification maps in the bylaw | It is understood that a number of ski lanes are creating (or are perceived to be creating) user conflicts or other navigation safety concerns. This option would involve either relocating or removing ski lanes from known popular beach picnicking and swimming spots or other features such as environmental constraints, recreational clubs, wharves, jetties or vessel launch facilities where navigation safety risks exist. |
| C | Establish additional ski lanes Update ski lane identification maps in the bylaw | New ski lanes could be established to address congestion and user conflict issues identified. These ski lanes could be created in the vicinity of existing ski lanes that may be subject to higher levels of use or congestion during peak periods. |
| D | Create areas for passive water users (i.e. swimmers, non-motorised craft) to provide additional separation | Create additional separation between ski lane users and other passive waterways users to mitigate identified user conflicts. |
| E | Improve ski lane identification and public understanding/compliance | Use a combination of regulatory and non-regulatory mechanisms to mitigate identified issues. It would address administrative inaccuracies related to ski lane locations (i.e. by improving the accuracy of GPS points in the bylaw), and operational tools (i.e. |

| Option | Description |
|--|--|
| Update ski lane identification maps in the bylaw | signage, education and enforcement) to improve public understanding and compliance with existing requirements. |

6.3. Recommended option and analysis

6.3.1. The recommended options for addressing ski lane issues is a combination of option B and E, and with respect to the Sunshine Bay ski lane only, option C.

6.3.2. Option B is considered to be the most efficient and effective means to address the range of known issues associated with specific ski lanes. **Attachment A** provides a summary of the 2022 ski lane engagement feedback, an analysis of known ski lane issues, options to address these issues, and officer's recommended option. **Table 4** below provides an overview of officer's recommended option for each ski lane.

Table 4 – Recommended options relating to each of the district's ski lanes

| Ski lane ¹⁹ | Recommended Option |
|---|--|
| Lake Whakatipu ski lanes | |
| Kelvin Grove | Amend – Reduce width of ski lane by shifting the eastern pole 50 metres west |
| Wilsons Bay | Amend – Retain ski lane but shift approximately 80 metres west by moving the right pole to the left pole location |
| Buckler Burn | No change |
| Kingston Main Beach | No change |
| Bobs Cove | No change |
| Sunshine Bay | Amend – Formally establish the ski lane within the bylaw and shift the ski lane poles 50 metres east away from the boat ramp and swimming area |
| Kinloch Main Beach | Remove ski lane |
| Frankton Beach | Remove ski lane |
| Willow Place West Side | Remove ski lane |
| Loop Road | Remove ski lane |
| Frankton Arm North Side | Remove ski lane |
| Frankton Beach | Remove ski lane |
| Lake Wānaka ski lanes | |
| Roys Bay – Main Beach adjacent to Pembroke Park | Remove ski lane |
| Roys Bay – Eely Point | Remove ski lane |
| Roys Bay – Waterfall Creek | Remove ski lane |
| Dublin Bay | No change |
| Glendhu Bay – East | Amend – Reduce the width of the ski lane by shifting the western pole east by 50 metres |
| Glendhu Bay – West | No change |

¹⁹ Note – the current ski lane locations are shown in maps 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12 of the current bylaw.

| Lake Hāwea ski lanes | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Lake Hāwea | No change |

- 6.3.3. In addition to the specific amendments detailed in **Table 4** (and supported by Attachment A), Option E encompasses a series of actions to a) ensure ski lanes are identified accurately in the bylaw (by way of improving the accuracy of GPS points in Table 2 – Access Lanes of Schedule 2), and b) to ensure QLDC manages the ski lanes in a way that gives effect to its roles and responsibilities under the MTA.
- 6.3.4. The current bylaw contains a number of provisions to manage user conflict and associated navigation safety, including in and around ski lanes. These provisions²⁰ control jumping, diving and swimming around jetties and wharves, prevent swimmers from entering ski lanes, prevent vessel obstructions and dangerous behaviour, manage congestion in ski lanes, control vessel speed in proximity to any structure or person, prevent skiing outside daylight hours, require incidents to be reported, and provide the Harbourmaster with enforcement discretion to ensure maritime safety.
- 6.3.5. Officers consider that these existing provisions provide reasonably practicable direction for waterways users, the Harbourmaster and Council’s regulatory staff to ensure ski lanes are used in a safe manner.
- 6.3.6. Officers’ recommended vessel identification provisions (discussed further below) would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring and enforcement provisions in circumstances where a vessel may be reported as operating in contravention of the bylaw.
- 6.3.7. Options C (excluding reference to the Sunshine Bay ski lane) and D involve specific bylaw amendments that may address some of the identified issues. However, they are not considered efficient or effective as they would create new access lanes or similar restricted use areas with the same or similar likelihood of user conflict. As noted above, a combination of options B and E is most appropriate as it proactively responds to site specific concerns and promotes compliance with existing provisions.
- 6.3.8. Option D would provide specific areas for swimmers or other non-powered users. However, popular swimming areas are already informally identified to promote user separation²¹. These informal areas, coupled with the existing abovementioned provisions, are considered sufficient to address any actual or perceived navigation safety risk between vessels and swimmers/non powered users.
- 6.3.9. Option A (status quo) is not considered efficient or effective. It does not sufficiently respond to the site-specific ski lane issues identified in Attachment A and fails to recognise the range of benefits associated with the regulatory and non-regulatory operational mechanisms inherent in the bylaw’s existing provisions.

²⁰ Clauses 42.2, 42.3, 42.4, 42.5, 9.1(a)(b) and (c), 10.1, 24.1, 28.1(a) and (b), 39.1, 40.1

²¹ Lake Wānaka Boating Guide, Lake Hāwea Boating Guide
<https://www.qldc.govt.nz/recreation/lakes-and-boating/>

- 6.3.10. With respect to the ski lane at Sunshine Bay only, officers recommend option C – establish additional ski lanes. This option is recommended on the basis that the ski lane is not currently formally identified with the bylaw despite it being physically established through demarcation of ski lane poles and buoys. In addition, it is recommended that the ski lane's location be amended marginally (by approximately 50 metres) to move it away from the existing boat ramp. This option would address an administrative error in the bylaw and enable QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff to enforce the provisions of the bylaw with respect to this ski lane to ensure navigation safety is maintained.

7. Albert Town Bridge – Recreational jumping

7.1. Issue discussion

- 7.1.1. The Albert Town Bridge (**the bridge**) is part of Waka Kotahi NZTA's state highway network, providing access over the Clutha River Mata-Au between Wānaka and Hāwea. The bridge contains a walking/cycling path separated from the vehicle carriageway.
- 7.1.2. QLDC has received concerns and complaints of people jumping from the bridge into the river. Vessels frequently use this stretch of the river. Swimmers (once jumped) can therefore create a navigation safety risk, which is the specific purview of this bylaw. Vessels may be travelling at speed²², and it can be difficult to identify if someone is on the bridge about to jump, or if someone is already in the water.
- 7.1.3. As part of early engagement, QLDC asked respondents to provide insights to this issue. The online survey asked, 'do you think QLDC should take action to address the potential navigational hazard caused by people jumping off the Albert Town Bridge?':
- 50% of respondents indicated that QLDC should not take action
 - 19% of respondents indicated that action should be taken
 - 31% of respondents didn't know or didn't respond to this question
 - A range of suggestions were provided to improve safety i.e. designating jumping spots and identifying vessel lanes, prohibiting powered vessels from this area.
 - Some opposition was expressed with regard to further regulation and site-specific rules.
 - Feedback noted that QLDC needs to be conscious of its health and safety responsibilities, and enforcement challenges associated with any action.
- 7.1.4. QLDC engaged Drowning Prevention Aotearoa²³ (**DPA**) to undertake an independent risk assessment of bridge jumping to inform Council's understanding of the risk, and what actions could be taken. DPA's interim summary is included as **Attachment B** to this report. Key findings from DPA are set out in **Table 5** below.

²² Note: Clause 35 sets out that no powered vessels may operate in the area between the Outlet Camping Ground and the Albert Town Bridge between 1 December and 30 April. Exceptions are provided for vessels operating under the conditions of an approved resource consent, if a vessel is carrying out specific activities permitted under the Proposed District Plan, or is being operated by the Harbourmaster. Between 1 May and 30 November any powered vessel operating in this area is subject to a 5 knot speed limit.

²³ <https://www.dpanz.org.nz/>

Table 5 – Key findings from the DPA interim summary

| Waterways user/activity | Key findings – See Attachment C for DPA risk matrix definitions and rating scores |
|--|--|
| Jumper / Manu ²⁴ | Risk Level: Extreme |
| Swimmers | Risk Level: High |
| Powered Craft User | Risk Level: High |
| Vehicles | Risk Level: Medium |
| Track or Bridge User – Walker/Cyclist | Risk Level: Medium |
| Non-powered Craft (Passive) User (i.e. Floaters (drifters) / kayakers / paddleboarders, rafting etc) | Risk Level: Medium |
| Kai Gatherer | Risk Level: Medium |

7.2. Options and analysis

7.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue, in response to the abovementioned feedback and DPA advice. These options are described in **Table 6** below:

Table 6 – Options for addressing navigation safety risk associated with people jumping from the bridge

| Option | Description |
|---------------|---|
| A | <p>Status quo</p> <p>Maintain current provisions in the bylaw. It would result in no new or amended provisions relating to people jumping from the bridge. People could continue jumping into the river without any additional controls.</p> |
| B | <p>Amend the bylaw (and undertake other non – regulatory mechanisms) to address the waterways users/activities identified by DPA as having an ‘extreme’ or ‘high’ risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jumper / Manu - Swimmers - Powered crafts <p>Respond directly to the DPA assessment by adopting recommendations put forward by DPA to address the waterways users/activities which have an elevated level of risk.</p> <p>This would involve the creation of vessel passage lanes directing powered draft through the bridge and the introduction of a \$500 infringement fine for vessels which do not follow the correct passage lanes.</p> |
| C | <p>Amend existing provisions enabling the Harbourmaster to prevent jumping, diving, swimming or other activities at their discretion.</p> <p>Clause 28 of the bylaw provides discretion to the Harbourmaster to prevent jumping, diving, swimming or other activities around wharves or jetties to ensure navigation safety.</p> <p>This option would expand Clause 28 so it also applies to any bridge. This would enable the Harbourmaster to use discretion to prevent actions in this part of the river.</p> |

²⁴ Te Reo term for jumping or diving

| Option | | Description |
|--------|--|--|
| D | Introduce provisions that prohibit swimming around the bridge. | The introduction of such provisions would prevent swimming around the bridge, and theoretically equate to a jumping ban. |

7.3. Recommended option and analysis

7.3.1. The recommended option for addressing the bridge jumping issue is option B. Option B would involve the following regulatory based mechanisms:

- a) Create defined upstream and downstream passage lanes for powered craft under the bridge to create separation from the known jumping/swim area.
- b) Signpost the middle lane of the bridge as a powered craft passage lane to minimise collision risks with people in the water.

7.3.2. **Attachment D** includes images illustrating approximate locations for the upstream and downstream powered craft passage lanes. These passage lanes are intended to separate vessel traffic from the area jumpers are generally understood to enter the water. Option B could also include non-regulatory mechanisms recommended by DPA, including hazard signage, installing public rescue equipment, and water depth markers. These mechanisms are operational in nature and require analysis by QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff. Further, some non-regulatory mechanisms will need to be considered in partnership with Waka Kotahi NZTA as owners of the bridge.

7.3.3. Option B is considered most efficient and effective as it provides a middle ground that ensures vessel traffic is separated from swimmers/people who have jumped from the bridge if they choose to do so. It would alert powered vessels of swimmers/jumpers, and therefore mitigate navigation safety risk.

7.3.4. Option B acknowledges that QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff will not be present to monitor and enforce activities in this area at all times. By contrast, options C and D would rely on an almost continuous presence of QLDCs Harbourmaster and/or regulatory staff (at least during peak summer months), which is not practical.

7.3.5. Option B is well supported by the independent expert assessment and recommendations of DPA, and is therefore considered more robust and effective than options A, C and D. The selection of options A, C or D may be subject to challenge as they do not align well with DPAs findings.

7.3.6. Option B recognises that people may continue to jump from the bridge. Officers consider that options C and D do not sufficiently take into account the ongoing possibility of the activity taking place without sufficient mitigation, possibly resulting in unintended navigation safety consequences. However, officers highlight that it is not the intention of option B to endorse jumping, nor to specifically enable the activity. It is noted that the bylaw continues to provide the Harbourmaster with wide ranging enforcement capabilities to prohibit or restrict activities if they are not satisfied that adequate precautions have been taken to ensure the health or safety of

any person or the public²⁵. Officers acknowledge that that option B (or indeed further any action taken to manage this issue) may create a perception that jumping/swimming in and around the bridge is without risk. While option B would mitigate the identified navigation safety risk, signage would be considered for this area to notify users of any relevant residual navigation safety risks in this area.

7.3.7. Option A is not considered appropriate as it does not sufficiently respond to the DPA assessment and recommendations. Further, it would not satisfy QLDCs roles and responsibilities under the MTA.

7.3.8. QLDCs obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 have been considered as part of this analysis. It is noted that QLDCs responsibilities for the purpose of this bylaw review relate to protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety as per section 145 of the LGA, as well as the management of navigation safety as required under the MTA. Officers consider that the risk assessment undertaken by DPA provides Council with the information necessary to make an informed decision on how to manage this risk. Option B is considered to addresses these obligations and the identified risk.

8. Vessel identification

8.1. Issue discussion

8.1.1. QLDC's bylaw does not currently require vessels to be identifiable. This impacts the capacity and capability for QLDC to implement its roles and responsibilities under the MTA. In particular, it limits the ability for QLDCs Harbourmaster to respond to waterway incidents and complaints involving vessels (including emergency events). This is because it can be very difficult to locate vessels based on a second-hand description of their appearance alone.

8.1.2. Many other navigation safety bylaws around the country require vessel identification²⁶, making QLDCs bylaw somewhat of an outlier. As such, QLDCs current bylaw is not representative of best practice.

8.1.3. However, there are no national requirements or direction requiring navigation safety bylaws to include vessel identification provisions. MNZ has some existing requirements for commercial and pleasure vessels to be identified²⁷. These requirements largely provide nationality to ships that travel overseas. This situation is extremely unlikely to apply to any vessel on the district's waterways. Vessel owners do have the option to register with MNZ if they choose to. As such, Council has a choice about whether or not to introduce such a requirement, and if so, what form it should take. An absence of national direction has resulted in some variation between bylaws in terms of the specific nature of identification.

²⁵ Clause 55.1

²⁶ Otago Regional Council Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020, Canterbury Regional Council Navigation Safety Bylaw 2016, Marlborough District Council Navigation By law 2023, the Nelson City Council Navigation Safety Bylaw 2012, Wellington Regional Navigation Safety Bylaws 2021, Waikato Regional Council 2013 Navigation Safety Bylaw, Auckland Council Navigation Bylaw 2021, Hawke's Bay Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024

²⁷ <https://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/commercial/ships/ship-registration/>

- 8.1.4. Key messages obtained during early engagement with regard to vessel identification include:
- Overall support for considering different options for vessel identification.
 - Suggestions for identification varied from vehicle/trailer registration, name of vessel, QLDC specific ID number.
 - QLDC needs to be conscious of enforcement and implementation challenges.
 - The use of IT should be considered to ensure implementation is effective and efficient.

8.2. Options and analysis

8.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue and in response to the abovementioned feedback. These options are described in **Table 7** below.

Table 7 -Options for addressing the issue of vessel identification

| Option | Description |
|--------|--|
| A | <p>Status quo</p> <p>Maintain the current approach which does not require vessel identification.</p> |
| B | <p>QLDC specific identification system</p> <p>Introduce new provisions requiring vessel identification. This option requires the development of system unique to the district.</p> <p>This option would require QLDC to develop an online registration platform and manage its administration.</p> <p>This option would also include the application of a \$150 infringement fee.</p> |
| C | <p>Apply ORCs vessel identification provisions (See Attachment E)</p> <p>ORC included vessel identification requirements in their Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020²⁸. These requirements prevent any person from operating a vessel that meets specific size thresholds unless it meets the identification provisions.</p> <p>This option would rely on a range of existing data sources and provide vessel owners with flexibility to choose which type of registration method best suits their vessel.</p> <p>Vessel owners would not be required to register with Council, nor would Council be required to administer a registration system.</p> <p>This option would also include the application of a \$150 infringement fee.</p> |

²⁸ Section 15 (Vessels to be identified)

https://www.orc.govt.nz/media/9185/orc-navigation-safety-bylaw_forweb_2020-09-23.pdf

8.3. Recommended option and analysis

- 8.3.1. Officers recommended option for addressing this issue is option C - Apply ORCs vessel identification provisions. The full text of ORCs vessel identification provisions is included in **Attachment E**.
- 8.3.2. The recommended option would prevent any person from operating a vessel unless it met the identification provisions. The provisions require vessels to have a name or number which meets a range of standards relating to appearance and individualism.
- 8.3.3. The recommended option would provide a range of different forms of identification, including a MNZ registration (if the vessel is registered with MNZ), a sporting body registration, a radio call sign, trailer registration number, or a sail number.
- 8.3.4. Not all vessels would be required to meet the full suite of recommended registration requirements, with smaller vessels simply needing to have the owners name and contact details noted somewhere on the vessel.
- 8.3.5. In addition, it is recommended that QLDC's Local Government (Infringement Fees for Offences: Queenstown Lakes District Navigation Safety Bylaw 2009) Regulations 2009 be updated to include provision for a \$150 fine for failing to comply with the recommended vessel identification requirements. This would match the fine applied in association with ORCs vessel identification requirements.
- 8.3.6. Replicating ORC's vessel identification requirements would provide a consistent approach across Otago. It is also noted that the Environment Canterbury Navigation Safety Bylaw 2016 has an almost identical set of vessel identification requirements²⁹ to those of ORC. Such policy alignment provides efficiencies for vessel owners, QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff. This is important as it is acknowledged that many people bring vessels to the district from other areas. Vessels compliant with other authorities' identification requirements would also satisfy the recommended provisions.
- 8.3.7. An identification requirement unique to the district would limit the 'pool' of identification data that would otherwise be accessible via the recommended provisions, and insufficiently recognise the efficiencies of regional consistency.
- 8.3.8. The recommended provisions provide a high degree of flexibility in terms the type of identification. This is efficient for vessel owners as it allows them to rely on a form of existing identification if it applies to them.
- 8.3.9. The proposed requirements would provide QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff with additional tools to fulfil their roles and responsibilities under the MTA and deliver improved customer service. In particular, requiring vessels to be identified would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of incident and compliant responses.

²⁹ Section 20 (Vessels to be identified)

<https://www.ecan.govt.nz/document/download?uri=2473039>

- 8.3.10. The recommended option would promote efficient administration and implementation of the bylaw because they would rely on a range of existing data sets, including a MNZ registration (if the vessel is registered with MNZ), a sporting body registration, a radio call sign, trailer registration number, or a sail number. QLDC can access this information to carry out its compliance and regulatory functions. In contrast, option B would require the establishment and maintenance of a unique vessel registration system. This system would need to be administered entirely in-house with additional resources needing to be allocated (or reallocated) to manage it successfully.
- 8.3.11. While the proposed provisions would require vessel owners to ensure their vessel name or number is displayed in a way that meets the standards, it would not impose a registration fee on account of its low administration cost. In contrast, option B would likely need to be cost recoverable (at least in part) due to its onerous administration requirements, and therefore necessitate the application of a registration fee for vessel owners.
- 8.3.12. The proposed requirements are considered to be 'right sized' or fit for purpose on the basis of the nature and scale of vessels needing to be identified. It places more fulsome identification requirements on vessels that are more likely to require regulation to maintain navigation safety. It maintains a 'minimum' identification requirement for other vessels to ensure owners can be identified if necessary.
- 8.3.13. The proposed provisions introduce a new requirement on vessel owners. While these costs are not likely to be significant in comparison to the cost of a vessel, it will be a new cost vessel owners will need to absorb. Option A (status quo) would not require any new costs on vessel owners and would therefore be the least cost option for vessel owners (and whose vessels may not already meet the identification requirements).
- 8.3.14. The proposed provisions provide a high degree of flexibility in terms of the type of identification that could be accepted. This may create some complexities for QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff as they will need to consider a range of different registration types that may be very different from one another.
- 8.3.15. The requirements would rely on a range of external data systems. This may create complexities and inefficiencies for QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff as they will have to rely on information from other sources. This may cause delays in responding to incidents or complaints if the information is not readily available. In contrast, option B (QLDC unique system) would ensure QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff have immediate access to a centralised data system, possibly enabling quicker response times.
- 8.3.16. On balance, officers advise that the recommended option (option C - Apply ORCs vessel identification provisions) is the most effective and efficient means of implementing QLDCs responsibilities under the MTA.

9. Events on the water

9.1. Issue discussion

- 9.1.1. The district is a popular place to conduct organised waterways events. These events range from small recreational club races, to large commercial events that attract a large number of participants. Organised waterways events may take place in locations and at a scale that could result in navigational safety concerns. As such, it is necessary for QLDC to manage such events to implement its roles and responsibilities under the MTA.
- 9.1.2. The bylaw currently contains provisions to manage ‘special events’³⁰. These events may include ‘*a race, speed trial, competition, display, performance, film, advertisement or other organised water activity*’.
- 9.1.3. Clause 31.1 of the bylaw currently specifies a need to apply to the Harbourmaster if an event is proposed to be held on the water **and** if the event seeks to uplift speed restrictions for the location and/or temporarily reserve an area and/or suspend the designation of permanent access lanes or reserved areas. The Harbourmaster may grant an application for an event if they are satisfied that it can take place without endangering the public.
- 9.1.4. The bylaw does not currently set out requirements for the Harbourmaster to provide approval for, or for Council to be notified of all events. Only those events which require an uplift of speed restrictions, and/or need to temporarily reserve an area and/or suspend a designation of permanent access lanes or reserved areas are required to notify Council and obtain Harbourmaster approval. These thresholds mean that an event of any scale and in any location could take place on the district’s waterways without Harbourmaster approval, Council notification or public notice if it does not trigger these thresholds.
- 9.1.5. This approach does not facilitate the most effective or efficient implementation of QLDCs roles and responsibilities under the MTA because, while these thresholds may contribute to a need for specific management, they alone do not necessarily pre-determine the absence or otherwise of navigation safety risk that has the capacity to endanger the public through the operation of an organised waterways event.
- 9.1.6. Events that take place without Harbourmaster approval, council notification or appropriate public notice may endanger the public or hamper an incident response because the Harbourmaster will not have access to the event organiser’s contact details, radio communication channels, course and event site maps, or oversight of the events water safety plan. Further, the Harbourmaster will not have the capacity to impose conditions on the event to ensure it operates in the interest of navigation safety. The absence of Council notification or appropriate public notice may result in other waterways users being unaware of an event taking place and occupying space where the event is to take place. All of these circumstances may result in navigation safety risks which are appropriately managed through the bylaw.
- 9.1.7. The current event provisions require that public notice³¹ is given (including in a newspaper) specifying the period of the activity and details of the supervision or reserved area not less than seven days or more than 14 days before the commencement of the activity. This requirement is onerous for event organisers and regulatory staff given the tight timeframes

³⁰ Part 31 of the bylaw

³¹ Public notice means a notice published on the Council website and in a newspaper circulating in the area of the District.

of event programming and newspaper circulation. It is also noted that national Maritime rules do not require such strict public notice actions for organised waterways events.

- 9.1.8. Key messages obtained during early engagement with regard to special events include:
- a) The majority of respondents agreed the Harbourmaster should be notified of events citing reasons of managing safety, user conflict and improving compliance.
 - b) A variety of events were suggested to be considered as a 'special event' ranging from swimming to jet boat racing events.
 - c) Clarity concerning approval processes, timeframes, required documentation and the role of the Harbourmaster is needed.
 - d) Thresholds created based of the nature and scale of the event that correlate to notification requirements were recommended.
 - e) QLDC should be mindful of the impacts of notification requirements, associated paperwork and administration costs.
 - f) A risk-based process should be considered.

9.2. Options

9.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue and in response to the abovementioned feedback. These options are described in **Table 8** below.

Table 8 - Options to address special events management issues

| Option | | Description |
|--------|---|--|
| A | Status quo - Harbourmaster approval and Council notification only required in limited circumstances. | Maintain the current approach which requires Harbourmaster approval in limited circumstances - if the event seeks to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - uplift speed restrictions for the location and/or - temporarily reserve an area and/or - suspend the designation of permanent access lanes or reserved areas |
| B | Create a risk-based threshold for event requirements dependent on the nature and scale of the event. Amend the requirement to give public notice of any event requiring approval of the Harbourmaster. Amend the definition of public notice to remove the requirement for a newspaper advertisement. | Amend the bylaw to include a risk assessment framework that aims to pre-empt the nature and scale of navigation risks associated with all events based on a detailed set of factors which could include the number of participants, the type of vessel i.e. powered vs. non-powered and the location of the event. The Harbourmaster and/or Council's regulatory staff would be required to assess each event against this framework and determine if the event should be approved or refused. This option would also remove the onerous public notice requirements in the current bylaw by enabling public notice to be given on the Council's website and at a more flexible time period before the commencement of the activity. |

| Option | | Description |
|--------|---|--|
| C | <p>Expand the scope of the existing provisions such that the Harbourmaster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - needs to be notified of all organised waterways events, and - has additional discretion to approve events on navigation safety grounds - would continue to have discretion to approve or refuse events that already require an application to be made (i.e. events which require an uplift of speed restrictions, and/or need to temporarily reserve an area and/or suspend a designation of permanent access lanes or reserved areas) <p>Amend the requirement to give public notice of any event requiring approval of the Harbourmaster.</p> | <p>This option would generally align with the approach for managing special events in ORCs Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020³². It would involve amendments that increase the Harbourmaster’s oversight of events. It would require event organisers to notify the Harbourmaster of their events in every circumstance, and result in some event organisers needing to obtain Harbourmaster approval in specified circumstances. If the Harbourmaster is not satisfied that the event can take place without endangering the public, this option provides the Harbourmaster with additional discretion to refuse an application.</p> <p>This option would also remove the onerous public notice requirements in the current bylaw by enabling public notice to be given on the Council’s website and at a more flexible time period before the commencement of the activity.</p> |

9.3. Recommended option and analysis

9.3.1. The recommended option for addressing this issue is Option C - expand the scope of the existing provisions to enable additional Harbourmaster oversight and discretion (and amend public notice requirements).

9.3.2. Option C would ensure that the Harbourmaster is notified of every organised waterway event. This additional notification requirement would provide scope for the Harbourmaster to determine if any proposed event is likely to affect normal operation of another vessel(s) or any other user(s) of the water. In addition, option C would continue to require Harbourmaster approval in those circumstances already provided in the bylaw. Officers consider that this additional scope will provide QLDC with a more robust framework to ensure it is effectively and efficiently implementing its roles and responsibilities under the MTA.

³² Clause 22 of ORCs Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020

- 9.3.3. Due to the expanded remit of option C, it is likely that additional organised events will need to be notified to and approved by the Harbourmaster. While the quantum of additional notifications and approvals is not known, it is likely that option C will create additional administrative requirements for QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff. However, officers consider that any such costs are likely to be absorbed within existing budgets and capabilities.
- 9.3.4. QLDC does not currently impose a fee for event organisers to notify the harbourmaster of their event or to apply for an uplift of speed restrictions, temporary reservations or suspensions of a designation permanent access lanes or reserved area. As such, any new obligations imposed by option C will not add further costs on event organisers. However, it is noted that QLDC regularly reviews its fees and charges, and officers may make future recommendations regarding the need to charge for any organised waterways event notification and associated Harbourmaster approval.
- 9.3.5. In addition, option C (and option B) would involve the simplification of public notice requirements for organised waterways events that require Harbourmaster approval. In particular, it would remove the strict timeframe associated with newspaper publication³³. Instead, it would enable the notice to be published at a more flexible time and on Council's website and social media platforms. This would be more effective and efficient as it would better suit the limited timeframes and programmes of event organisers, while still ensuring appropriate levels of awareness of waterways events. It is also noted that Council's regulatory staff has a range of contacts with recreational groups and commercial operators. Staff will use discretion to proactively contact such groups if an event may impact their usual operations.
- 9.3.6. Option C is generally consistent with the waterways events provisions within ORCs Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020. This level of regional consistency benefits waterways event organisers who may operate across the wider Otago region.
- 9.3.7. Option B is not recommended as it would require the development of a complex waterway event risk matrix that may be inconstantly applied and create confusion. It is not likely to provide sufficient scope to accurately assess the unique circumstances of every type of organised waterway event in every single location. On balance, officers consider that QLDCs Harbourmaster (and regulatory staff) are best qualified to consider each event on a case-by-case basis on account of their knowledge of district's waterways and experience in managing navigation safety.
- 9.3.8. Option A is not considered effective or efficient. It would not address the identified issue and may result in navigation safety risks because some waterways events will not be appropriately considered by QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff. It is not sufficient to ensure QLDC implements its obligations under the MTA.

10. Safe Use of The Wave Hawea

10.1. Issue discussion

³³ It is noted that some temporary waterway events may require a notified resource consent or road closure application. These applications may involve specific public notification processes under the RMA or LGA respectively.

10.1.1. The Wave (also known as the Hāwea Whitewater Park) is a man-made structure located in the channel of the Hāwea River upstream of the Camphill Bridge. It creates waves for recreational users including kayak, white water, body boarding and surfing enthusiasts.

10.1.2. The Wave comprises two drop features of different levels, a smaller top wave and a bigger bottom wave. It was constructed by Contact Energy to mitigate the effects on recreational who used natural rapids on the Kawarau and Cutha Mata-Au Rivers that were lost beneath the waters of Lake Dunstan and the Clyde Dam.

10.1.3. The Wave creates strong currents in and around this part of the Hāwea River. The Camphill Bridge immediately downstream can create risks for people riding the water. QLDC has received concerns and observed safety issues relating to the type of tethering used to secure users to their boards. Incorrect tethering may result in navigation and general safety risks as people could get caught on the supporting structures of the Camphill Bridge.

10.1.4. Key messages obtained during early engagement with regard to the Wave include:

- a) Reports of safety issues.
- b) Monitoring, signage, presence of a lifeguard, tether types and lifejacket use were identified to promote safer use of the Wave.
- c) Additional restrictions were not strongly supported, but options should be considered.
- d) Education is important and preferred to additional rules.
- e) QLDC should be mindful of enforcement challenges.

10.2. Options

10.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue and in response to the abovementioned feedback. These options are described in **Table 9** below.

Table 9 – Options to address safe use of the Wave

| Option | | Description |
|--------|--|---|
| A | Status quo | Maintain the current approach which does not identify any specific controls relating to the Wave or the way it is used. |
| B | Specific provisions relating to the use of the Wave (i.e. lifejacket use, tether type) | <p>Introduce new provisions that set out how people are required to use the Wave to ensure navigation safety.</p> <p>It is understood that the most appropriate (safest) method for people to tether themselves to their board while riding the Wave is on the biceps or waist, not the leg, and that this tether should include a quick release function. This advice is provided in the form of signage on the shore around the Wave. Signage states that correctly sized lifejackets and/or wetsuits and crash helmets are to be worn when using the Wave.</p> <p>This option would introduce provisions to require users to give effect to these best practice safety guidelines, and</p> |

| Option | | Description |
|--------|---|--|
| | | would allow QLDC to enforce and/or infringe users who do not comply. |
| C | Signage / education on safe use of the Wave | <p>Use of confined non-regulatory mechanisms to ensure Wave users implement established best practice safety guidelines described on signage in and around the Wave.</p> <p>This option would not introduce any additional site-specific provisions relating to the use of the Wave, and would primarily rely on a review of existing signage around the Wave, engagement with recreational groups, and education campaigns by QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff.</p> |

10.3. Recommended option and analysis

10.3.1. Officers' recommended option for addressing this issue is option C - signage / education on safe use of the Wave.

10.3.2. With regard to of lifejackets, it is noted that the requirements of Part 3 (Carriage and wearing of lifejackets) of the bylaw do apply to people using the Wave, whether that be on a board, kayak or any other sort of vessel. As such, QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff already have the capacity to enforce and infringe people who are not wearing lifejackets and/or a wetsuit in accordance with the bylaw.

10.3.3. The current provisions do not go so far as to specify how boards are to be tethered to a person using the Wave (as set out in the on-shore signage). It is considered that the existing lifejacket provisions and signage are generally appropriate to ensure people using the Wave are appropriately equipped to ensure navigation safety. In combination with additional and ongoing education activities undertaken by QLDC's Harbourmaster and regulatory staff in partnership with recreational groups, officers are satisfied that QLDC would be implementing its obligations to achieve navigation safety at the Wave.

10.3.4. Option A wouldn't result in the application of any further, reviewed or proactive engagement with recreational groups, and education campaigns by QLDCs Harbourmaster and regulatory staff to promote best practice and safe use of the Wave. As such, option A is not recommended. While option C may result in some additional costs to QLDC in terms of officer time and/or revised signage, these costs are not likely to be significant and can be absorbed within existing budgets.

11. Other miscellaneous amendments

11.1. Issue discussion

11.1.1. A confined number of provisions within the bylaw contain minor errors, incorrect references to other documents, or other inaccuracies. These components of the bylaw are not considered to materially impact the capacity or capability of QLDC to fulfil its role and

responsibilities under the MTA. However, they do have the capacity to compromise the legibility and usability of the bylaw.

11.1.2. **Attachment F** provides an overview of these minor errors, incorrect references, or other inaccuracies.

11.1.3. Officers have not undertaken public pre-engagement on these specific minor amendments, nor did they request guidance from Elected Members via a workshop given their limited nature and scale.

11.2. Options and analysis

11.2.1. A range of options have been considered to address this issue. These options are described in **Table 10** below.

Table 10 - Options to address minor errors, incorrect references, or other inaccuracies

| Option | | Description |
|--------|--|---|
| A | Status quo | Maintain the current wording in all the subject provisions. |
| B | Undertake amendments to address the identified minor errors, incorrect references to other documents, or other inaccuracies. | Undertake a number of minor amendments throughout the bylaw to address relevant miscellaneous issues. |

11.3. Recommended option and analysis

11.3.1. Officers' recommended option for addressing this issue is Option B - Undertake minor changes to address minor errors, incorrect references to other documents, or other inaccuracies.

11.3.2. These changes will improve the legibility and usability of the bylaw for general users, and avoid potential ambiguity. The subject amendments are not considered to have a material impact on waterways users, nor on the capacity or capability of the Harbourmaster or QLDCs regulatory staff to fulfil their obligations under the MTA.

11.3.3. Option A is not considered efficient or effective as it would retain known issues within parts of the bylaw that could be addressed at this time.

[Consultation Process | Hātepe Matapaki](#)

12. Significance and Engagement | Te Whakamahi I kā Whakaaro Hiraka

12.1. This matter is of medium significance, as determined by reference to the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy 2021. While the bylaw review and officer's recommended amendments may result in a range of amendments that could change the way lakes and rivers are managed to ensure navigation safety, and which are likely to be of high community interest, this paper is not seeking approval from the Board for specific amendments. Rather, the Board is

being asked to recommend that the review proceed. No decision is being requested at this time on substantive amendments to the bylaw and officer's recommendations are set out in this paper to provide clarity on what is intended to be presented for approval by Council ahead of consultation on draft bylaw amendments.

12.2. The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter are Kāi Tahu, commercial waterways operators, recreational users, and the general public. Council has engaged with Kāi Tahu, MNZ, Waka Kotahi NZTA, ORC and QLDC Harbourmaster, commercial waterways operators, recreational users, and the general public to guide the development of recommended options to address key issues. Further engagement will take place ahead of requesting Council to endorse a draft bylaw for consultation via the special consultative procedure.

13. Māori Consultation | Iwi Rūnaka

13.1. Kāi Tahu have been engaged (via Council's Māori Strategy and Partnerships Manager) and have been provided with the recommended options. While Mana Whenua have a high interest in matters relating to water quality and quantity, the bylaw does not address these matters. Water quality and quantity are managed by way of the Resource Management Act 1991. On that basis, no feedback has been provided. Kāi Tahu will have an opportunity to provide input as part of formal consultation.

Risk and Mitigations | Kā Raru Tūpono me kā Whakamaurutaka

14. This matter relates to the Regulatory/Legal/Compliance risk category. It is associated with RISK10026 Ineffective enforcement within the QLDC Risk Register. This risk has been assessed as having a moderate residual risk rating.

15. The approval of the recommended option will allow Council to implement additional controls for this risk. This will be achieved by ensuring QLDC's bylaw provides the most efficient and effective provisions for it to fulfil its obligations under the MTA.

Financial Implications | Kā Riteka ā-Pūtea

16. It is considered that the proposed changes can be implemented through existing budgets.

Council Effects and Views | Kā Whakaaweawe me kā Tirohaka a te Kaunihera

17. The following Council policies, strategies and bylaws were considered:

- a) Our Vision and Mission - QLDC
- b) Significance and Engagement Policy 2021
- c) Enforcement Strategy and Prosecution Policy 2021

18. The recommended options are consistent with the principles set out in the above mentioned named policies.

19. Provision for the review of bylaws is identified in the Long Term Plan – Bylaw enforcement and compliant response and waterways management.

**Legal Considerations and Statutory Responsibilities | Ka Ture Whaiwhakaaro me kā Takohaka
Waeture**

20. Council is bound by the LGA when making or reviewing bylaws. The base determination, notification, and consultation procedures set out under sections 155, 156 and 157 of the LGA apply.
21. It is proposed that consultation on a draft bylaw would be done via the Special Consultative Procedure outlined in sections 83 and 86 of the LGA. The special consultative procedure requires that Council adopts a formal statement of proposal, has a consultation period of not less than one month, and allows people to present their views to Council in a manner that enables spoken interaction, such as by having a hearing. In accordance with section 83 of the LGA, it is proposed that Council will encourage people to give feedback, by:
- placing advertisements in local newspapers,
 - promoting the consultation on Council's social media pages, and
 - having the statement of proposal accessible on Council's Let's Talk website.
22. The preparation of QLDC's bylaw must be in accordance with the MTA and relevant associated national maritime rules set by MNZ. Council has obtained legal advice in the preparation of the recommended options to ensure they give effect to the MTA and national maritime rules.

Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions | Te Whakatureture 2002 o te Kāwanataka ā-Kiaka

23. Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 states the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. The review of the bylaw will deliver on this purpose as it will ensure QLDC is managing waterways to give effect to section 145 of the LGA. As such, the recommendation in this report is appropriate and within the ambit of Section 10 of the Act.
24. The recommended option:
- Can be implemented through current funding under the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan;
 - Is consistent with the Council's plans and policies; and
 - Would not significantly alter the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the Council or transfer the ownership or control of a strategic asset to or from the Council.

Attachments | Kā Tāpirihaka

| | |
|---|---|
| A | Ski lanes - Summary of feedback from 2022 ski lane engagement and analysis of known issues, options and recommended options |
| B | Drowning Prevention Aotearoa Albert Town Bridge Risk Assessment - Interim Recommendation Summary |
| C | Drowning Prevention Aotearoa – Risk matrix and rating score |
| D | Approximate locations of the powered craft passage lanes under the Albert Town Bridge |
| E | ORC Navigation Safety Bylaw 2020 vessel identification provisions |
| F | Overview of minor errors, incorrect references, or other inaccuracies, including recommended solutions |