Statement of Proposal

Proposed Ture ā-rohe Haumaru Whakatere o Te Tairāwhiti – Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024

Gisborne District Council (GDC) has reviewed its Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 and is seeking public feedback on a new bylaw to replace it – the proposed Ture ā-rohe Haumaru Whakatere o Te Tairāwhiti – Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024 (the proposed Bylaw).

The Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 was last reviewed 10 years ago, and a lot has changed in that time. To ensure Council continues to comply with maritime law and is aligned with best practice, we are proposing a number of changes to the current Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012. The scope of the changes led to us choosing to revoke and replace the bylaw, rather than just amending the current bylaw.

This document is the Statement of Proposal for the purposes of Section 83(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002. This document contains:

- a summary of relevant information
- a description of the proposed changes
- information on how to have your say
- the relevant legislative requirements
- a draft of the proposed Bylaw.

Summary

Every day people use Gisborne's navigable waters for both recreation and business purposes. The waterways can be busy places with various activities going on in one area. To help ensure these activities can be carried out safely, rules are set under the Navigation Safety Bylaw to manage them.

The number of people and variety of uses of Gisborne's navigable waters can increase the risk of accidents, nuisance and damage. The Navigation Safety Bylaw puts rules in place to minimise those risks.

At the June 2022 meeting (Report 22-110), Council determined that the Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 should be amended, and that a bylaw is the most appropriate way of regulating navigational safety.

What Council proposes to change

We recently reviewed the Bylaw to check if the rules we have in place are working as they should be, and to identify improvements that can be made. While most of the rules within the Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 still exist in the proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024, they have been redrafted or reordered to make the bylaw easy to read, and some material changes proposed, which are outlined below: -

1. **Revoke the Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 and replace it with a new Bylaw** to reflect the more comprehensive review undertaken.
2. **Extend bylaw coverage** to all navigable waters throughout the district.
3. **Extend the life jacket requirement** to require every person on board a recreational craft of six metres of less to wear a personal flotation device when a vessel is underway.
4. **Prohibit the discharge of cargo** into navigable waters.
5. **Require vessels to be identified** by either a name or number, visible on the vessel.
6. **Increase requirements for oil spill contingency plans**, including notification to the Council in advance.
7. **Require two operational means of communication** to be carried on most vessels with some exceptions such as for sporting events and surfing.
8. **Increase safety for swimmers in open water** by requiring swimmers 200 meters or more from shore to tow a safety float or wear a bright swim cap.
9. **Increase the available space to catch crayfish** by reducing the cray pot exclusion area within the harbour.
10. **Revoke historic exemptions on the Waiapu River** (the Water Recreation (Waiapu River) Notice 1979) which exempted the area from speed rules. The area is now subject to the district-wide speed rules within the bylaw.
11. **General changes** proposed to increase the readability of the Bylaw, to include and formalise existing Harbourmaster directions, ensure consistency with existing national regulation, consistency where appropriate neighbouring regional councils, and make the bylaw more straightforward to administer and enforce.

The options for these proposed changes to the current Bylaw are discussed in detail below and are reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

During our review of the Bylaw, we identified areas for improvement. We also asked the public and key stakeholders through a pre-consultation process in September and October 2022 if they had any changes they would like us to consider when drafting the proposed Bylaw. This feedback was incorporated into the review.

In most cases we have identified that the existing rules are effective for ongoing navigational safety. The major changes proposed to the Bylaw are summarised in the table below, along with the reasons for proposing them the options considered, and Council's preferred option.

Proposal (1)	**Revoke the Navigation and Safety Bylaw 2012 and replace it with a new Bylaw**
Reasoning	The current bylaw came due for review in 2022, when this review commenced, and will automatically revoke in December 2024. During the review, staff identified more comprehensive changes were required to the existing bylaw. To ensure compliance with the review requirements of the Local Government Act 2002, a new bylaw is proposed as opposed to a reviewed 2012 Bylaw.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo: do not change the current 2012 bylaw and complete the review without the changes in the proposed Bylaw. This option will mean the current rules will continue to be in place. Some of the changes proposed can be managed operationally through Harbourmaster directions and within the national Maritime Rules, but these are not as visible or transparent as a bylaw, and many of the changes suggested in the proposed Bylaw will not be able to

	be enforced. This option does not reflect what the community and key stakeholders told us through pre-consultation. **Option Two** - *Preferred*. Revoke and replace the current Bylaw (2012). This option enables Council to receive feedback from the public and stakeholders on the proposed changes described within this statement of proposal, which reflect best practice, provide consistency with the Maritime Transport Act 1994 (the Act) and the Maritime Rules, and provides more consistency with our neighbouring councils.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Revoke and replace the current 2012 Bylaw with a new proposed Bylaw attached to this statement of proposal.

Proposal (2)	**Increase the area the bylaw covers to the entire Gisborne District**
Reasoning	To ensure all rules are consistent across all of the district's navigable waters.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Retain the status quo, only covering Tūrangarui-a-Kiwa/Poverty Bay and Tolaga Bay. In this option, rules will remain inconsistent across the district's navigable waters. If vessels are being operated in an undesirable manner outside of these areas the Harbourmaster may not be able to intervene. **Option Two** – *Preferred*. Widen the coverage of the bylaw to include the navigable waters in the whole district. This means any waters in the Gisborne District whether coastal or inland which are able to be navigated out to the 12 nautical mile limit and includes harbours. This option means there would be consistent rules across the district, and Council can act immediately if there is a navigation safety risk outside Tūrangarui-a-Kiwa/Poverty Bay or Tolaga Bay. It is common practice for Navigation Safety Bylaws to cover the whole region/district, therefore bringing Gisborne in line with other councils. There may be more work initially for the Harbourmaster to educate the public about the rules and how they apply, however, this may happen as a result of reviewing the bylaw even without changing the area the bylaw covers.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Widen the coverage of the bylaw to include the navigable waters in the whole district, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (3)	**Require life jackets to be worn by people on vessels 6m or less while the vessel is underway.**
Reasoning	To reduce safety risks by requiring life jackets to be worn, not just be on board. This is consistent with our neighbour Hawkes Bay, and with the approach taken by the NZ Safer Boating Forum. It also brings us in line with most of the country.
Options Considered	**Option One** –Status quo. In 2012 Bylaw life jackets must be available on board and worn in adverse conditions. This is the minimum requirement as per the Act. Skippers must carry a correctly sized lifejacket for each person on board and ensure that lifejackets are worn in circumstances where tides, river flows, visibility, rough seas, adverse weather, emergencies or other situations cause danger or a risk to the safety of person on board. **Option Two** – Life jackets required to be worn when the vessel is making way. This captures the minimum requirement as per the Act, with the additional requirement that life jackets must also be worn when the vessel is being propelled by an engine, oars, sails or other instrument. **Option Three** – *Preferred*. Life jackets required to be worn when the vessel is underway. This captures the minimum requirement as per the Act, with the additional requirement that life jackets must also be worn when the vessel is not at anchor, moored, made fast to a structure or the shore, or aground. This proposed requirement doesn't apply in certain situations like sporting events, training, ceremonial events, where a support vessel can provide adequate assistance. **Option Four** –Life jackets to be worn at all times. This captures the minimum requirement as per the Act, with the addition that life jackets must be worn at all times.
Preferred Option	**Option Three** – Life jackets required to be worn when the vessel is underway, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (4)	**Prohibit discharging cargo into navigable waters from a vessel, wharf or land.**
Reasoning	To prevent dangers associated with dropping cargo into navigable waters and include associated infringement fee
Options Considered	**Option One** –Retain the status quo – no clause to prevent discharge of cargo. Costs for removing discharged cargo will be borne by Council. Discharged cargo could present a danger to vessels in navigable waters. Potential reputation damage to Council if they are unable to limit vessels from discharging cargo and/or recover the costs of clean-up. There would be no administrative costs of issuing infringement notices. **Option Two** - *Preferred*. Prohibit the discharge of cargo into navigable waters.

	There may be administrative costs to identifying the vessel which discharged cargo and issuing the infringement notice. The likelihood of discharges is reduced. Clean-up costs are covered.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Prohibit the discharge of cargo to enable Council to recover costs and provide a deterrent to discharging cargo into navigable waters through including an infringement fee, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (5)	**Requiring a boat name or number on vessels over 4m long**
Reasoning	Add a requirement that all motorised boats over 4m long display a name or number on the side of the vessel for easy identification.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo: there is no provision to require naming or numbering of vessels in the current bylaw, however most vessels already have a name or some form of identification as it is a common requirement in navigation safety bylaws in other regions. **Option Two** – *Preferred*. Add a requirement to require naming or numbering of vessels over 4m long. This provision would be in line with other councils around the country including Hawke's Bay and Bay of Plenty. This enables quick identification of a vessel in distress, a vessel found with no one on it, or if the Harbourmaster needs to communicate with the owner of a boat. As most boats already have an identifying name, this requirement is not likely to place an onerous burden on boat owners, and Council can take an educational approach to achieving compliance.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Add a requirement to require naming or numbering of vessels over 4m long, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (6)	**Include safety requirements for oil transfer activities**
Reasoning	To ensure any oil transfer activities are properly notified and have contingency plans in place.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo. There is no provision for oil spill contingency plans and no requirement for notification to Council when undertaking oil transfers. Potential for environmental damage if oil spills occur and there is no contingency plan in place. There is no ability for Council to enforce an infringement fee for such events, and costs fall to Council for clean-up. However, in this option there will be no administration resource associated with

	receiving notifications of oil transfers. **Option Two** - *Preferred*. Require oil spill contingency plans and notification to Council when undertaking oil transfers. This option means Council Staff are aware of large oil transfers and can be ready to respond in the event of a spill, and the likelihood of environment damage from oil spills is reduced. Infringement fees can be enforced on those who breach this clause, which can be used to cover the cost of clean-ups. There is likely to be some administration duties associated with receiving notifications of oil transfers.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Require oil spill contingency plans and notification to Council when undertaking oil transfers, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (7)	**Require at least two operational means of communication to be carried on vessels**
Reasoning	To increase safety measures onboard vessels. This will not apply to some situations such as sporting events where there is an adequate support vessel present with means of communication.
Options Considered	**Option One** –Status quo – only one means of communication is required under the Maritime Rules. The 2012 Bylaw is silent on this matter, however, the Harbourmaster has been encouraging people in charge of vessels to consider having two means of communication on board, as a safer option than the minimum. **Option Two** -*Preferred*. Increase the requirement to having two means of communication on board a vessel, as opposed to one. This option will increase safety on the water and is consistent with the current advocacy of the Harbourmaster and with other councils. This is a relatively easy requirement to comply with, as a communication device can be a VHF radio or a cellphone, and also includes affordable options such as flares and whistles.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Require at least two operational means of communication to be carried on vessels, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (8)	**Require swimmers 200 meters or more from shore to tow a safety float or wear a brightly coloured swim cap.**
Reasoning	To increase the ability to identify swimmers in open water, outside demarked swimming areas and to make it easier to help in case of distress.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo. The 2012 Bylaw is silent on this matter. Currently while vessels must stay 50 meters away from swimmers as per the Maritime Rules, and windsurfers do not have this requirement. **Option Two** – *Preferred.* Requiring swimmers who are swimming 200 meters or more from the shore to either tow a safety float or wear a brightly coloured swim cap will increase their visibility in the open water which will in turn make it easier for people in control of vessels to see and avoid them. While no incidents have occurred in Tairāwhiti, there have been incidents (near misses/ injury/ death) between open water swimmers and other water users within New Zealand. This safety measure will proactively increase the safety of swimmers who choose to swim more than 200 meters off-shore.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Require swimmers who are swimming 200 meters or more from the shore to either tow a safety float or wear a brightly coloured swim cap, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (9)	**Reduce the cray pot exclusion area within the harbour**
Reasoning	To maximise space available for cray pot fishing while maintaining the shipping lanes as an exclusion area.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo – the 2012 Bylaw has a larger exclusion area which covers an area previously utlised by the Port. This area is no longer used by the Port. **Option Two** – *Preferred.* Reduce the cray pot exclusion area within the harbour. This option means there will be more areas available for people to catch cray fish, and reflects the change in port operational requirements, as the Port no longer needs to use the area proposed to be removed from the exclusion. The new area means the cray pots are away from the shipping lanes, but other areas are maximised. In developing this proposal, the Harbourmaster spoke with the Port and other key stakeholders.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Reduce the cray pot exclusion area within the harbour, as reflected in the maps within the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (10)	**Revoke the Waiapu River speed limit uplift**
Reasoning	The speed uplifting was made in the 1970's and this bylaw review poses an opportunity to consult with the community about removing this uplifting, which would mean the standard speed limit of 5 knots would apply to the river.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Status quo. The historical speed uplifting remains in place, and there is no speed limit on the Waiapu River. **Option Two** – *Preferred.* Include a provision in the Bylaw to revoke the Waiapu River speed uplifting and apply the default 5 knot rule (200m away from any shoreline). This, coupled with the proposed extension of scope of the Bylaw to include all navigable waters in the district, will mean Council is better equipped to manage safety on the Waiapu River. This safety measure is appropriate as the river runs through residential areas and swimmers and other users utilise the river for recreation.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – revoke the Waiapu River speed uplifting, as reflected in the proposed Bylaw.

Proposal (11)	**Changes proposed to increase readability of the Bylaw, include and formalise existing Harbourmaster directions, ensure consistency with existing national regulation, consistency where appropriate neighbouring regional councils, and make the bylaw more straightforward to administer and enforce**
Reasoning	The key changes from the current approach as included in the 2012 Bylaw which fall within this proposal are as follows: **11.1** **Add a provision stating the purpose of the Bylaw**, to help readers understand the Bylaw, and to be consistent with Council's new bylaw format. **11.2** **Update and clarify powers and responsibilities of Harbourmaster,** to reflect the powers and responsibilities given to the Harbourmaster by the Maritime Rules. This clarifies the scope of the Harbourmaster and ensures consistency with the Maritime Rules. **11.3** **Add further general duties of people in charge of vessels**, to follow best practice of noting that other legislation is relevant, and to align the responsibilities of the person in charge with current maritime law. **11.4** **Add provision enabling flagged areas on beaches, and restricting activities within these areas**. This will standardise using flagged areas of beaches for swimming, making these areas easily recognisable. Formalises the flagged swimming areas and makes it easier for council to restrict activities in or near the swimming areas.

	11.5 **Change speed of vessels rule for surf lifesaving vessels**, to enable more efficient operation of surf lifesaving activities by removing the requirement for surf lifesaving club vessels to comply with speed restrictions when they are operating in accordance with all other appropriate operating procedures. This formalises the status quo as speed limits as they relate to surf lifesaving activities are not enforced. This also reflects a consistent approach with other councils. **11.6** **Regulate how long a vessel may stay in certain locations and requiring permission for longer moorings or anchorage**, to provide regulation around timeframes for anchoring and mooring at public wharves. Currently there are no time limits, and this provision enables the Harbourmaster to move vessels along if required. **11.7** **Change designated large vessel anchoring positions to set points,** to spread out anchoring positions and allow more available points. Set points were already in place via a Harbourmaster direction, and inclusion in the bylaw formalises this. Limiting the number of places where vessels can anchor manages congestion, increases safety on the water, and limits the environmental impact of the anchoring activity on the sea bed. **11.8** **Add permitted anchorage positions for cruise ships**, to future proof harbour use by providing two further anchorage positions for cruise ships. Previously these points were managed in a more ad-hoc way, and inclusion in the bylaw will formalise the approach. This gives cruise ship operators assurance and keeps other uses safe as the location of cruise ships will be known. Limiting the number of places where vessels can anchor manages congestion, increases safety on the water, and limits the environmental impact of the anchoring activity on the sea bed. **11.9** **Regulate the use of flashing lights and sound,** to increase maritime safety by clarifying when these lights and sounds can and cannot be used in navigable waters. This proposed addition ensures consistency with other regions and gives the Harbourmaster the ability to regulate the misuse of lights and sounds, so bona fide emergencies are not compromised. **11.10** **Amend clause on moorings**. To future proof the Bylaw by providing for any future moorings offered in Gisborne. While there is no current moorings/mooring areas, this makes it easier for any to be established in future by defining the process required to apply, and links moorings to the resource consenting process. This is consistent with the approach taken by other councils. **11.11** **Amend provision on use of buoys**, to clarify requirements of safe use and placement of marker buoys. This makes the rule explicit and requiring contact details to be on these buoys brings this bylaw consistent with other councils. This is likely to capture buoys attached to cray pots and fishing nets. **11.12** **Add clause on distance from vessel showing Flag B**, to require certain distance from vessels showing Flag B or a red all-round light, to reduce chances of maritime incidents. This is consistent with the Maritime Rules.

	Vessels are required to show Flag B if they are taking in, discharging or carrying dangerous goods. **11.13 Require a hot works permit before works begin** to notify the Harbourmaster of the hot works (for example, welding) so any safety risks can be managed. The changes provide more clarity as to the requirements for people planning on undertaking hot works and makes the process easier to administrate and manage for the Harbourmaster. **11.14 Require planning and monitoring information when loading and unloading logs**, to ensure any person loading or unloading logs has plans in place if logs are lost, and to assist in their recovery. This formalises the status quo and ensures the rules and expectations of information are clear. **11.15 Add a prohibited anchorage area shoreward of Ariel Bank** to manage congestion in this area and restrict anchoring. This area is a poor holding ground, which means anchors drag easily. This is a safety issue because vessels are not properly at anchor. There is also an environmental impact of dragging anchors on the sea floor. This change formalises a Harbourmaster direction and brings it into the bylaw. **11.16 Clarify exemptions under the bylaw by providing that an exemption to any provision in the bylaw may be considered by the Harbourmaster and a licence to be exempt may be granted under the Local Government Act 2002**. This exemption does not allow for the Harbourmaster to act outside their scope as defined within Maritime Rules and legislation. **11.17 Update definitions and descriptions of terms to ensure consistency with the Maritime Rules and legislation, and ensure defined terms add to the readability of the bylaw**. For example, the definition of Beacon has been changed for consistency with the Maritime Rules, and a definition of Nuisance has been added to give some clarity of the meaning of that term to make it easier to understand and enforce. **11.18 Update and clarify offences and penalties provisions** to ensure alignment with legislation and clear enforceability. **11.19 Update the maps** to enable easier use and understanding, as well as adding additional information to maps where required by changes in the bylaw. **11.20 Update format and layout of bylaw clauses** to be consistent with Council's other bylaws, and to align with current best practice drafting standards. This will make the bylaw easier to read and understand.
Options Considered	**Option One** – Do not make these changes (status quo) or make some (not all) of these changes. This may require a redrafting of the proposed Bylaw as many of these changes are fundamental to the structure of the proposed Bylaw, or a reversion to the approach taken to the 2012 Bylaw. This option does not enable Council to fully benefit from the stakeholder engagement which has informed this review, including with Maritime New Zealand and other councils.

	Option Two – Make these changes to increase readability, ensure consistency with national regulation and neighboring regional councils, and make the bylaw more straightforward to administer and enforce. This means that the community can respond to the proposal through the consultation period, and this feedback is likely to further increase the readability of the Bylaw.
Preferred Option	**Option Two** – Seek public feedback on the changes described above as included in the proposed Bylaw.

Council proposes to replace the current Navigation Safety Bylaw 2012 **with the new Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024, which will be operative by November 2024.**

We want to know what you think!

Before making any final decisions, we'd like to have your input. We are keen to hear your views on the proposed Bylaw as well as any other changes to the bylaw you may support which can increase safety on the water.

The submission period will be open from 14 April until 14 May 2024. A summary of the proposed changes, the proposed Bylaw, and information about how to make a submission will be made available on the GDC website: https://www.gdc.govt.nz/council/have-your-say. You can send us your submission:

- Online: www.gdc.govt.nz
- By Post: P.O Box 747, Gisborne 4040
- In person: At Gisborne District Council – 15 Fitzherbert Street, Gisborne

If you would like to speak to your submission, please indicate this on your submission and provide your contact details so we can get in touch to arrange a hearing time with our elected members.

You can also discuss your feedback with the Harbourmaster before sending us your submission. Email harbourmaster@gdc.govt.nz to set up a conversation,

Timeline

The consultation period begins: 14 April 2024

Closing date for submissions: 4pm 14 May 2024

Public hearing (if required): XX 2024

Deliberation and decision of Council: XX 2024

Legislative Framework

Determinations under Section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA):

Section 155 of the LGA provides that Council must consider certain criteria when making the Navigation Safety Bylaw. This includes whether the proposed Bylaw is:

- the most appropriate way of addressing a perceived problem;
- the most appropriate form of Bylaw, and
- not inconsistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

Council is required to complete an analysis against the above criteria when making or amending a bylaw.

This analysis was initially undertaken in June 2022 when Council determined that a bylaw remains the most appropriate way of regulating navigational safety This determinations report was presented to the Sustainable Tairāwhiti Committee on 2 June 2022 and in accordance with the requirements in Section 155 of the LGA, the Committee approved the review of the Navigation Safety Bylaw 2012 (Report 22-110).

Does this proposed Bylaw meet the requirements under the Bill of Rights Act 1990?

Council revisited the Section 155 criteria before they adopted this proposed Bylaw for public consultation, at their meeting on 5 March 2024 (Report 24-64). This analysis confirmed that Council considered the proposed Bylaw to be consistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, as the proposed Bylaw is reasonable, and not overly restrictive or impractical. The areas of regulation are limited to the areas that require protection and provide a locally tailored approach to enforcing national maritime rules.

Consistency with the Maritime Transport Act 1994

Section 33M of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 (MTA) gives Council the power to make navigation bylaws, in consultation with the Director of Maritime New Zealand. Such bylaws may be made for the purpose of ensuring maritime safety in the region. They must comply with certain requirements in the MTA, such as ensuring the bylaw does not unnecessarily affect commercial port operations. Any navigation bylaw must be consistent with the MTA and any regulations or rules made under the MTA, and with the Natural and Built Environment Act 2023.

Special consultative procedure under Section 83 of the LGA:

Section 83 of the LGA 2002 outlines that when using the special consultative procedure, a local authority must-

a) Prepare and adopt-
   I. A statement of proposal; and
   II. If the local authority considers on reasonable grounds that it is necessary to enable public understanding of the proposal, a summary of the information contained in the statement of proposal; and
b) Ensure that the following is publicly available:
   I. The statement of proposal; and
   II. A description of how the local authority will provide persons interested in the proposal with an opportunity to present their views to the local authority in accordance with section 82(1)(d); and
   III. A statement of the period within which views on the proposal may be provided to the local authority (the period being not less than 1 month from the date the statement is issued); and
c) Make the summary of information contained in the statement of proposal prepared in accordance with paragraph (a)(ii) (or the statement of proposal, if a summary is not prepared) as widely available as is reasonably practicable as a basis for consultation; and
d) Provide an opportunity for persons to present their views to the local authority in a manner that enables spoken (or New Zealand sign language) interaction between the

person and the local authority, or any representatives to whom an appropriate delegation has been made in accordance with Schedule 7; and

e) Ensure that any person who wishes to present his or her views to the local authority or its representatives as described in paragraph (d) –
   I. Is given a reasonable opportunity to do so; and
   II. Is informed about how and when he or she may take up that opportunity.

f) For the purpose of, but without limiting, subsection (1)(d), a local authority may allow any person to present his or her views to the local authority by way of audio link or audiovisual link.

g) This section does not prevent a local authority from requesting or considering, before making a decision, comment or advice from an officer of the local authority or any other person in respect of the proposal or any views on the proposal, or both.

Attachment

Proposed Navigation Safety Bylaw 2024