From:Liz AngeloSent:Wed, 23 Nov 2022 16:41:17+1300To:District PlanSubject:Submission on Proposed Plan Change to the Mackenzie District Plan Spatial Planchange 21Change 21

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside Mackenzie District Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

## District Plan - Submission on Proposed Plan Change to the Mackenzie District Plan

Plan Change 21 Implementation of Spatial Plans

### Applicant:-

Name: Liz Angelo (Trustee BP Heritage Trust & 50 year resident of Burkes Pass)



# Mackenzie County Council meeting at the Council Office, Burkes Pass, 1891. (Built 1876)

The photo above was taken in 1891. It shows the 'Mackenzie County Council' meeting at the Council Office, Burkes Pass. That room still exists.

Built in 1876, it is now a **Heritage NZ Category 2** because of its status as the seat of decision making for the district. It is a legacy of the role of Burkes Pass in NZ local government

My husband and I saved that building's life for 50 years & new owners now add to its value to. If the current council and staff cannot see a national heritage value in that building, let alone others in this **Heritage Precinct**, there is something amiss.

Twenty odd years ago, we faced the threat of our 1872 wooden church being taken away too. The Burkes Pass Heritage Trust was formed to save it. That wooden church is now a **Heritage NZ Category 1.** A very special award, and one to be cherished by locals and international visitors.

These are just two of many, many projects undertaken by the Trust, who's work is now well known.

For over 20 years, The Burkes Pass Heritage Trustees have worked in a voluntary capacity on improving the heritage, cultural and physical environment of the township, including the category 1 church, several cob cottages, a heritage walk, oral histories, TV & radio items and many, many, events. Evidence of these can be seen on the website and facebook pages. <u>https://www.burkespass.org.nz/</u>

### Burkes Pass is the Heritage Precinct of Mackenzie Country.

### Submission Details

The specific provisions of the Proposal this submission relates to are:

- D The Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct
- □ Low Density Residential Zone for Te Kopi-O-Opihi/ Burkes Pass
- Large Lot Residential Zone.
- D Mixed Use Zone for Te kopi-O-Opihi/ Burkes Pass

Support or oppose these provisions: Oppose as they stand.

### Reasons for this submission:

The Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct.

### Note: This is an issue that we feel very strongly about and is a significant injustice.

This has been omitted from Plan Change 21. It should have been included, or signalled, just like the Takapo/ Lake Tekapo Precinct has with its very detailed description.

The "Burkes Pass Rural Character Area" has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. This area is considered to have special heritage character and provides the township with a distinctive identity and a unique opportunity. The controls applicable within the precinct would be intended to ensure that development within this area are sympathetic to the heritage character of the township. The boundaries of the precinct are clearly designed to include the heritage features and protect their amenity value.

The proposed Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct was <u>THE</u> major feature of the original Spatial Plan and point of difference to other spatial plans in the Mackenzie. The late change of name to this area is a result of flawed planning procedure as outlined in the appendix. This area needs engagement of a Heritage Precinct consultant to consider its name and design requirement which is fit for purpose.

### Low Density Residential Zone for Te Kopi-O-Opihi/ Burkes Pass and Large Lot Residential Zone

The low or large lot density residential zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct. Much more work needs to be done on identification of design elements for this heritage area.

It is also inconsistent that a Large Lot Residential Zone is suitable for Kimbell but not Burkes Pass.

### The Mixed Use Zone

This zone is not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area/ Heritage Precinct because it is not consistent with heritage values. It is also inappropriate that a range of commercial activities can be carried out unconditionally in residential areas; e.g. someone setting up a firewood business in their backyard with excessive chainsaw noise for most of the day.

Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character.

#### We seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council

- □ The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature.
- □ A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct).
- □ The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21.
- □ The Residential Zone, outside the heritage precinct, truly reflect the rural character of Burkes Pass.
- □ Mixed use zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass.

### I wish to be heard in support of this submission (via zoom)

I would consider presenting a joint case with similar submissions.

#### Appendix.

#### The flawed planning process leading to the adoption of the spatial plan for Burkes Pass.

The MDC should not base the new District Plan for Burkes Pass based on the adopted Burkes Pass Spatial Plan because the planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure.

The Spatial Plan was developed through two rounds of positive and enthusiastic formal community engagement and presented to the community as the finished plan in an (undated) letter from the Planning Manager, Aaron Hakkaart about March 2021.

Opportunity to comment on final plans in the Mackenzie District were advertised on Facebook for the main centres but from the notice we interpreted that it did not include Burkes Pass as that was to come later. However according the OIA correspondence the council did notify on their website to include Burkes Pass. This was most confusing and caused us to miss the critical drop-in meeting and lost the opportunity to support the final version. Many supporters of Burkes Pass Heritage live or work out of the district or indeed NZ.



OIA information released stated that "*As it was only drop-ins or informal meetings there were no minutes*" but "*notes were made for presentation to Councillors as points of discussion*". Oral communication with the Chief Planner indicated that one or two residents "strongly pushed back" on some features of the plan but refused to identify them. All submitters must be fully identified for decisions to be valid

One of those notes was to change the proposed "Heritage Precinct" to "the Burkes pass Rural Character Area". The Heritage Precinct was **the** major key feature of this Spatial Plan.

OIA information released state that "The changes were not notified, rather Council adopted the final document."

We strongly believe that such major changes should not be made on the basis of;

- □ An informal drop-in meeting especially at one where the notification was confusing.
- □ Comments and those making them were not recorded.
- □ No minutes were taken.
- □ No formal consultation opportunity.

We strongly request that the Spatial Plan needs to be revisited with proper formal consultation with the community before being adopted by the District Plan.

Name: Liz Angelo (Trustee BP Heritage Trust & 50 year resident of Burkes Pass)

Postal Address: Unit 6/27 Arthur St, Dunedin 9016

Email: angelo.tekapo@gmail.com

Telephone: 03 34719505

Date: 23 Nov 2022