Page 1

From:	MDCSendmail@mackenzie.govt.nz
To:	"District Plan" <districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz></districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz>
Date:	10/16/2022 5:45:53 PM
Subject:	Mackenzie District Council - General Submission

A new General Submission has been received.

Details of Appli	cant
First Name:	Richard
Last Name:	Smith
Postal Address:	262 Talbot street Geraldine 7930
Email:	richard.smith@alpineenergy.co.nz
Telephone No:	0272216007
Fax:	
Date:	2022-10-17 00:00:00
Customer number (if known):	r
Contact person:	
Contact person Telephone No:	
Submission Det	ails
The specific	
provisions of the	
Proposal my submission	Plan Change 21
relates to are as	
follows:	
I support / oppose these provisions:	e I oppose
	I oppose the restrictions being put on property owners in reflection to visitor accommodation. The houses have been built and paid rates for infrastructure over the years with the council collecting these rates. This could be despite the fact that the houses are empty for a majority
The reason(s) for my submission are:	of the time and not creating any pressure on the fore mentioned infrastructure. Therefore when a house is let for visitor accommodation the property owner is only but getting use out of the infrastructure they are paying for. Do the council need to pay a reduction in rates when these houses are not putting pressure on infrastructure and are not occupied? Like pay to view TV. An additional charge on these properties is not the solution to the increased revenue that the district gets from increased visitor stays. To charge increased or penal rates for providing this benefit to the local economy is short sighted. To limit numbers is like saying people cannot have their extended family visit as that will increase the numbers in the house also. Obviously if a development has a no short term accommodation as a caveat, then that is overarching.
my submission are: I seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council:	of the time and not creating any pressure on the fore mentioned infrastructure. Therefore when a house is let for visitor accommodation the property owner is only but getting use out of the infrastructure they are paying for. Do the council need to pay a reduction in rates when these houses are not putting pressure on infrastructure and are not occupied? Like pay to view TV. An additional charge on these properties is not the solution to the increased revenue that the district gets from increased visitor stays. To charge increased or penal rates for providing this benefit to the local economy is short sighted. To limit numbers is like saying people cannot have their extended family visit as that will increase the numbers in the house also. Obviously if a development has a no short term accommodation as a caveat,
my submission are: I seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council: I do or do not wish to be heard in support of my submission:	of the time and not creating any pressure on the fore mentioned infrastructure. Therefore when a house is let for visitor accommodation the property owner is only but getting use out of the infrastructure they are paying for. Do the council need to pay a reduction in rates when these houses are not putting pressure on infrastructure and are not occupied? Like pay to view TV. An additional charge on these properties is not the solution to the increased revenue that the district gets from increased visitor stays. To charge increased or penal rates for providing this benefit to the local economy is short sighted. To limit numbers is like saying people cannot have their extended family visit as that will increase the numbers in the house also. Obviously if a development has a no short term accommodation as a caveat, then that is overarching.
my submission are: I seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council: I do or do not wish to be heard in support of my	of the time and not creating any pressure on the fore mentioned infrastructure. Therefore when a house is let for visitor accommodation the property owner is only but getting use out of the infrastructure they are paying for. Do the council need to pay a reduction in rates when these houses are not putting pressure on infrastructure and are not occupied? Like pay to view TV. An additional charge on these properties is not the solution to the increased revenue that the district gets from increased visitor stays. To charge increased or penal rates for providing this benefit to the local economy is short sighted. To limit numbers is like saying people cannot have their extended family visit as that will increase the numbers in the house also. Obviously if a development has a no short term accommodation as a caveat, then that is overarching. No visitor number restrictions. No increased rates or additional charges on properties used for short term accommodation. No limitations on visitor night stays. Uphold existing caveats on subdivisions where they oppose visitor accommodation.

I would or would not be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing: Additional information for this submission: Attach a supporting document: