

## Hearing of Submissions on the Proposed Plan Change 13 Mackenzie District Council

Notes supporting the submission by Simon & Priscilla Cameron to the Proposed Plan Change 13.

Our family has been farming in the Mackenzie Country since 1891 and has seen many changes in that time.

From the early settlements around the stations with shelter plantings, the expansion of access roads and bridges and the beginnings of settlement villages at Lakes Tekapo and Pukaki, The Rest and Mount Cook.

My grandfather with his young family planted the trees on the five pound note Island and this was the first icon that was drowned with the raising of Lake Pukaki in the 1940-50's.



Up until the raising of Lakes Pukaki and Tekapo there had been virtually no major impact on the Mackenzie landscapes apart from the dwellings and roads and fences. The views today have not changed greatly except where there are wilding trees. The most recent visual effects were caused when the second raising of Lake Pukaki occurred and the huge canal structures were



constructed from 1967 until 1983. This along with the extensive overhead power cables and lines have been this biggest factor in changing the basin. Following recent Tenure Review negotiations extensive areas of the higher land is now under Department of Conservation management. Within the basin many family businesses which include farming, eco and adventure tourism, rely on the flexibility of a forward thinking District Council to allow reasonable and well planned activities to develop. It is necessary to grow their businesses to create wealth for our region. These opportunities will be varied and exciting and add to the dynamics of the area for locals and visitors alike. The new Tekapo Winter Park is a typical example.



Ohau Valley



Lake Tekapo  
1890's



Lake Pukaki



Access to the Mackenzie in the early 1900's

Fairlie, Mackenzie's Gateway



Further  
Mechanization in  
the 1930's.  
Road around  
Lake Ohau



The Proposed plan is too prescriptive and most of this is brought about by including the whole basin as an outstanding natural landscape. This of course is not correct as so much of the basin has already seen vast change as I described earlier. This is the primary reason I asked for the District Council to consider withdrawing the existing proposed plan.

Having completed the tenure review process all the land considered outstanding has been identified leaving the freehold land for production.

I have already developed two residential areas close to Twizel that could be described as nodal. I would not however presume that this type of development would suit all building developments in the future. In some cases it might be a new homestead or home to cater for an expanding business or a specialist high quality lodge or tourist related building that may require to be a stand alone complex. I don't like the blanket idea of nodal development being the only way to progress. I believe each new development should be looked at on its own merits and on a case by case basis and that includes the numbers of dwellings allowed. A maximum of 10 buildings may be too few to make development of a cluster economic to develop.

Where developments are out of site of the State Highway, dwellings and farm buildings need not have such heavy restrictions applied.

A Building size of 400m<sup>2</sup> is an unnecessary restriction. This could restrict someone from building an exclusive lodge.

Planning Maps 7:3 7:4

The maps showing capacity for new nodes needs to be revisited in consultation with each land holder. The existing map is vague and in some cases totally inaccurate and doesn't include existing nodes or buildings let alone provide opportunities for new developments. The different land forms on each property are so dynamic that areas suitable for future developments need to be discussed on a case by case basis.

Policy 3L. Each subdivision be allowed a building site.

The minimum size of 200 hectare outside of nodes may not allow for future horticultural opportunities to develop so this area needs to be more flexible and provisions made for such an eventuality.

Policy 3E Limitations on Residential Subdivisions and Housing.

This does not allow the possibility of the Pukaki Village or others in the future to proceed once the need for more housing is required. The council needs to be thinking well ahead when increased population may require this type of expansion.

3B The need to add *Working Landscape* to this section is paramount. Power generation, aviation, farming and various recreational activities are presently a given in the area and need to be recognized as part of the existing fabric. This clause will need to allow for changing circumstances as new farming methods and new tourist ventures develop. We cannot be locked into a time warp.

