

IN THE MATTER OF:
Proposed Plan Change 13 to the Mackenzie
District Plan.

COMMISSIONERS' MEMORANDUM TO THE PARTIES

Background

1. At the completion of the reconvened hearing relating to Twizel area submissions the Plan Change 13 hearing was adjourned to allow the hearing panel to consider all the material presented. We have now reviewed the Plan Change as notified and assessed that against the District Plan as it stood prior to the Plan Change being introduced. That review has been assisted by the reports provided by the Council's consultants, Mrs Patricia Harte and Mr Graeme Densen, and the considerable amount of evidence and submissions presented over almost eight days of the hearing.
2. The purpose of this Memorandum is to set out our main conclusions and explain how we intend to complete the Plan Change process.

Abandon the Plan Change?

3. In our assessment proposed Plan Change 13 as publicly notified should not proceed, but we are not persuaded that it should simply be abandoned. The purpose of Plan Change 13 is stated as:
"The primary purpose of this Plan Change is to provide greater protection of the landscape values of the Mackenzie Basin from inappropriate subdivision, development and use".
4. The Plan Change notes:
"There has been considerable subdivision and development pressure for the last 5 or so years, particularly for residential purposes and particularly within the Mackenzie Basin. Currently, the District Plan provides little or no control over such development, creating considerable potential for adverse effects of sporadic subdivision to occur".
5. Many submitters questioned the need for the level of control introduced by Proposed Plan Change 13, but many of these also acknowledged that the Mackenzie Basin does have important landscape values. The debate focused around the kind of controls that

are appropriate and acceptable. Plan Change 13 proposes a particularly restrictive regime, while there are submitters seeking that the Plan Change be withdrawn, providing us with a wide range of options between these two positions. This Plan Change procedure process has generated a considerable amount of useful information about the landscape values of the Mackenzie Basin and the issues related to farming activities. It would be wasteful to ignore this and start afresh.

Outstanding Natural Landscape

6. Proposed Plan Change 13 put forward a new policy:
*“Policy 3A-Recognition of Mackenzie Basin
To recognise the Mackenzie Basin as an outstanding natural landscape and through the Mackenzie Basin Sub-zone within the Rural Zone, to protect the Basin from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.”*
7. We heard evidence from several landscape architects called by submitters questioning whether the Mackenzie Basin is in fact an *“outstanding natural landscape”*. At first sight, this is a significant question because of the requirement under section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act to protect *“outstanding natural landscapes”*. There seemed to be an assumption on the part of many people at the hearing that classification of the Basin into areas that are and are not *“outstanding natural landscape”* should determine the level of control over development that would affect landscape. We acknowledge that is the approach in many districts where landscape is an important resource.
8. The situation in the Mackenzie Basin is however unusual. The Basin as a whole is a distinctive and widely valued landscape unit at a regional or national level, and we accept that the landscape integrity of the Basin as a whole should be maintained. It does not necessarily follow that the whole basin is an *“outstanding natural landscape”* as that term has been interpreted in other districts for the purpose of section 6(b) of the Act. As several submitters pointed out, the landscape of the Basin has been modified by hydro-electric development, farming, townships and more recently rural-residential development to the extent that it is difficult to describe some areas as *“natural”*.
9. There is great variability of landscape character within the Basin and great variations in the degree to which particular areas contribute to the overall landscape character of the whole Basin. It would be possible to distinguish between these areas by mapping them, but it would be a huge and controversial task to classify and map landscape units at the level of detail recently undertaken for Banks Peninsula, for example, and we are not sure it would really achieve anything. The difficulty with any mapping

exercise in this vast landscape, as illustrated by the proposed “pink areas” put forward in Plan Change 13, is that within areas that might be classified as incapable of absorbing development there may be pockets where structures would be completely hidden, while only a very detailed mapping exercise could really identify areas where it could be confidently predicted that development would have no significant effect on the landscape resource.

10. It must be remembered that section 6(b) of the Act does not provide absolute protection for “outstanding natural landscapes”; it requires protection from “*inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*” After hearing from many of the Basin’s farmers, we do not regard development of the Basin for farming purposes, including associated new structures, as generally inappropriate even in areas that in any recognised classification system would probably be identified as “outstanding natural landscape” areas. Our conclusion is that the Basin as a whole has important landscape values and the potential adverse effects of some types of developments on those values can be better controlled by rules that require assessment of development proposals against specified criteria, rather than relying on detailed landscape classification of the Basin, particularly a classification that attempted to distinguish “outstanding natural landscape” from the rest.
11. It must be remembered too that section 6 matters, including section 6(b) which requires the protection of outstanding natural features and landscape, are subservient to the overall purpose of the Act set out in section 5. The purpose is “*sustainable management*” of natural physical resources, and “*sustainable management*” is defined in a broadly enabling way, but subject to some provisos set out in section 5(2). The evidence was that the sustainable management of the resources of the Basin, including the landscape as an important resource, requires continued farming activities. Without viable farming the problems of wind erosion, rabbits and wilding pines would rapidly become insurmountable.

Nodes of Development Approach

12. Plan Change 13 promoted an approach to controlling development using established nodes of development (essentially the base area of each high country station) and a system where new nodes of development could be established within areas identified on a map as having capacity for new development. This has proved highly controversial.
13. Outside of the settlements, the pattern of development involving buildings has, until recently, been nodal. Each of the stations has at least one farm base where buildings

are concentrated. We accept that these are an expected element in this landscape and almost without exception they do not unduly detract from the landscape. They have a clear relationship with the land. We also accept that more development could take place within these nodes, without adverse effects on the landscape.

14. The process for identifying possible new nodes for development under Plan Change 13 raises serious difficulties however. The proposal is to identify areas (shown pink on map 8 of Plan Change 13) where it is anticipated that up to a defined number (between 1 and 5) of new nodes could be absorbed by the landscape. There is an obvious difficulty in that this would promote a *“first in first served”* approach because many of the pink areas include more than one property. More fundamentally, we heard evidence that some submitters consider parts of these pink areas not suitable for new nodes while other submitters consider there are areas outside the pink areas that are equally suitable for development and/or that the maximum number of potential new nodes specified on map 8 is too restrictive.
15. After looking at some of these areas on the ground, we are drawn to the conclusion that it is simply too difficult to define suitable and unsuitable areas at this scale of mapping. We intend to recommend that this part of the Plan Change 13 proposal is discarded, so that new development will not necessarily be confined to the pink areas shown on the map.

Farming Activities

16. We heard concerns from farmer submitters that Plan Change 13 would inhibit diversification of farming. While the Plan Change 13 rules would not directly inhibit diversification such as irrigation, there are indications in the background landscape assessment that the *“greening”* of the Basin is seen as undesirable in landscape terms. That may be the case but in the face of strong evidence that diversification is necessary for the viability of the total farming systems, including the control of rabbits, wilding trees, and soil loss through wind erosion, we consider some detriment to the landscape has to be accepted. The key to diversification appears to be irrigation. Irrigation may not be sustainable in the long term but we will not be recommending any controls that would discourage it.
17. There were concerns from some submitters that the Plan Change 13 requirement for consent, as a Controlled Activity, for remote farm buildings would be onerous. We acknowledge that this would involve a process additional to obtaining a building consent under the Building Act, but it may have been overlooked by some people that

Controlled Activities by definition cannot be declined and they are invariably processed on a non-notified basis. We propose to recommend that new farm buildings outside the existing farm base areas will be a Controlled Activity anywhere outside the existing identified building nodes, deleting the proposed rule 3.5.6 that would have made some new farm accessory buildings Non-complying Activities.

18. The definition of *“farm building or farm accessory building”* introduced by Plan Change 13 does not clearly include or exclude homesteads or workers’ accommodation. A definition of *“homestead”* is introduced, suggesting that homesteads are not within the definition of *“farm building or farm accessory building”*. This interpretation is reinforced by proposed rule 3.1.2d which states *“Farm buildings shall be a minimum of 100m from any non-farm buildings other than homesteads”*.
19. We agree with the submitters who asserted that homesteads and workers’ accommodation are an integral part of farming operations, and that when the issue is effects on the landscape there is no need to distinguish them from other types of farm buildings.
20. We intend to recommend that the definition of *“farm building or farm accessory building”* specifically includes homesteads and workers’ accommodation. Provision for these in the existing identified building nodes as a permitted activity should allay some of the concern expressed by submitters.

Farm Retirement Dwellings

21. A couple of submitters raised concern about the lack of provision for farmers to build retirement houses on their properties. We acknowledge that some farmers wish to remain on the farm and take an active part in farm work after they *“retire”* and they may not wish to live in close proximity to family members who have taken over primary responsibility for farm management.
22. It was pointed out that on these large properties there are always suitable sites away from the existing farm base where a retirement house can be erected with minimal adverse effect on landscape values. We consider that should also be permitted as a Controlled Activity, with Council assessment limited to landscape effects. A definition of *“farm retirement dwelling”* will be required.

Existing Building Nodes

23. Many submitters questioned the boundaries of the identified existing building nodes shown in the aerial photographs forming part of Plan Change 13 and Mr Densem's report on the submissions indicated that he could see scope for reviewing the boundaries in some cases. We indicated at the hearing that we would not recommend contested boundaries without seeing them on site.

24. Part of the purpose of this Memorandum is to indicate that we have asked Mr Densem to review the boundaries of the identified existing building nodes, having regard to the submissions, if necessary visiting some areas again. We see no need for these nodes to be restricted to any nominal maximum area: the question is the extent of the area within which new buildings will be perceived from public viewpoints as part of the existing group of buildings. In some cases, submitters' concerns about the boundaries of the identified building nodes may be diminished given that we are proposing a more liberal regime outside these nodes, but we confirm that we would not finalise a boundary that is still contested after Mr Densem's review, without seeing the situation on the ground.

Non-farming Activities

25. Prior to Plan Change 13, the District Plan Rural Zones Rules imposed some restrictions on commercial recreational activities, visitors' accommodation, and retail sales. Proposed Plan Change 13 made all non-farm buildings Non-complying Activities outside the Identified Building Nodes and (future) Approved Building Nodes.

26. In our assessment the distinction the District Plan pre Plan Change 13 made between visitors' accommodation for up to 20 people and visitors' accommodation for over 20 people provides a reasonable demarcation between the scale of accommodation that is likely to be accessory to high country stations, and the sort of accommodation that is not. The evidence was that on some high country stations there is a desire to supplement farming income by providing accommodation. We believe this should be facilitated, but large-scale accommodation should be assessed on the same basis as other non-farming activities. Our recommendation will be that non-farming buildings should have the status of Permitted Activities within the defined existing farm base areas. Incidentally, we think "existing farm base" is clearer than the term "identified building node" used in the Plan Change.

27. We are going to recommend however that non-farming buildings should have the status of Discretionary Activities outside the existing farm base areas, with some new specified assessment criteria. There are three main reasons for greater scrutiny of non-farm activities and buildings than for buildings required for farming. Firstly, as discussed above the evidence was that viable farming activities are necessary to maintain the open landscape – in particular to make the control of wilding pines feasible. Secondly, from our site visits we have clear impression that farm buildings generally appear to fit into this landscape because even if they are quite large they have an obvious functional relationship to the land. They are an expected element in a farmed landscape. Thirdly, non-farm activities and buildings have more potential to have adverse effects besides landscape effects, such as traffic, noise and privacy effects.
28. The District Plan already lists relevant objectives, policies and assessment matters but we consider some modifications would provide useful guidance leading to applications that meet the Council's expectations and can thus be granted with minimal cost and delay. Although these were not sought in any submissions, we believe they can be added within the scope of the Plan Change because the set of controls we intend to recommend will be squarely within the continuum between the District Plan as it stood prior the Plan Change and as it now stands with the Change 13 restrictions. Part of the purpose of this Memorandum is to set out those amended policies and assessment matters and invite comment on them.

Subdivision

29. There was considerable discussion at the hearing about the proposed restrictions on subdivision. We do not see any difficulty about subdivision within the existing identified farm base areas, but otherwise we consider it needs to be controlled to prevent fragmentation of land with expectations that new titles imply that development is anticipated.
30. Submitters raised concerns about having a minimum area for subdivision. After considering the argument advanced, we have come to the view that subdivision should be related to intended use of land. We consider that special provision should be made for subdivision to allow retirement properties for retiring farmers as discussed above. These need to involve a reasonable area of land to discourage subdivision simply to create small rural-residential properties. A minimum area of 50 hectares for retirement properties was discussed at the hearing as being a size sufficient to discourage that but not so large as to discourage genuine proposals where there will be a continuing relationship with the farm as well as the security of separate title. It would be

impractical to attempt to prevent sale of these properties when families circumstances change, but if the dwellings are tied to being retirement homes at the time they are built, and the minimum area sub-divided is at least 50 hectares, we do not see this leading to a significant amount of land fragmentation and sporadic housing.

31. There was evidence at the hearing about the possibility of diversification, particularly where water is available, that could allow viable farming units to be created on suitable parts of extensive grazing stations. We accept that the subdivision rules should facilitate this but we consider there is still a need at the time of subdivision to consider appropriate location of associated buildings. This is simply a matter of checking that the proposed title boundaries include in area where likely buildings associated with the proposed land use can be fitted into the landscape.
32. As in the case of buildings for farming purposes, we consider that subdivision for farming purposes should be subject to only the minimum necessary control. Controlled Activity status is not practical however because Controlled Activity applications cannot be declined, and it is conceivable that a lot could be proposed in a location where there is no suitable site for associated buildings. Restricted Discretionary Activity status will allow consideration of the potential effect on landscape of likely future buildings, while giving landowners the security of a process that involves scrutiny of only that issue.
33. Subdivision for non-farming activities raises some other issues. Several landowner submitters expressed ambitions for non-farming developments at some time in the future; specifically rural-residential development, subdivision for holiday homes, and travellers' accommodation. Although these activities do not use the land for production as farming activities do, they do use land as a resource – something that provides benefits. Land is a resource for potential non-farming developments in the Basin not simply because it provides space, but because land in the Basin has an attractive landscape context. We accept that because of the complexity of the topography of the Basin there will be areas capable of absorbing substantial developments without significantly adversely affecting the landscape, as seen from public viewpoints. It is also obvious however that such developments in the wrong places would undermine the very landscape resource they benefit from.
34. We agree with the underlying rationale of Plan Change 13 that the landscape impact of such developments will be best managed by concentrating new non-farming developments in nodes, rather than allowing scattered low-density developments throughout the Basin. The problem is that it is impossible without a great deal more

landscape assessment to identify where such nodes could be located with minimal landscape impact. As that it is not practical, there has to be consideration of proposals for non-farming development on a case-by-case basis, assessing them against some amended policies and assessment matters set out below.

35. The draft assessment matters indicate a preference for permanent residential accommodation to be focused around the existing towns in the Basin because that will allow new residents to contribute socially and economically to those existing communities as well as allowing for efficient servicing, access for emergency services etc.
36. Plan Change 13 deleted the Lakeside Protection Areas and made non-farm buildings anywhere outside the Identified Building Nodes and (future) Approved Building Nodes Non-Complying Activities. We have considered whether that status should stay, at least for the Lakeside Protection Areas. Although one of us has granted consent for a dwelling within a Lakeside Protection Area, the circumstances were unusual and we do not see any evidence that the Discretionary Activity status was providing insufficient protection. Our conclusion is that the Lakeside Protection Areas should be re-instated and that whether a site is within a Lakeside Protection Area will become an assessment matter.

Other Matters

37. We can indicate that we intend to recommend that proposed earthworks rules are relaxed so as to permit the sort of earthworks required for fencing on slopes and the installation of pipes and power cables. We also intend to recommend retention of Pukaki Village Zone, not because we are persuaded that this is a particularly suitable place for another settlement, but because we consider it would be unreasonable to remove something that has been in the District Plan so long. In relation to the issues in the Twizel area, we will detail our conclusions in our report and recommendations to the Council, but we can indicate here that we do not see this Plan Change as the appropriate vehicle for making major decisions about the future of the Twizel area. A comprehensive review of the future of the Twizel area is underway, which will lead to a separate plan change.

Summary of Status of Activities

38. To summarise, we intend to recommend the following:

Within Existing Farm Base Areas:

Farming buildings (re-defined to include homesteads and workers' accommodation) – Permitted Activity.

Farm retirement dwellings – Permitted Activity

Non-farming buildings – Permitted Activity, but with the limits on commercial recreation, visitors' accommodation and retailing as in the District Plan prior to Plan Change 13.

Outside Existing Farm Base Areas:

Farming buildings (including homesteads and workers' accommodation – Controlled Activity.

Farm retirement dwellings (defined) – Controlled Activity

Non-farming buildings – Discretionary Activity.

Subdivision:

Subdivision for farming activities – Restricted Discretionary.

Subdivision for a farm retirement dwelling (defined) - Controlled Activity (minimum 50 hectares) if land use consent for the dwelling has been granted or is being considered simultaneously, otherwise Restricted Discretionary Activity.

Subdivision for non-farming activities – Discretionary Activity.

Draft Amendments to Objectives and Policies

39. As discussed above, we intend to recommend a set of provisions which distinguish between farming and non-farming buildings and subdivision to facilitate these. This distinction allows less restrictive controls over farming buildings than would be needed if all buildings were treated the same. Such a distinction does however require a policy foundation. The attached draft amendments to the relevant objectives and policies are put forward for comment by submitters:

Draft Assessment Matters for Farming Buildings and Farm Retirement Dwellings

40. We intend to recommend that “farming buildings” (re-defined to include homesteads and permanent and temporary workers' accommodation) and farm retirement dwellings (defined as built for occupation at least initially by retiring farmers) will be Permitted Activities within the defined existing farm base areas and Controlled Activities outside these. As noted in the District Plan (16.1c, discussion about assessment matters on page7-68): *“In the case of Controlled Activities, the assessment matters shall only apply in respect to conditions that may be imposed on a consent.”* Comment is invited on the following draft assessment matters:

- a. Whether the farming building(s) or farm retirement dwelling would be located away from main surfaces, ridgelines and skylines of landforms. (Refer to the report "The Mackenzie Basin Landscape: character and capacity" Graeme Densem Landscape Architects November 2007 for descriptions of areas to be avoided in terms of their vulnerability to change.)
- b. Whether the proposed building(s) would be adjacent to a change point of the topography, such as a slope, stream course, or forest edge.
- c. Whether the farming building(s) or farm retirement dwelling would be highly visible when viewed from public viewpoints such as the state highway or the surface of a lake.
- d. The extent to which existing natural topography would be or could be used to ensure that development is located where it is not highly visible when viewed from public viewpoints.
- e. Whether the building(s) would be located so they would be highly visible in the foreground of views of the mountains surrounding the Basin or views of the lakes, from public viewpoints.
- f. Where the siting and/or scale of proposed building(s) means they would have an adverse effect on the landscape, whether there are other sites on the application property where the building(s) could be located and serve the intended function without such adverse effect.
- g. The extent to which any potential adverse effects on the landscape would be avoided or mitigated by appropriate design and landscaping, and/or other measures (including covenants and other restrictive instruments).
- h. Whether the building(s) would be located where it/they would break the line and form of any skylines, ridges, hills or prominent slopes, and in particular whether buildings would appear above the skyline when viewed from any public viewpoint.
- i. The extent to which any proposed accessways, earthworks or landscaping would follow the form and lines of the natural topography and landscape.
- j. Whether the farm building(s) or farm retirement dwelling would be concentrated together or in close proximity to existing buildings or other man-made structures (preferred).
- k. Whether the colours of the roofs and walls would be recessive and of low reflectivity.

Draft Assessment Matters for Non-Farming Activities and Buildings

41. We intend to recommend that non-farming buildings will be a Permitted Activity within the identified existing farm base areas (constrained by limits on commercial recreation, visitors' accommodation and retail activity as in the District Plan prior to Plan Change 13), and a Discretionary Activity outside these. Comment is invited on the following draft assessment matters:

- a) The extent to which building(s) would be visible when viewed from public viewpoints such as the state highway or the surface of a lake.
- b) Whether existing natural topography would be or could be used to ensure that activities and buildings are located where not visible when viewed from public viewpoints.
- c) Whether building(s) would be visible in the foreground of views of the mountains surrounding the Basin or of the lakes, from public viewpoints.
- d) Whether and the extent to which the nature, scale and overall layout of the development would compromise the character of the surrounding landscape.
- e) Where the siting and/or scale of proposed building(s) means it/they would have an adverse effect on the landscape, whether there are other sites on the application property or in the wider area where the building(s) could be located and serve the intended function without such adverse effect.
- f) The extent to which any potential adverse effects on the landscape would be avoided or mitigated by appropriate design and landscaping, and/or other measures (including covenants and other restrictive instruments).
- g) Whether building(s) would be located where they would break the line and form of any skylines, ridges, hills or prominent slopes, and in particular whether buildings would appear above the skyline when viewed from any public viewpoint.
- h) The extent to which any proposed accessways, earthworks or landscaping would follow the form and lines of the natural topography and landscape.
- i) Whether building(s) would be concentrated together or in close proximity to existing buildings or other man-made structures (preferred).
- j) Whether the colours of the roofs and walls would be recessive and of low reflectivity.
- k) Whether the site is within a Lakeside Protection Area.
- l) Whether the application includes proposals for ecological restoration and/or the containment and control of wilding species.
- m) The extent to which any exterior lighting can be minimised to avoid adverse effects on amenity values.

- n) Any adverse effects of the proposed activity in terms of:
- Noise, vibration and lighting from the activity and from vehicles entering and leaving the site.
 - Loss of privacy for adjacent properties.
 - Levels of traffic congestion or reduction in levels of traffic safety.
 - Noise, dust and traffic from earthworks.

Draft Assessment Matters for Subdivision

42. We intend to recommend that subdivision will be effectively permitted (Controlled Activity) within the defined farm base areas, and that otherwise the status of subdivision will depend on the associated existing or proposed land use. Subdivision to create a separate lot for a farm retirement dwelling (minimum 50 hectares) will be a Controlled Activity where a proposed building platform has been granted or is being considered simultaneously or otherwise a restricted discretionary activity, with the Council's discretion limited to the landscape effect of a dwelling on that building platform. Subdivision to facilitate farming activities will also be a Restricted Discretionary Activity, with the Council's discretion limited to considering whether the proposed lot can provide a suitably unobtrusive site for potential buildings associated with the identified farming development. Subdivision for non-farm activities, where an application for the non-farm activity has been granted or is applied for simultaneously, will be a Discretionary Activity. Comment is invited on the following draft assessment matters:

- a) In the case of subdivision to create a separate title for a farm retirement dwelling, the extent to which the proposed building platform would allow the future dwelling to meet the assessment matters for farm buildings and farm retirement dwellings.
- b) In the case of subdivision to facilitate farming activities, the extent to which the proposed lot(s) could provide sites for potential buildings associated with the identified farming purpose that would allow the buildings to meet the assessment matters for farm buildings.
- c) In the case of subdivision for non-farming activities, the extent to which the proposed lot(s) could provide sites for the proposed buildings and associated development that meets the assessment matters for non-farm activities.

Process to Complete Plan Change 13

43. This Memorandum has set out our main conclusions on Proposed Plan Change 13. As discussed above, we intend to recommend a simplified and more permissive

planning regime for the Mackenzie Basin than that introduced by Plan Change 13, but one that we consider will preserve the important landscape resource of the Basin.

44. The process will now be that the Council's landscape architect, Mr Densem, will review what Plan Change 13 termed the "Identified Building Nodes" (now to be called "Farm Base Areas"), particularly the ones where owners have questioned the boundaries. Any changes will be made available to the landowners concerned, and to any other submitters on request, for comment. A reasonable period for comment on Mr Densem's revised recommendations on the location and boundaries of the farm base areas would be a month from when they are received by landowners.
45. Comment in writing is also invited on the draft assessment matters set out above. As views on these may depend on the revised proposals for the farm base areas, we will receive comments on these at any time up until the deadline for comments on the farm base areas.
46. We are conscious that in fairness all submitters have to be given an opportunity to respond to comments made by other submitters on these two matters – boundaries of "farm base areas", and the draft new policy and assessment matters. Depending on the number and type of initial comments in writing received, we will decide whether it is more efficient to advise all submitters when these comments have been collated, inviting any responses, or to simply re-convene the hearing to allow people to present their comments and any responses to others' comments in person.
47. We would like to thank the submitters and Mrs Harte and Mr Densem for giving us a better appreciation of the difficult decisions and compromises that have to be made in planning for the future of the Mackenzie Basin.



David W Collins
Graeme Page
Evan Williams
Hearings Commissioners
17th December 2008

Objective 3A – Outstanding Landscape

To protect and sustain the outstanding natural landscapes and features of the District from inappropriate subdivision, use and development for the benefit of present and future generations.

Objective 3B– Economy, Environment and Community

To encourage a healthy productive economy, environment, and community within, and maintain the identity of, the Mackenzie Country.

Policy 3A – Recognition of Mackenzie Basin

To recognise the Mackenzie Basin as having a distinctive and highly valued landscape containing outstanding natural landscapes and, through the Mackenzie Basin Subzone within the Rural Zone, to protect the Basin’s landscape from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Policy 3B – Landscape Diversity

To recognise the diversity of physical settings and landscapes within the Mackenzie Basin and the varying capacity of these to absorb further subdivision, buildings and domestication, and in particular to recognise the suitability of existing farm base areas to accommodate and absorb additional buildings.

Policy 3C – Farming Buildings and Subdivision

To enable productive use of the land of the Mackenzie Basin and in particular farming use, by providing for farming buildings and subdivision to facilitate farming, while limiting their potential adverse impacts on important landscape values.

Policy 3D – Adverse impacts of Buildings and Earthworks

To avoid adverse impacts on the distinctive and highly valued landscape and features of the Mackenzie Basin from domestication, structures, earthworks, tracks and roads.

Policy 3E - Adverse Effects of Sporadic Development

To control non-farming buildings and subdivision in the Mackenzie Basin (outside of existing farm base areas) to ensure adverse effects on the environment of sporadic development and subdivision are avoided and to sustain existing and likely future productive use of farm holdings

Policy 3F – Design and Appearance of Buildings

To control the design, scale, appearance and location of buildings within the Mackenzie Basin having regard to their purpose and thereby avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse impacts on the landscape and heritage values of the Basin Subzone.

Policy 3G- Lakeside areas

To avoid adverse impacts of buildings, structures and uses on the landscape values and natural character of the Mackenzie Basin lakes and their margins.

Policy 3M – Manuka Terrace Rural-Residential Zone

To manage the adverse effects of existing and further subdivision and development to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of future subdivision and development on Manuka Terrace, Lake Ohau through the Rural Residential –Manuka Terrace Zone.

Policy 3x – Hydro electricity generation

To recognise the importance of the Mackenzie Basin, and in particular Lakes Tekapo, Ruataniwha, Pukaki, Ohau and Benmore and their associated renewable energy generation and transmission infrastructure and operations to the district, region and nation’s social, economic and cultural well-being,

Add new Rural Objective 3C as follows:

Objective 3C – Landscape Values

Protection of the natural character of the landscape and margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands and of the natural processes and elements that contribute to the District’s overall character and amenity