

(mdc_sept08)

Plan Change 13

Submitter #95

Plan is said to about landscapes
But it is more about land title and building requirements.
I believe Council has sufficient existing control of those.

Landscape is more about what is on the land, not who owns it.

Landscape is about foreground and background
Background (lakes, mountains) are large and unlikely to be influenced by any human activity.

‘Subdivision’ in plan, and ‘development’ in discussions.

These words are not defined.
They have widely different meanings in different contexts.
In farming circles they generally mean further subdivision fencing, fertiliser, over-sowing, cultivation, cropping, forestry, irrigation, dairy farms etc.
That is how I first read it and I think how others were also interpreting it.
It is in that sense that I objected that the proposed Plan Change 13 as it could stifle agricultural development.

It is only when one gets to the rules in detail that there is an implication that the words means possible legal subdivision into house or building sized sections.

They should also not apply to possible whole farm splitting or subdivision.

The Mackenzie Basin is a ‘working landscape’ not a ‘natural landscape’

The effect of the Plan would be to lock the Basin into one time-frame – the last few decades.

My submission made the point that many of the features now regarded as iconic, started out being obtrusive, became not uncommon, standard and now regarded as special - homesteads tucked in the foot in the foot of the hills, hay-paddocks, shelter belts, hydro-canals, ski-fields, spaas, etc.

Also that several of the features which have a ‘wow’ factor for transient visitors are not necessarily desirable – barren landscape, rabbit infestations, dust storms, council road-side shingle pits.

Let enterprise flourish!

David Scott