

From: [webmaster](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: 32 Tammett
Date: Friday, 6 June 2014 9:17:35 a.m.

The following submission was received from:

Name: Mark Tammett
Address: 561 Kowai Road
Kowai Bush
RD1 Springfield
7681
Email: mtammett@gmail.com
Phone: 021 921 490

SUBMISSION:

I am a:
Lifestyle property owner

Submitting on behalf? No
If so, on behalf of:

Wants to be heard at hearing? Yes

Q1

Agree with 5 Strategic Directions? Partly Support

Comments: The concept that Council should be trying to micro-manage where growth occurs is fundamentally flawed. It should be left to the market where it occurs.

In rural areas close to small towns like Springfield, lifestyle block subdivision was previously allowed, and in 1991 it was removed. Up till recently however the owners of these previously subdivided (and generally serviced) small rural lots could at least get a consent to erect a house on an "under-sized" lot that had previously been created. Now their applications are being rejected, effectively wiping out the value in the land, which is not an economically viable rural unit. This is an outrage that violates property rights and needs to be addressed urgently. For the record I am not directly disadvantaged by this (at least at the present time), but I easily could have been and it is an outrage that my neighbours have had their property rights violated. I am concerned the strategic directions do not address this problem.

Q2 Priorities:

1. Remove development limitations, particularly on small towns like Springfield. Don't try and concentrate development in any area, but respond to market demand. Allow small lifestyle blocks to be developed surrounding towns.
2. Be prepared to upgrade core Council services (eg: water supply in Springfield) so this doesn't act as a choke on growth.

Q3 Growth in the remainder:

You don't need to "manage growth" in these smaller towns, you just have to let it happen according to market demand, and be prepared to supply basic services such as water supply to meet that demand as it occurs.

Q4 Rural subdivision:

A more laissez faire approach should be adopted by Council so that new population centres develop where people want to live (wherever that is). It's not something Council planners should be trying to second guess. Respond to what people want and where they want to live, don't try and force it any particular direction

Q5a - Township network:

As per comments above, these concepts generally have the effect on strait-jacketing growth a certain way. This may be based on planning concepts that seem viable at the time, but can't by their very nature capture the complex realities and the varying needs of everyone, and tend to become quickly outdated.

Q5b - Activity Centre network:

As per comments above, these concepts tend to limit a town evolving in the most desirable way. An example is the town of Springfield being regarded as a "rural service town". The town has huge tourism and lifestyle potentialities, similar to if not greater than Oxford and Methven. However by planners slapping a label on it and creating rules that stop it being anything but a "rural service town" that potential is lost.

Q6 Self sufficiency:

No comment.

Q7 Housing options:

Yes - but they don't need to "encourage" it as such, but allow it so that builders and developers can respond to what people actually want and can afford.

Q8 Layout and pathways:

No comment.

Q9 Strong community:

No comment.

Further comments:

The recent change with consent applications to erect houses on "under-sized" rural lots being rejected is being blamed on the LURP. This does not stack up as the LURP was intended as an enabling document, and if Council is reading it differentially this is likely to be an unintended consequence that needs to be addressed.