As a dedicated farmer and community member, I wish to share my perspective on the Landscape Schedules. While landscape protection is invaluable, the current approach feels unbalanced and too narrowly focused. Here's why:

The agricultural landscape will inevitably evolve. With global shifts and societal needs, methods of producing essentials foods like **food forests** can be part of fulfilling our dietary needs, or another example carbon forests to reduce greenhouse gas, will require different thinking as it will transform the landscape, You may be aware but farmers are expected to have to pay a Greenhouse gas tax, Biodiversity planting and Carbon already playing a huge role in agriculture. We need a landscape policy that can accommodate these shifts.

High Country farming's economic challenges pushed us to diversify. It's crucial that landowners can seize evolving opportunities from a place of strength, not desperation. Selling to the affluent isn't a sustainable solution. However, introducing Agri-tourism allows farmers to welcome visitors, provide employment, and reinvest in the land. A shining example of this symbiosis is The Camp the Glen Dene Hunting & fishing Business, the Glen Dene Station farm tours which offers a rich outdoor experience, impacts the community positively, and plans to enhance its offerings, benefitting locals and visitors alike.

In essence, the emphasis should shift from halting development to directing it beneficially. Lines on a map shouldn't stifle progress but ensure it aligns with community and environmental well-being. Integrating more structures and people doesn't necessarily threaten the ONL; instead, it allows broader access, shared experiences, and collective prosperity. The community's values must guide this process not foreign landscape planners.

**Key points**: While I respect the need to protect our landscapes and preserve their intrinsic values, I believe there's a need to relook the existing capacity designations:

- 1. **Some landscape capacity**: We need flexibility in what "sensitively located and designed development" means. We need room for creativity and innovation, ensuring that the land's potential isn't stifled.
- 2. Limited & Very Limited Capacity: While these designations are understood, it is vital to remember that the landscape's capacity is not static. It evolves, and our understanding should evolve with it.

- 3. **No Landscape Capacity**: This absolute term feels like a death knell for any innovation, change or development aspirations. We need a more nuanced approach with balances economic and sustainability.
- 4. **Tourism Clarifications:** Glen Dene sought a clearer definition of 'tourism related activities', which was subsequently defined as extremely limited capacity for tourism related activities, with traditional farming systems not at all sustainable, I would encourage you to be more considerate to tourism and investigate further as the council just signed off supporting the new Destination management plan This is a new tourism plan supporting tourism new approaches.

https://www.qldc.govt.nz/community/economicdevelopment/supporting-tourism-to-become-regenerative

- 5. Need for Flexibility: Land is dynamic, and as it changes, so do our necessities and visions. The future generation might see diverse potential in the land, such as establishing a nut forest or exploring almond milk production. Presently, the strict regulations appear to inhibit such innovations by seemingly preserving the land in its current state, disallowing its natural and human-driven evolution.
- 6. **Economic Challenges:** Rising costs challenge traditional farming practices. An instance highlighted is the shearing of sheep, where the expenses now exceed the returns. Added to this are constraints on gatherings and tree plantations, further limiting agricultural flexibility and innovation.

In conclusion, while protecting our landscapes is important, it should not come at the expense of stifling innovation and compromising the socioeconomic health of communities dependent on the land. I urge the commission to review these schedules with an open mind, considering the aspirations and concerns of landowners like me. After all, it's not just about preserving the land; the RMA refers to ensuring a sustainable and prosperous future for those who live on it.