

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLICY ON DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

### Summary of original submissions received

Sub #	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Appear	Summary of comment
1	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Conditionally support	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised development contributions policy appropriately apportions costs on Frankton Flats.</li> <li>• Approach is consistent with QAC's view that it facilitates rather than generates the demand for Council's services.</li> <li>• Policy should be amended to allow the Council to accept an advanced lump sum payment of development contributions when volunteered by a developer.</li> <li>• Airside land not publicly accessible should not have been included in the Council's traffic modelling and should be removed from the targeted area.</li> </ul>
2	Queenstown Central Ltd and Queenstown Central E2 Ltd		Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with Council's split of 92% (direct benefit of trips to immediate landowners)/8% (wider benefit) and argue that % of wider benefit should be higher, meaning that higher contributions should be sought from outside the Contributing Area.</li> <li>• Have concerns about the methodology applied to traffic modelling.</li> <li>• Policy does not recognise that existing developments will also benefit significantly from EAR and a way of making them share in the costs is needed (e.g. through rates or increased general transportation contribution).</li> <li>• QCL will not benefit a lot from the unconstructed part of EAR due to the position of its land holdings and its development plans.</li> <li>• Would be fairer to determine contributions through a private developer agreement. QCL has been in discussions with Council about contributions and asks for the proposed policy amendment to be put on hold until these are concluded.</li> <li>• Express concerns about insufficient timeframes for consultation.</li> </ul>
3	Remarkables Park Ltd ('RPL')	Oppose	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is contrary to the terms of the signed agreement between Council and RPL (and SPL) which anticipates the Council funding the EAR.</li> <li>• Policy does not comply with Local Government Act 2002 ('LGA')</li> </ul>

Sub #	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Appear	Summary of comment
				<p>which requires Council to make those who will benefit most from the asset to pay for it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modelling methodology is questionable and the conclusions reached are therefore unreliable. (Detail of specific concerns is provided in original submission).</li> <li>• It is unfair and wrong to ask landowners to fund any interest cost when the investment and costs are to be incurred in the future.</li> <li>• Council cannot infer a direct relationship between ownership and benefits.</li> <li>• The mechanism of financing an investment from a balance sheet and debt reduction perspective using questionable allocation assumptions does not meet the requirements of the LGA.</li> <li>• It would be better to use the rating mechanism to fund the EAR.</li> </ul>
4	Pexton Holdings Ltd	Oppose	No	Own a residential property in Grant Road intending to build a residence there with an adjoining barn for storage purposes. Assert that will receive no benefit from the development of the EAR.