

To view the full supporting documents, please refer to 'Let's Talk Supporting Submissions Pack'

Surname	First Name	Organisation	Summary	RO Comment
Allan	Craig		The submitter opposes the proposed rates increases, stating that cumulative rises are no longer affordable for many households amid ongoing cost-of-living pressures. While acknowledging council cost pressures from growth and infrastructure, they argue too much of the burden is falling on existing ratepayers and call for affordability to be treated as a hard limit. The submission urges stronger control of operational spending, prioritisation of essential infrastructure only, clearer communication of trade-offs, and deferral of non-essential expenditure to avoid pushing long-term residents out of the district.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Anson	Danielle		The submitter strongly opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is materially higher than the district average and unaffordable for a community with lower median property values. The submission states the increase is largely driven by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme, which is not yet operational, and highlights inconsistency with Kingston, where cost recovery has been deferred. It argues that a significant proportion of costs are growth-related and should be recovered from developers rather than existing residents, and calls for affordability to be treated as a firm constraint, non-essential spending to be deferred, and Hāwea's increase to be brought closer to the district-average range.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Beable	Barbara	Aspiring Athletics Club Wanaka	The Aspiring Athletics submission highlights the long-standing and urgent need for improved sporting facilities in Wānaka, noting that despite concerns being raised repeatedly since 2018 and supported by multiple council-commissioned reports, little progress has been made, leading to growing community frustration. It argues that population growth and demand in the Upper Clutha have not been matched by fair investment when compared with Wakatipu, citing significant funding for Queenstown facilities alongside minimal allocations for Wānaka. The submission prioritises full development of the Ballantyne Road Sports Hub (or an equivalent alternative) and the development of a dedicated all-weather athletics track at Three Parks, outlining shortcomings of the current grass track, lost training opportunities, and the absence of any nearby all-weather facility. It emphasises athletics as a foundational sport that supports youth development, multiple sporting codes, and potential economic and regional benefits, and calls on Council to address the widening gap between demand and infrastructure through equitable, timely investment in Upper Clutha facilities.	Investment into sports facilities within QLDC has been deferred over the past 2 long term plans due to funding issues (primarily due to COVID, the leaky homes claims, the cryptosporidium outbreak, the 3 Waters coming back to Council budgets in 2024). Several key Community Services projects were deferred across the district including the commencement of the Ballantyne Road sports fields, the Queenstown Events Centre Indoor Courts design, the Ladies Mile community facility and the Frankton Golf Course upgrade. In the 2024-2034 Long Term Plan an option was proposed and adopted to bring forward three Community Services projects including funding for a Wānaka Sports fields/lighting project to address immediate sports field needs as the No 1. community services priority for the Upper Clutha. Each LTP the total capital investment of Upper Clutha vs Whakatipu is reviewed and is balanced with the populations (roughly 65/35 split) including the apportionment of districtwide projects.  Council's Sport & Recreation investment priorities are informed by our CODC-QLDC Sub-Regional Sport & Recreation Facility Strategy 2020 in which sports clubs were engaged with, to understand current demand and future growth. This strategy is currently being updated for the 2027-37 Long Term Plan and will guide future investment priorities across the region including Ballantyne Road Sports Hub.

Bedggood	Hemi	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<p>The submitter, Federated Farmers of New Zealand, acknowledges Council's financial challenges but raises concerns about rates affordability, debt levels, and equity for rural and primary industry ratepayers. The submission prioritises roading, cost control, and spending discipline, noting QLDC has among the highest rates and debt burdens nationally and calling for greater transparency around total gross debt. Federated Farmers supports a back-to-basics approach, urges rates increases to align more closely with inflation, and argues the current 120% rural differential unfairly burdens farm operators who receive fewer services. Key recommendations include simplifying rating differentials, increasing the Uniform Annual General Charge to spread costs more evenly, prioritising essential infrastructure (particularly roading), and exercising caution around new funding tools such as a district-specific visitor levy.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases.</p> <p>QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year.</p> <p>Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Brake	Natalie		<p>The submitters, Luggate residents, formally oppose the proposed 29.1% rates increase, describing it as a tipping point that threatens the affordability and viability of the community for year-round residents, including teachers, tradespeople, and service workers. They argue that rates based on property valuations rather than ability to pay are unfair for households that are asset-rich but cash-poor, and raise concerns about insufficient fiscal restraint and transparency, particularly regarding approximately \$4 million in development contributions collected in Luggate and the allocation of wastewater costs between growth and existing households. The submitters question why current residents are subsidising future growth, seek clearer accountability around Council spending and alternative revenue sources, and urge Council to reconsider the scale and timing of the increase to avoid pricing local families out of the district.</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>
Bulluss	Joanna		<p>The submitter, a Luggate resident and ratepayer, opposes the Draft Annual Plan on the grounds that the scale and speed of the proposed rates increases are unaffordable and unreasonable, with a single-year increase of up to 29% following an approximately 17.8% increase the previous year, resulting in cumulative rises of well over 50% for some households. They note that this can equate to increases of more than \$1,000 in a year, placing significant pressure on households already facing rising living costs. While acknowledging the importance of infrastructure investment, the submitter considers the proposal lacking in predictability and affordability, and asks Council to reassess the increases and adopt a more gradual, phased approach to avoid large one-year cost shocks</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>

Busst	Nicola	Arrowtown Promotion & Business Association (APBA)	APBA Annual Plan Arrowtown Masterplan referenced on page 14 item 1A	no comment
Causa	Connie		The submitters, Luggate residents, oppose the Draft Annual Plan on the grounds that the scale of consecutive year-on-year rates increases is unaffordable and inequitable, particularly for families who have committed their savings to living in a small, non-affluent community. They highlight that connected properties face increases of up to 29.3% on top of a 17.8% increase the previous year, driven largely by wastewater charges that more than double in a single year, which they consider unsustainable and well above the district average. The submission raises concerns about a lack of transparency around wastewater cost allocation, development contributions, and historical funding, and questions whether growth-related costs are being fairly shared. The submitters request Council reassess affordability, provide clearer information on development contributions and past investment, ensure a fair balance between growth and existing residents, clarify implications of water services reform, and improve transparency around geographic distribution of investment, particularly for Luggate and the Upper Clutha	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association
Clifton	Carolyn & Rowan		The submitters, Luggate ratepayers, oppose the Draft Annual Plan on the basis that large wastewater-driven rates increases are unaffordable, inequitable, and poorly timed, with connected properties facing increases well above the district average and significant one-year cost shocks. They raise concerns about costs being concentrated on a small number of households, a lack of transparency around development contributions and historical funding, uncertainty linked to water services reform, and perceptions of uneven geographic investment favouring Queenstown over smaller communities. The submitters ask Council to reassess affordability, phase wastewater increases, improve transparency and geographic reporting, ensure growth pays its fair share, and better align major changes with upcoming funding policy reviews.	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association

Clouston	Charlotte	on behalf of JE&A.	The submitter, JE&A, opposes the proposed increases to Planning and Development user fees, particularly hourly charge-out rates for planning staff, arguing they are excessive, uncompetitive, and insufficiently justified. The submission contends that the proposed rates exceed those of many private-sector consultancies and do not adequately reflect Council's role as a public, monopoly service provider. It further argues that the rates fail to properly apply the 80% private / 20% public benefit funding split set out in the Long-Term Plan, noting that even the discounted rates remain higher than comparable authorities. The submitter questions the cumulative effect of repeated annual increases, requests greater transparency through historical charge-out data, and asks that hourly rates remain unchanged, citing a lack of demonstrated efficiency improvements or justification for further increases.	Council's fees and charges are set on a cost-recovery basis to ensure that the costs of processing private development applications are met by applicants, rather than being subsidised by ratepayers. Targeted assistance for low-income households is generally addressed through wider housing and social policy initiatives, rather than through subsidising regulatory processing fees. This enables fairness across all rate payers.
Collins	Mike	Business South	The submitter, Business South, supports Council's efforts to reduce the proposed average rates increase to 11.6%, but raises concern about the cumulative impact of sustained above-inflation increases on business viability, particularly for commercial ratepayers facing higher-than-average rises. The submission calls for a strong infrastructure-first focus (roads, water, wastewater, parking and worker housing), improved value for money and fiscal discipline, and greater transparency where user fees and charges are increased, including measurable service-level improvements. Business South supports the pursuit of alternative funding mechanisms—such as visitor levies, developer contributions, the Ratepayer Assistance Scheme and the Otago Central Lakes Regional Deal—to reduce reliance on rates, and seeks earlier, more structured engagement with the business community as Council develops the Long Term Plan 2027–2037, positioning businesses as partners in shaping priorities rather than late-stage consultees.	Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.  Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, visitors, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the <u>consultation process</u> .
Fifield	Sharon	Queenstown Business Chamber of Commerce	The submitter, the Queenstown Business Chamber of Commerce, supports Council's focus on essential infrastructure and service delivery but raises concerns that ongoing pressures on affordability, infrastructure delivery, and regulatory performance remain unresolved in the Draft Annual Plan. While acknowledging reductions from earlier rates forecasts, the Chamber highlights the cumulative impact of rates, targeted rates, fees, and charges on businesses, alongside infrastructure delivery lagging behind growth, transport congestion reducing productivity, and slow and inconsistent regulatory processes. The submission calls for clearer prioritisation and delivery certainty, stronger value-for-money discipline, accelerated pursuit of alternative funding sources, improved transport sequencing, more efficient regulatory processes, fairer funding mechanisms for growth and visitor impacts, and stronger partnership and communication between Council and the business community.	no comment

g	anna		<p>The submitter strongly opposes the proposed rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is inequitable and unaffordable given long-standing underinvestment in local infrastructure and services relative to Wānaka and Queenstown. The submission states that while Hāwea ratepayers have historically contributed at comparable levels, the township has not received a proportionate share of district investment and should not now be required to absorb further increases to fund catch-up infrastructure. The submitter emphasises affordability pressures in the current cost-of-living environment and calls for growth- and underinvestment-related costs to be more fairly shared across the wider rating base, alongside greater transparency around funding trade-offs. The decision sought is a significant reduction in the proposed increase, deferral of non-essential expenditure, or use of district-wide rates to support essential infrastructure in Lake Hāwea.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Galvagno	Giada		<p>The submitter, a long-term Lake Hāwea resident, opposes the Draft Annual Plan on the basis that the pace and cumulative impact of rates increases are no longer affordable for many existing households, particularly when combined with current cost-of-living pressures. While acknowledging the need for growth and infrastructure investment, they argue that too much of the cost burden is being shifted onto existing residents, and that affordability must be treated as a hard limit rather than a secondary consideration. The submission calls for stronger control of operational spending, clearer prioritisation of essential infrastructure only, a fairer balance between growth and current ratepayers, and more transparent communication about trade-offs and deferred projects. The submitter is concerned that without a change in approach, rising rates risk driving long-term locals out of the district, undermining the community that has supported Lake Hāwea's growth.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Giddens	Brett	J2B Limited	<p>The submitter, J2B Ltd, supports the outcomes sought through the Widgeon Park Development Plan and the Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country and Bridesdale Reserve Management Plan, but raises concern that current funding and maintenance levels are insufficient to protect reserve values and deliver adopted objectives. They highlight deterioration of access infrastructure, pest and weed pressures, degraded riparian environments, and unmanaged vehicle impacts, noting a clear gap between Council's adopted policy framework and on-the-ground implementation. The submission seeks targeted funding in the 2026/27 Annual Plan for coordinated weed and pest control, riparian restoration of Hayes Creek, succession planting, access upgrades, and ongoing maintenance, arguing that timely investment would support community use, enhance ecological outcomes, enable delivery of existing plans, and avoid higher future costs from deferred maintenance and degradation.</p>	<p>This reserve is classified as a Natural Reserve. As a result, no routine maintenance activities are undertaken unless a specific service request is received. There are no plans to change this level of service.</p> <p>A rabbit proof fence has been installed around the perimeter of the reserve to help manage pest issues.</p> <p>Approximately half of the reserve is currently leased under a grazing licence. Historically, road maintenance has been undertaken reactively in response to complaints. Moving forward, this will shift to a regular annual maintenance schedule under the roading contract.</p> <p>The development plan recently adopted for the reserve will be included in the LTP as a request for funding to deliver identified elements.</p>

Gillespie	Grant		<p>The submitter, a Luggate ratepayer, raises concerns about the affordability and equity of the Draft Annual Plan, highlighting significant consecutive year-on-year rates increases—including a cumulative increase approaching 50% for sewer-connected properties—which they consider unsustainable and lacking assurance about future moderation. They also question the fairness and transparency of wastewater and water infrastructure cost allocation between Luggate Village residents and Queenstown Airport users, noting insufficient information on usage assumptions and cost sharing, particularly given changes to the Airport’s development scope. The submitter requests Council reassess affordability where increases exceed district averages, phase wastewater-related increases, provide greater transparency on development contributions, and ensure growth pays an appropriate share so existing residents are not disproportionately burdened.</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>
Goodwin	Gina		<p>The submitter opposes the proposed rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is fundamentally unfair for existing residents to fund infrastructure driven by recent and ongoing development. The submission states that rapid growth was approved before adequate wastewater and supporting infrastructure was in place, and that the resulting costs are now being retrospectively shifted onto long-standing ratepayers who did not create the demand. The submitter highlights inconsistency with Council’s approach in Kingston, where cost recovery has been deferred until services are operational and benefits realised, and argues the same fairness principle should apply in Lake Hāwea. The decision sought is a revised funding model that better aligns growth-related costs with new development, reduces immediate affordability pressures on existing residents, and improves equity, transparency, and long-term sustainability.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>
Gwynne Jones	David		<p>The submitter opposes the proposed rates increase for Lake Hāwea, stating it is disproportionate and unaffordable for a small community with lower median capital values and many lower-paid workers and retirees. They highlight that Hāwea faces a significantly higher increase than other parts of the district despite having fewer services. While accepting the need for water and wastewater upgrades, the submission argues growth has been the key driver and that costs should be met through developer contributions rather than existing ratepayers. Concerns are also raised about transparency, value for money, and the risk of compounding increases in future years.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Hall	Graeme	Otago Conservation Board	The Otago Conservation Board urges Council to include repairs to the Skippers Suspension Bridge in the 2026/27 Annual Plan so the bridge can be reopened before the end of 2026. The submission notes the bridge has been closed since January 2026, removing public access to the historic Skippers township and Mount Aurum Recreation Reserve. It highlights that engineering options exist to extend the bridge's life by a further 30 years and that the works would likely attract approximately 50% funding from NZ Transport Agency, with a risk of reduced funding if delayed. The Board emphasises the bridge's Category 1 heritage status, its critical role in access to significant historic and recreational sites, and the importance of Council demonstrating leadership in maintaining nationally significant heritage assets. The submitter also requests the opportunity to speak (online) in support of the submission	QLDC have not yet investigated the various options regarding the bridge. There are also a number of issues to address along the Skipper Road. Once further information is available it will be shared publicly. The Bridge is currently closed for safety reasons and will remain so until a solution for repair is found or any alternate route options can be considered. Consequently timeframes are not currently known. QLDC's Transport Strategy Team is also working on other tasks which are being prioritised over this one, until resources become available.
Hall	Nicholas		The submitter, a Lake Hāwea ratepayer, opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for 2026/27, describing it as unreasonable and inequitable compared with the district average of 11.6%, particularly given that Hāwea and Luggate have the lowest median property values and are home mainly to working families, tradespeople and retirees. They argue that most of the increase is driven by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme, which is not expected to be operational until early 2027, meaning residents are being required to pay in advance for benefits not yet delivered. The submission highlights an inconsistency with Kingston, where Council has deferred cost recovery for a larger, non-operational scheme, and contends that growth-related costs should have been funded primarily through development contributions. The submitter calls for the wastewater-related portion of the increase to be deferred until the scheme is delivering benefits, and for Hāwea's rates increase to be treated more consistently with the rest of the district.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Heath	Ruth	Te Atamira Whakatipu Community Trust	Te Atamira supports Council's continued investment in arts and cultural infrastructure, highlighting its role as a key community facility delivering social, cultural, and economic benefits across the district. The submission outlines strong and growing demand since opening in 2022, with high levels of participation, broad community access, and partnerships across diverse cultural groups. Te Atamira is described as essential infrastructure that supports connection, inclusion, and wellbeing in a rapidly growing district, while also contributing to district identity, liveability, and the visitor economy through festivals, events, and cultural activity. The submission emphasises Te Atamira's role in supporting local artists and the creative ecosystem, and strongly endorses continued prioritisation of arts and culture as critical to long-term community wellbeing and economic resilience.	Te Atamira is a valued community service, providing spaces and delivering a wide range of creative and cultural programmes for our diverse and growing communities. Council partners with Te Atamira Trust. Council funds the lease cost for the venue and contributes towards operational funding, alongside other funders. Te Atamira hosts a wide range of community groups who utilise the variety of space to deliver range of services e.g. dance, art, theatre, exhibits. The Centre supports diverse community groups from youth through to older people, Māori and multicultural engagement. Te Atamira will be working on options to extend their programming and partnerships into the Upper Clutha area in the next few years. We look forward to working alongside Te Atamira as they continue to strengthen their deepening community relationships, supporting district-wide creative practice, presenting accessible, high-quality arts experiences, and connecting the district to regional, national and international cultural networks.

Hendriks	Julie		The submitters, Lake Hāwea residents, strongly oppose the proposed 22% rates increase for 2026/27, describing it as unsustainable and inequitable for a community made up largely of working families, essential workers, and older residents on fixed incomes already facing significant cost-of-living pressures and limited transport alternatives. They question the justification for funding wastewater infrastructure that is not expected to be operational until 2027, arguing that costs should be deferred until benefits are delivered, and contend that growth-related infrastructure costs should not fall on existing residents but be recovered through higher developer contributions or broader district funding. The submission also highlights ongoing deficiencies in basic local infrastructure—such as footpaths, kerb and channel, and water leakages—and urges Council to reconsider the scale and timing of the increase, adopt a fairer approach aligned with delivered services, and better reflect the financial realities of the Lake Hāwea community.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Howard	Ant	Lake Wānaka Arts and Culture Charitable Trust	The submitter, Lake Wānaka Arts and Culture Charitable Trust, advocates for arts and culture to be treated as core economic and social infrastructure within the Draft Annual Plan, aligning with Council's goals for economic diversification, liveability and community wellbeing. The Trust highlights growing population pressures and end-of-life existing facilities, arguing that without investment the district risks falling below acceptable levels of service and losing creative talent and touring activity. The submission makes the case that arts and culture deliver year-round economic value, community connection, and resilience, and requests \$125,000 in Annual Plan funding to co-fund development of a robust establishment plan for a Wānaka Performing Arts Precinct, positioning Council as a strategic partner alongside philanthropy, iwi and central government rather than the sole funder.	Council recognises the value of the creative sector through its partnership in the development and delivery of Te Muka Toi, Te Muka Tākata   The Creativity, Culture and Heritage Strategy for the Queenstown Lakes District. The need for investment in social infrastructure is a significant pressure point in a rapidly growing community. There are recognised risks and fiscal challenges (and opportunities) in Council committing to a proposed performing arts precinct of this scale. However, with direction from elected members, officers are open to working with the Lake Wānaka Arts and Culture Charitable Trust on the site feasibility and master plan for a potential precinct, including financial modelling, operating model development, partnership opportunities, community engagement approach and funding strategy. Careful consideration of how staff can prioritise this work to ensure appropriate contribution of time will need to be factored into staff work programmes and captured in a collaboration agreement.
Kirk	Samantha	Three Lakes Cultural Trust	The submitter, Three Lakes Cultural Trust, supports the Draft Annual Plan and emphasises that creativity, culture and heritage are essential infrastructure for a rapidly growing Queenstown Lakes District, contributing to economic diversification, community wellbeing and liveability. While not seeking additional funding in 2026/27, TLCT stresses the importance of continued support for delivery of Te Muka Toi   Te Muka Tākata, the Council-endorsed Creativity, Culture and Heritage Strategy. The submission highlights the creative sector's strong economic and employment contribution, its growing role in visitor experience, and its value in supporting mental health, social cohesion and local identity, and encourages Council to continue treating arts and culture as core infrastructure as the district grows.	Council supports delivery of Te Muka Toi   Te Muka Tākata, the Creativity, Culture and Heritage Strategy in a number of ways including managing the Creative Communities funding (on behalf of Creative NZ), supporting public art and creative industries (e.g. film), arts/cultural events and Te Atamira. Council wants to acknowledge the work undertaken by the 3 Lakes Cultural Trust and the strong working relationship it has with Council.

Knight	Jo		<p>The submitter opposes the scale and pace of proposed rates increases for Luggate, noting cumulative increases of up to 50% over two years, which they argue is unaffordable and well outside the district average. The submission identifies wastewater and water supply charges as the primary driver, with costs concentrated across a small number of connected properties, resulting in significant affordability impacts. While supporting investment in essential infrastructure, the submitter raises concerns about fairness and transparency—particularly the allocation of costs between growth and existing residents, the treatment and ring-fencing of development contributions, and clarity on historical funding decisions. The decision sought includes reassessing affordability, phasing wastewater-related increases, improving transparency around development contributions and geographic investment, and ensuring growth contributes an appropriate share of infrastructure costs</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>
Knight	Jo	Sport Central	<p>The submitter, Sport Otago, supports the Draft Annual Plan's direction but emphasises the ongoing importance of investing in sport, recreation, and play infrastructure to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population and to support community wellbeing. They highlight strong evidence that participation in sport delivers significant social, health, economic, environmental, and cultural benefits, including strong social return on investment, and stress the value of continuing to implement the Regional Sport and Recreation Facility Strategy. The submission supports targeted investments such as expanded indoor and outdoor sports capacity, improved amenity facilities, and artificial turf in the Upper Clutha, and encourages Council to align investment with demonstrated local need and strategic planning. While acknowledging financial pressures and the need for some user fee increases, Sport Otago recommends keeping these as minimal as possible, particularly for community facilities, to ensure access, affordability, and equity for local residents.</p>	<p>Sport Otago continues to be a strong advocate for Play, Active Recreation &amp; Sport across the Otago region as a key partner for QLDC. The submission is noted and supported.</p>
Lamm	Jennifer	Alcohol Healthwatch	<p>Alcohol Healthwatch, supports changes to alcohol licensing fees but argues that the nationally set fees under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013 no longer reflect the true costs of administering alcohol licensing, resulting in ongoing subsidies by councils and ratepayers. They note that proposed increases to some charges do not address the underlying revenue shortfall and that cost pressures are likely to increase further if proposed legislative reforms proceed. The submission strongly encourages Council to adopt a licensing fees bylaw enabling full (or near-full) cost recovery, undertake a comprehensive review of licensing, monitoring and enforcement costs, and ensure fees better reflect local circumstances, regulatory effort, and harm-reduction objectives, aligning with Council's strategic framework and public health outcomes.</p>	<p>A review of the alcohol licensing fees set under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013 is required to be undertaken by the Ministry of Justice every five years. The last review took place in 2022 with the next review set to take place in 2027. The creation of a Fees Bylaw would need to be prioritised by Council over and above other policy work currently being worked on.</p>

Latham	Nancy		<p>The submitter, a long-term Queenstown Lakes District ratepayer and Wānaka resident, urges Council to prioritise stormwater management in the Upper Clutha to protect Lake Wānaka and connected freshwater systems under increasing pressure from growth. She opposes the proposed \$1.1 million deferral of the Stone Street stormwater upgrades, arguing that repeated delays are exacerbating contamination risks to Bullock Creek and Roys Bay. The submission calls for re-prioritisation of operational expenditure toward stormwater, improved transparency in service-level spending, and stronger alignment of the Developers' Code of Practice with international best-practice stormwater management. The submitter contends that current funding levels do not reflect the proportion of rates collected for stormwater services and that deferring investment risks greater environmental and financial costs in the future.</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged and QLDC recognise the ongoing and increasing need to invest in stormwater treatment and management. The current Ten Year Plan reflects the prioritisation of this investment.</p> <p>Despite the deferral of the investment in the substantive stormwater management improvements upstream of Bullock Creek, investment has been completed this FY to support better environmental and performance outcomes.</p> <p>The current Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice is well aligned with best practice stormwater management approaches adopted across NZ.</p>
Lay Yee	Samantha	Property Council New Zealand	<p>Property Council New Zealand raises concern about the scale of proposed rates and fee increases in the Draft Annual Plan 2026–27, noting an average rates increase of around 11.7% and higher impacts for business properties, which they argue compound cost pressures and affect investment feasibility. The submission calls for stronger cost control, improved transparency and forecasting, and greater use of alternative funding mechanisms such as targeted rates, user-charges and other non-rates tools. Property Council supports the transparent, CPI-based approach to fees and charges, but seeks clearer presentation and predictability of development contribution increases, particularly during the transition to proposed national funding reforms. The submission also recommends that funding reform and Wānaka–Upper Clutha priority projects be addressed more fully through the upcoming Long-Term Plan, with clear trade-offs and equitable funding models.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates for some small communities is driven almost entirely by the investment required to upgrade the local wastewater system. These upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet consent requirements, and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the <u>consultation process</u>.</p>
Lin	Eric		<p>The submitter strongly opposes continued rates increases, stating they are no longer affordable and are placing significant financial stress on households already facing high living costs. They argue that cumulative increases feel unsustainable and unfair, particularly for local families and workers. The submission calls for affordability to be prioritised, clearer evidence of cost discipline and savings, a stronger focus on essential infrastructure only, and a reduction in the burden of growth-related costs falling on existing residents. The submitter also seeks greater transparency about trade-offs and delays if rates continue to rise, warning that current settings risk forcing locals out of the district.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Work continues across the organisation to create operational savings. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the <u>consultation process</u>.</p>

McArthur	Marsha	NES Central Ltd	NES Central Ltd, opposes the proposed TMP and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure on the basis that the scale of increases is unreasonable, poorly justified, and inconsistent with cost-recovery principles under the Local Government Act. They raise concerns about a lack of transparency and meaningful industry consultation, noting that the increases are not aligned with standard regulatory practice or comparable RCA fee structures elsewhere in New Zealand, and that benchmarking cited by Council has not been substantiated. The submission highlights the significant impact on business viability, particularly the continued application of a \$2,660 non-excavation global CAR fee alongside TMP charges for low-risk, short-duration activities, where it is unclear what level of service the fee is intended to recover. Overall, the submitter considers the proposal disproportionate to risk and industry expectations and strongly opposes it in its current form.	Same response as submitter Aaron Scott
McDonald	Eoin		The submitter opposes the proposed rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is unfair and inequitable, particularly as it is largely driven by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. The submission emphasises the principle of fairness, stating that growth-driven infrastructure costs should be attributed to growth and developers rather than existing ratepayers. It questions the equal cost split with Wānaka, noting significant differences in population, seasonal demand, and growth pressures, and argues this results in an unjust burden on Hāwea residents. Concerns are also raised about deferring costs for other communities while Hāwea ratepayers are expected to shoulder immediate increases, reinforcing the view that the proposed apportionment is inappropriate and unfair.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Meale	Chris		The submitter, a Luggate property owner and ratepayer, opposes the proposed rates increases of up to 29%, arguing they are disproportionate, unaffordable, and insufficiently justified compared with the district-wide average. The submission raises concerns about the fairness and transparency of cost apportionment for recent and planned water and wastewater infrastructure, questioning how costs have been allocated between existing connected households, unconnected properties, future developments, and the airport. Particular concern is raised about the arbitrary step increase for properties valued over \$1 million, which the submitter argues is unrelated to service demand. The submission seeks clearer evidence of how development contributions have been collected, protected, and applied, and how Council intends to avoid front-loading future growth infrastructure costs onto current residents, given that recent upgrades appear designed to service growth well beyond current demand.	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association

Meyer	Andre		<p>The submitter opposes the proposed rates increases particularly in Hāwea, citing lack of transparency, affordability concerns, and unfair cost allocation. Key issues include charging for infrastructure before services are delivered, increased depreciation funding at a time of financial pressure, inequitable service provision despite comparable rates, and an unfair 50/50 cost split with Wānaka. The submission calls for clearer reconciliation of past depreciation funding, moderation or deferral of discretionary funding increases, and a fairer allocation of costs that reflects community scale, service delivery, and district-wide benefit.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>
Mollan	Danny		<p>The submitter opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea and 29.3% for connected Luggate properties, arguing these are extreme outliers compared with the 11.6% district average and disproportionately impact the district's lowest-value, smallest communities. The submission contends the increases are driven by growth-related wastewater costs that should have been recovered from developers, not existing ratepayers, and highlights inconsistency with Kingston, where cost recovery has been deferred for a non-operational scheme. The submitter seeks a reduction of increases to within the district range, earlier review of the Developer Contributions Policy, and greater transparency on growth attribution and funding before rates are finalised.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates increase affecting many Lake Hāwea residents is driven almost entirely by the investment required to upgrade the local wastewater system. These upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet consent requirements, and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Moser	Claire		<p>The submitters oppose the proposed rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is unsustainable given the cumulative impact of repeated annual increases on households. They state Hāwea has reached a "tipping point" where rates are placing significant pressure on fixed- and middle-income residents and threatening the affordability of living in the area for essential workers. The submission raises concerns about equity, asserting that growth-related infrastructure costs—particularly water and wastewater upgrades—should be more fully funded through developer contributions rather than falling disproportionately on existing residents. The submitters also note that Hāwea ratepayers have historically contributed to district-wide projects with limited local benefit, and seek a more equitable, region-wide funding approach. They ask Council to reduce the proposed increase through further operational savings, review development contributions policy, and apply a fairer sharing of costs across the wider rating base.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Moser	Jill		Submitter has attached Annual Plan 2025-2026	no comment
Moss	Jennifer		The submitter, a long-term Luggate resident, strongly opposes the proposed 29% rates increase, stating it is unaffordable and unjust given their fixed and reduced income following the death of their spouse. They note that infrastructure contributions for water and wastewater were already paid at the time of purchase and have continued to be funded through rates, and argue it is unfair for existing residents to bear further costs arising from growth allowed beyond infrastructure capacity. The submission highlights the disparity between property valuation-based rates and ability to pay, particularly for older residents who are asset-rich but cash-poor, and expresses deep concern that the increase may force long-standing community members to leave the area. The submitter asks Council to reconsider the scale of the increase and recognise the impact on elderly residents and those on fixed incomes who wish to remain in their homes and community.	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association
O'Donnell	Sarah	Wakatipu Pony Club	The submitter, Wakatipu Pony Club, raises concern about the progressive loss of equestrian access across the Queenstown Lakes District, driven by urban development, trail restrictions, unsafe road environments, and declining access to paper roads and open land. The submission highlights that equestrian activity—an established part of the district's identity—has been increasingly excluded from planning and investment, despite significant funding for cycling and walking infrastructure. Particular concern is raised about the impact on young people, especially girls, for whom Pony Club provides important opportunities for participation, wellbeing and community connection. The Pony Club seeks greater recognition and inclusion of equestrian activity in recreation and open space planning, protection and restoration of existing access routes, targeted investment in equestrian infrastructure (such as mapped trails and signage), support for safe shared-use where appropriate, and direct engagement with the equestrian community to co-design solutions that ensure horse riding can continue as part of a diverse and inclusive recreation network.	We have been working with the Whakatipu Horse Advisory Group for some time to explore options for enabling horse access on suitable sections of the trail network in the Whakatipu. This work includes identifying what is required to enable access safely, including a site visit (with stakeholders) undertaken in March 2026 that will inform a case study to support future approaches to understand what changes may be required. There are riding opportunities at the Project Tohu Coronet site near Arrowtown, where we have been working closely with the horse community to co design a network of accessible trails. An open day was recently held at the site, and it is expected to open later in summer 2027. The Parks Planning team is also continuing to look at future opportunities to improve horse access where possible.

O'Donnell	Sarah	Destination Queenstown & Lake Wānaka Tourism	Destination Queenstown and Lake Wānaka Tourism have submitted their FY26–27 Business Plan to QLDC seeking continued and increased funding through the targeted tourism promotion levy to support destination marketing and management. The business plan was developed following robust member and community engagement and was endorsed by the Strategic Review Board on 21 April 2026, including approval of both the plan and the funding sought. The submission reflects strong support from the DQ and LWT membership for an uplift in funding for 2026–27.	QLDC is a partner in the delivery of the Destination Management Plan ('Travel to a thriving future') and contributes to this via work done by teams including Climate and Biodiversity, Economic Futures and Waste Minimisation and the strong working relationship is appreciated. The robust industry input into the annual plan submitted is acknowledged and the current funding process means it is accepted as the basis on which the rates are charged and passed on.
Paterson	Cara	Creative New Zealand	The submitter, Creative New Zealand Toi Aotearoa, supports QLDC's Draft Annual Plan and encourages Council to strengthen its investment in arts, culture, ngā toi Māori and creativity as foundational community services that deliver significant social, cultural and economic benefits. The submission highlights the creative sector's strong contribution to the Queenstown Lakes economy and community wellbeing, noting that the district has one of the highest proportions of creative employment in New Zealand, while also facing increasing pressure from economic conditions and fragile funding environments. Creative New Zealand encourages Council to prioritise investment in cultural programmes, public art, events, festivals, accessible venues and creative infrastructure, ensure support reaches across the wider arts ecosystem (including Te Atamira and smaller communities), and to embed Te Muka Toi, Te Muka Tākata in both the Annual Plan and upcoming Long Term Plan. The submission also strongly advocates for increased support for ngā toi Māori, partnerships with iwi and hapū, and collaborative regional approaches to strengthen long-term arts investment and sustainability.	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association
Raynes	Chris		The submitter, a Lake Hāwea resident, strongly opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Hāwea and higher increases for Luggate, noting this would be the third consecutive year of double-digit rises, resulting in a cumulative increase of approximately 62% since 2024, far exceeding inflation. They argue the increases are untenable and disproportionate, particularly for a community made up largely of retirees and first-home owners on fixed incomes, and raise concern about the financial stress and mental wellbeing impacts on residents. The submitter considers the proposed increases among the highest in the country, questions Council's regard for community wellbeing, and urges QLDC to rethink the 2026/27 Annual Plan, find alternative funding approaches, and align Hāwea and Luggate increases more fairly with the rest of the district.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Rose	Suzanne	Whakatipu Wilding Control Group	The Whakatipu Wilding Control Group strongly supports continued and increased Council funding for wilding conifer control, noting the programme's long-term success, high benefit-to-cost ratios, and significant leverage of national funding. The submission highlights a growing maintenance backlog, escalating costs if control is deferred, and increasing wildfire risk, particularly in areas already identified as high-risk. WCG cautions that any reduction in funding would undermine prior public investment and community trust, and advocates for sustained, adequately resourced funding through the Annual Plan and forthcoming LTP to protect landscapes, biodiversity, water catchments, and communities.	The Council funding commitment has been consistently \$500K for the last few LTPs through the Community Grants process. In previous LTPs (when there was one group) funding went solely to the WCG. For the 24/34 LTP the Upper Clutha groups established themselves. Council provided \$450k to WCG and \$50K to UC i.e. council funding stayed the same but from WCG perspective had diminished. Any funding split shouldn't further reduce the WCG portion. This is because it aligns with the activated MPI MUs i.e. funding aligns with current national priorities.
Rutherford	Susan		The submitter opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea, arguing it is unfair and unaffordable, particularly as residents are being asked to pay now for infrastructure that is still under construction and not yet delivering full benefits. The submission questions why a significant increase is required given future central government funding for wastewater upgrades and raises concerns about existing residents bearing a high share of growth-related costs. The submitter highlights the disproportionate impact on lower-income households and notes that similar infrastructure projects in other communities are facing much lower increases. The decision sought is a reduction in the Hāwea increase to better align with the district average and a fairer allocation of growth-related costs away from existing ratepayers.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Saunders	Christopher		The submitter strongly opposes the proposed 29.3% rates increase for Luggate, describing it as excessive, poorly justified, and financially unsustainable. The submission raises significant concerns about the lack of transparency and supporting information, requesting detailed breakdowns of borrowing, operating cost increases, depreciation, asset lives, and cost-recovery timeframes. It argues that the increase is disconnected from household income growth and cost-of-living realities, inadequately reflects community wellbeing impacts, and lacks evidence of internal cost discipline or alternative scenarios. The submitter seeks withdrawal or material revision of the proposal, with any increase more closely aligned to CPI-level movements unless robust justification and transparency can be demonstrated.	We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association

Scott	Nicholas		<p>The submitter, a Hāwea ratepayer, strongly opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase, arguing it is unaffordable, inequitable, and inconsistent with how similar infrastructure costs are being treated elsewhere in the district. They contend that the increase is driven largely by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme (UCCS), which is not yet operational, and that charging full cost recovery now—particularly interest on growth-related debt—unfairly shifts growth costs onto existing residents. The submission highlights stark contrasts with Kingston, where cost recovery has been deferred for a non-operational scheme, and questions why the same principle is not applied to Hāwea. The submitter calls for affordability to be treated as a hard limit, deferral of UCCS-related costs until the scheme is operational, recovery of growth-attributable costs from developers as intended under the Local Government Act, clearer communication of trade-offs, and alignment of Hāwea's increase closer to the district average to avoid pricing long-term residents out of the community.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates increase affecting many Lake Hāwea and residents is driven almost entirely by the investment required to upgrade the local wastewater system. These upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet consent requirements, and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents were published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the <u>consultation process</u>.</p>
Scott	Julie	Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust	<p>The submitter, Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust (QLCHT), requests that Council formally re-engage with QLCHT on the redevelopment of the Lynch Block site to deliver long-term affordable rental housing. The submission outlines QLCHT's long-standing role as a Council-supported community housing provider and notes that discussions on the Lynch Block have been ongoing since 2012, with indicative master-planning demonstrating potential for up to approximately 150 apartments. QLCHT highlights the district's acute rental housing crisis, with 1,680 households currently on its waiting list, and argues that enabling development of the Lynch Block would have minimal impact on the 2026/27 Annual Plan budget while clearly demonstrating Council leadership. The proposal is strongly aligned with Council's adopted housing strategies and action plans, including the Homes Strategy, Joint Housing Action Plan, and previous Mayoral Housing Affordability Taskforce recommendations, and seeks a partnership-led approach to move from strategy into tangible delivery of affordable housing in <u>the town centre</u>.</p>	<p>QLDC is currently investigating different options for this site. The use of the site for retained perpetual affordable housing will be one of the options considered by Council. This is inline with Action 2E of the Joint Housing Action Plan - whereby Council committed to investigate opportunities to purchase, or utilise existing land for affordable housing development by a registered Community Housing Provider.</p>
Smith	Gemma	Kincardine Angus Ltd	<p>The submitter, a long-term Wakatipu Basin resident and rural business owner, raises concerns about the progressive loss of safe, legal equestrian access as a result of subdivision, intensification, and trail development that has prioritised cycling and walking while largely excluding horse riders. While supporting the benefits of the cycleway network, the submission argues that equestrian activity—an established part of the Basin's rural identity and community life—has been marginalised due to insufficient consultation and planning, despite evidence that shared-use trails can function safely with appropriate design and education. The submitter calls for renewed and formalised consultation with the equestrian community, protection and reinstatement of historic access routes (including paper roads), integration of equestrian access into future trail and subdivision planning, developer contributions to recreational infrastructure, and strategic land protection to ensure the long-term viability of equestrian recreation and related community organisations in the district.</p>	<p>Same comment as Sarah O'Donnell</p>

Spackman	Angela	Lakes Sports Trust	<p>The submitter, Lakes Sports Trust, generally supports the direction of the Draft Annual Plan but seeks stronger recognition of the need for additional indoor sporting infrastructure in Queenstown, noting that existing facilities are already under pressure and will not meet future population growth. They propose a multi-sport indoor facility to complement (not duplicate) the Events Centre upgrade, providing for sports such as cricket, squash, futsal, netball and padel that are currently underserved. The project would be community-led and operated by a charitable trust, with all surpluses reinvested into local sport, and no capital funding is sought from Council. Instead, the Trust requests in-principle Council support and access to suitable Council-owned land, enabling them to proceed with feasibility work, a full business case, and external fundraising to deliver a low-risk, high-impact community facility.</p>	<p>Council officers are currently developing a Community Facilities Request process to be able to provide Councillors with transparency, equity and information to make informed decisions around the use of Council land and buildings. This proposal is one of 60+ groups wanting land/buildings etc and should be considered alongside these other groups regarding the best outcome for Council and the community. The proposal indicates that Netball, Futsal and Indoor cricket training is not being provided for however these are programmed within the development of the new QEC 4x indoor courts project currently in concept design. The location identified has some constraints, i.e. access, consenting and has been planned as sportsfields in the Draft QEC Masterplan due to the shortage of fields across the District. If prioritised by Councillors then a potential partnership around the development of the QEC shared clubrooms (currently Year 2028/29 of 24-34 Long Term Plan) could be explored.</p>
Stewart	Vivien		<p>The submitter, a long-term Luggate resident living on a single superannuation income, strongly opposes the proposed rates increase, describing it as shockingly high and unaffordable. They express distress at the impact on retirees and long-standing residents, arguing that the scale of the increase risks forcing people out of the community and undermines Luggate's character as a place for families and retirees. The submission calls on Council to reconsider the increase and find fairer, more sustainable ways to manage costs without disproportionately impacting vulnerable residents.</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>
Suggate	Helen		<p>The submitter from Lake Hāwea strongly opposes the proposed rates increases under the Annual Plan, describing the scale and cumulative impact as unaffordable and unsustainable for long-term residents. They argue that the 22.6% increase reflects poor historical planning, particularly for wastewater and future infrastructure, and that existing ratepayers are now unfairly bearing these costs. While acknowledging genuine infrastructure and growth pressures, the submitter calls for a clear affordability cap, stronger control of operational spending, prioritisation of essential infrastructure only, and a fairer balance between costs driven by growth and the impact on existing residents, to avoid pushing locals out of the district.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Sutherland	James	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	<p>The submitter, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, supports the Draft Annual Plan but emphasises the importance of stronger provision for historic heritage protection, incentives, and statutory compliance across planned activities. They highlight Council's obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, particularly in relation to archaeological authorities for infrastructure projects involving ground disturbance, and encourage early consultation to avoid delays and unmanaged risk. The submission supports continued and increased investment in heritage incentives, including funding and regulatory relief to assist owners with maintenance and seismic strengthening, and notes growing risks to heritage from climate change. Heritage New Zealand also encourages Council to support the remediation and continued use of Skippers Bridge, and to ensure heritage impacts are appropriately considered and budgeted for in major projects.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's submission and the importance of robust heritage protection, statutory compliance, and early engagement in projects involving ground disturbance. Council meets its statutory obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 through established regulatory frameworks, including the District Plan, resource consenting processes, and internal procedures. In addition, there is an increasing focus on providing proactive, cross-Council heritage advice to support early identification and management of heritage risks across projects.</p> <p>Council also continues to work alongside community heritage organisations to support restoration, advocacy, and awareness, contributing to a more coordinated and district-wide approach to heritage outcomes. The existing Heritage Incentive Grant remains available to support private owners; however, it is acknowledged that demand for heritage funding and support continues to grow and will be an important consideration in future Long Term Plan processes. Council recognises the potential impacts of climate change on heritage assets and will continue to consider these risks at a strategic level as part of ongoing asset and project planning.</p> <p>The matters raised in relation to Skippers Bridge are noted. The asset is currently under investigation by relevant Council teams, and heritage considerations <u>continue to be advocated for as part of that process.</u></p>
Tapper	Humphrey	Recreation Milford Limited	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed rates increase for Cardrona, noting an average increase of around 20% compared with a district-wide average of 11.7%, which they argue is inequitable and disproportionate. While accepting that water and wastewater costs must be funded, the submission contends the current approach places an excessive burden on a small existing community and does not align with the funding principles in s101(3) of the Local Government Act. The submitter seeks that Council moderate or phase the increase, improve transparency around cost allocation, and broaden the contributor base by encouraging greater uptake of the Cardrona public water and wastewater network as growth occurs.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates increase affecting many Cardrona residents is driven almost entirely by the investment required to upgrade the local wastewater system. These upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet consent requirements, and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases.</p> <p>QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>

Tapper	Humphrey	Recreation Milford Limited	<p>The submitter, Recreation Milford Limited, opposes the proposed approximately 20% rates increase for Cardrona, arguing it is inequitable, disproportionate, and insufficiently justified compared with the district-wide average increase of 11.7%. They contend that the increase—driven largely by the operating costs of the Cardrona public water and wastewater network—places an excessive burden on a small, established community, risks undermining affordability and community wellbeing, and does not adequately reflect the funding principles in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002. While accepting that infrastructure costs must be met, the submitter argues that growth-related infrastructure should not be disproportionately funded by existing residents and that a fairer approach would involve moderating or phasing the increase, improving transparency around cost allocation, and broadening the contributor base by encouraging greater uptake of network connections and enabling future growth so costs are shared more evenly over time.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates increase affecting small communities is driven almost entirely by the investment required to upgrade the local wastewater system. These upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet consent requirements, and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. The Development Contributions policy and the QLDC Financial Strategy assumes that "growth pays for growth". Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the <u>consultation process</u>.</p>
Thompson	Judy		<p>The submitter does not support the proposed rates allocation, citing an unexpected increase of up to 29.3% for Luggate following a 17.8% increase the previous year, and raising concerns about inadequate consultation, timing, and transparency. While acknowledging the need for water and wastewater upgrades, the submission questions cost attribution, growth and airport-related apportionment, and whether development contributions have been correctly applied to protect existing ratepayers. The submitter supports user fees and charges, is neutral on Wanaka–Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects given affordability pressures, and urges Council to reconsider the proposed increase, improve disclosure, and explore alternative approaches such as longer loan repayment periods to reduce impacts on residents.</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>
Thompson	Judy	Luggate Community Association	<p>The Luggate Community Association, representing Luggate residents, does not support the proposed rates increases for Luggate or the Wānaka–Upper Clutha project plans, stating that the community cannot sustain further increases in the current economic environment, particularly following a 17.8% increase last year and a proposed rise of up to 29.3%. While acknowledging the need for water upgrades and supporting proposed user fees and charges, the submission raises strong concerns about affordability, transparency, and communication, noting a lack of clear information on cost attribution, scheme capacity, development contributions, and the role of growth and the airport in funding infrastructure. The Association highlights significant social impacts, especially for residents on fixed or low incomes, and reports community concern about people being forced to leave Luggate. It urges Council to review and reduce the proposed rates increase, consider extending repayment periods, and substantially improve transparency and communication to rebuild trust and ensure residents can understand and plan for future costs.</p>	<p>We have received a comprehensive LGOIMA request from the Luggate Community Association regarding Luggate water and wastewater rates. We will respond in accordance with our obligations under the LGOIMA. Once released, the response may be shared publicly, including by the Community Association</p>

Thorne	Heather	Albert Town Community Association	The Albert Town Community Association opposes the proposed rates increase, estimating an average increase of around 13% for Albert Town based on Wānaka figures, which it considers unaffordable for a community characterised by young families and lower-than-average incomes. The submission highlights cost-of-living pressures, including rising food, fuel, housing, and mortgage costs, and raises concern about the social and wellbeing impacts of continued large increases. While acknowledging forecast increases in the LTP and Council efforts to improve efficiency, ATCA seeks clearer, Albert Town-specific rates information, stronger promotion of the Ratepayer Assistance Scheme, and assurance that priority infrastructure and transport projects benefiting Albert Town remain on track. The submission concludes that the scale of the proposed increase is unsustainable and should not proceed.	see comment for Eric Lin submission
Topp	Carlyn		The submitter strongly supports funding in the 2026–2027 Annual Plan to extend the Queenstown Events Centre with additional indoor courts, citing growing demand and existing facilities operating at or near capacity. The submission highlights benefits for community participation, youth engagement (particularly addressing drop-off in teenage sport), and year-round access given local climate conditions. It emphasises wider wellbeing, social cohesion, and inclusion benefits, alongside economic gains from the ability to host regional and national sporting, cultural, and community events. The submitter argues the investment responds to strong community feedback, supports future growth, and reinforces the Events Centre's role as a key district-wide community hub.	The CODC-QLDC Sub-Regional Sport & Recreation Facilities Strategy 2020 (currently being updated) identifies clearly the need for increased indoor court capacity based on population growth and the benefits of sport & recreation to the communities physical and social wellbeing.
Turnham	Claire	OWL Foundation	The submitter, OWL Foundation Charitable Trust, requests that Council formally provide for natural burial across the district, citing an environmental, cultural, equity, and affordability gap in current cemetery services. They argue that the absence of natural burial options forces residents into higher-impact and less culturally appropriate end-of-life practices, which conflicts with Council's environmental commitments and community wellbeing objectives. The submission highlights that natural burial is legally permitted, lower-impact, cost-effective, and increasingly preferred, yet unavailable anywhere in Queenstown Lakes, making the district an outlier nationally. OWL asks Council to commit to district-wide natural burial provision, identify and designate suitable sites (particularly Hāwea, Glenorchy and Kingston), engage early with Ngāi Tahu as mana whenua, and integrate natural burial into cemetery planning and the District Plan, supported by community education and partnerships.	Council is currently progressing a district-wide Cemeteries Master Planning activity, which is intended to provide a strategic, long-term framework for cemetery reserves management across the Queenstown Lakes District. This work will include consideration of future burial typologies and service offerings provided by Council, including natural burials, alongside site suitability, demand forecasting, cultural engagement (including with mana whenua), operational requirements, and long-term maintenance implications. The master planning process is specifically intended to address the types of questions raised in this submission, including identifying appropriate locations for future cemetery provision (such as Hāwea, Glenorchy and Kingston), ensuring equitable access across the district, and aligning cemetery services with community expectations and environmental outcomes. This approach (i.e. cohesive master plan versus ad hoc cemetery site considerations) will ensure a consistent, well-informed, and sustainable approach across the district. The Cemeteries Master Plan is scheduled to be progressed over the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial years and will provide recommendations to Council on the appropriate provision, location, and implementation pathway for natural burials within the district.

Walthew	Cherilyn		<p>The submitter opposes the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea, stating it is significantly higher than the district average and places an unfair burden on a lower-value, working community. While acknowledging the need to fund essential wastewater infrastructure, the submission argues that a substantial portion of the costs are growth-related and should not be borne disproportionately by existing residents, particularly while the scheme is not yet fully operational. The submitter highlights inconsistent treatment compared with Kingston, where cost recovery has been deferred, and raises concerns about transparency, fairness, and confidence in Council's rating approach. The decision sought is to reduce or smooth the increase to closer to the district average, improve transparency around growth funding (including Infrastructure Acceleration Fund support), and review developer contribution and funding arrangements to ensure growth pays for growth.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Youngman	Ben	Wai Wanaka	<p>The submitter, WAI Wānaka, supports the overall direction of the Draft Annual Plan but argues that freshwater systems, particularly stormwater, need to be treated as core infrastructure in the Upper Clutha. They raise concern that current investment and funding approaches risk externalising environmental costs, leading to reduced resilience and higher long-term liabilities. The submission calls for freshwater health measures to be embedded in Levels of Service, stronger application of the growth-pays-for-growth principle for stormwater impacts, greater use of nature-based and distributed solutions, and clearer governance to ensure freshwater outcomes are prioritised through future infrastructure planning and the Water Services CCO.</p>	Comments acknowledged and QLDC recognise the ongoing and increasing need to invest in stormwater treatment and management. The current Ten Year Plan reflects the prioritisation of this investment.
Zadrozny	Vicki		<p>The submitter, a long-term Lake Hāwea resident, opposes the Draft Annual Plan on the basis that the pace and cumulative impact of rates increases are no longer affordable for many existing households, particularly when combined with current cost-of-living pressures. While acknowledging the need for growth and infrastructure investment, they argue that too much of the cost burden is being shifted onto existing residents, and that affordability must be treated as a hard limit rather than a secondary consideration. The submission calls for stronger control of operational spending, clearer prioritisation of essential infrastructure only, a fairer balance between growth and current ratepayers, and more transparent communication about trade-offs and deferred projects. The submitter is concerned that without a change in approach, rising rates risk driving long-term locals out of the district, undermining the community that has supported Lake Hāwea's growth.</p>	The master planning process is specifically intended to address the types of questions raised in this submission, including identifying appropriate locations for future cemetery provision (such as Hāwea, Glenorchy and Kingston), ensuring equitable access across the district, and aligning cemetery services with community expectations and environmental outcomes.