

Surname	First Name	Organisation	Contribution	RO Comment
Achterberg	Anton		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. <p>It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Stronger control of operational spending. <p>There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. <p>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Ackroyd	Toni		<p>I oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>This increase is significantly higher than the district average of 11.6% and places an unfair burden on our community. Lake Hāwea and Luggate already have some of the lowest median property values in the district, yet residents are being asked to absorb one of the highest increases. This disproportionately affects young working families, retirees, and those on fixed incomes.</p> <p>In particular, many of our neighbours are retirees who are receiving a 3% increase to their superannuation, while expecting to increase their rates payments 22% they will be left worse off.</p> <p>In the same vein, the average pay increases for working families amounts typically to 4-6% (if I base this on myself - I haven't received a pay increase since 2022), again leaving the working class worse off year by year when calculating the cost of living compared to inflation. While this may not affect QLDC members as much with their 8-15% pay increases each year, this really hurts the average homeowner in lake Hawea.</p> <p>A substantial portion of the cost driving this increase appears to be related to growth and infrastructure, particularly the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. Based on Council's own figures, a significant share of these costs should be attributed to growth and therefore recovered from developers, rather than existing ratepayers.</p> <p>It is also concerning that Lake Hāwea residents are being asked to fund costs now for infrastructure that is not yet operational, while other areas such as Kingston have had cost recovery deferred under similar circumstances. This inconsistency does not appear equitable.</p> <p>I ask Council to reconsider this proposal and reduce the increase for</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Adams	Tyron		<p>I am a local homeowner in Hawea and have been for 10 years and am not happy about the rates increase planned for Hawea , especially taking into consideration the current economic environment.</p> <p>I think they are ridiculously high and unsustainable.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>
Adams	Helena		<p>I am not in support of the changes proposed to rates in the Hawea area. The increase is not comparable to inflation and too high for most home owners to manage.</p>	no comment
Allan	Craig		<p>Maybe sell the land a Ladies' Mile to make up funding shortfall rather than just making ratepayers pay more every year, use the airport dividend.</p>	<p>Ladies Mile land was purchased for sports field usage due to the lack of these in Whakatipu. This was consulted on as part of the last LTP. The QAC dividend is used to pay down debt, and any change to this would require amending the Revenue and Financing Policy and be consulted on as part of the upcoming LTP process</p>

Allen	Erica		<p>Good Afternoon Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026 – 2027. I wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13 – 14 May 2026. I object to the 22.3% median residential rates increase as proposed for Hawea in the QLDC's Draft Annual Plan 2026 – 2027, when compared to the district average of 11.6%. In the 2025 – 2026 year our increase was 15.3% so the combined increase on an average house in Hawea over 2 years is around \$1,816 – way more than a middle to lower income village should be expected to deal with.</p> <p>The explanation for this large increase has been given as necessary to cover the costs incurred or to be incurred for the development of the sewerage system and pipeline to Project Pure near Wanaka Airport but my question is why should those of us who have owned our property in Hawea for many years and previously paid for sewerage and water upgrades have to pay for something that would not be necessary if the recently developed and future large subdivisions had not been forced upon Hawea. Why should the existing ratepayers be forced to cover the costs that are being incurred to provide services for future residents – surely these charges should be covered by those who are developing new land and stand to profit from these developments.</p> <p>Wanaka is also benefitting from this waste water project so why is the cost of the development being split 50:50 with Wanaka who have vastly more residential and commercial units to share the costs across, where is the fairness in this approach? The residents of Hawea, both long-term and recent are not generally wealthy people. <u>They have chosen to live in Hawea for it's quality of life and</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Anderson	Rod	Luggate Community Association	<p>The proposed increase in Rates in the Luggate area. A proposed increase of 29% is both ridiculous and unfair to many residents. As residents we have contributed to the costs of QLDC over many years including the Leaky homes fiasco in Queenstown so now if Luggate has a project that is beyond the community financing why is the entire community not helping us out? I understand that the Airport required additional water to allow future approval, so this also is a region expence</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The proposed rates increase for Luggate is predominately due to increased wastewater and water supply charges. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. An FAQ document 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>

Anderson	Lynnette		<p>Proposal to increase rates in Lake Hawea 22%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hawea has been a more affordable area to live. But now it is becoming too expensive to stay 2. Why do we have to pay for the new 3 waters scheme before we have it. 3. Why do existing residents have to pay for council approved additional developments which were disputed by the community at the time. Why cant developers contribute more. 4. It seems unfair to have to share the 3 waters scheme 50/50 with Wanaka when they have a bigger population than Hawea. 5. Due to this area being a big tourist attraction, could there be a tourist levy that would contribute to our infrastructure. During Peak tourist and holiday seasons our existing infrastructure is tested. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Aotearoa	Protect Our Winters	Protect Our Winters New Zealand incorporated	<p>Wanaka Lakefront development should be a priority and will benefit locals and visitors.</p> <p>An Active Transport network for Wanaka is essential, and should be designed and built early</p> <p>Public transport must be prioritised, but smarter urban design would make public transport more efficient too. Both need to be considered together.</p> <p>General advice: Less urban sprawl, smarter, denser housing with public transport! More natural recreation development such as trails for walking, hiking, biking close to town.</p> <p>A visitors levy to help fund things such as active transport networks, recreational trails, and public transport.</p>	Active travel implementations have been included for Wanaka town centre in the long list for the next LTP.
Aubrey	Louise		<p>Afternoon,</p> <p>Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027.</p> <p>I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13-14 May 2026.</p> <p>I do not support the rates increase proposed for Hawea as a ratepayer in the area.</p> <p>Lake Hawea and Luggate have the lowest median property values in the district. Working families, tradespeople and retirees bear the burden - not wealthy holiday-home owners. On Councils own figures 47% of the UCCS cost is attributable to growth. that should have been recovered from developers not existing ratepayers, and the UCCS is not yet operational.</p> <p>Thank you very much,</p> <p>Louise Aubrey</p> <p>Submitted via email, entered by Let's Talk team</p>	no comment

Barker	Chris		<p>I wish to object to the proposed 2026-7 median rate rise of 22.3% for Lake Hawea.</p> <p>Additionally, being a former ratepayer in Luggate, I would also add my opposition to the proposed 29.3% increase for that district.</p> <p>I have been a Wanaka-area ratepayer for approximately 28 years, and am well aware of the expansion history of this District, which has been dynamic to say the least. I do appreciate that QLDC has undergone a rapid expansion during this time in order to keep up with same.</p> <p>However, in recent years it would seem a disconnect has grown between QLDC and ratepayers on "this side of the hill", particularly with regard to the smaller outlying districts around Wanaka.</p> <p>An example is the Longview Liquor license application; If locals didn't object, it would go through. Locals did object, in record numbers, but their objections were dismissed as too "generic" and unable to prove specific harm to the community - that's a high bar to clear until it's built, and then it's too late anyway. We were even told that because we didn't object to the supermarket selling booze we had set a precedent (!) So, to be consistent, we should have been outside New World Three Parks with our tambourines and Salvation Army band when that opened....</p> <p>The KHL application was resubmitted and pushed through without consultation.</p> <p>Bottom line is now the people of Longview will now enjoy convenient access to RTD's before they have similar access to fresh food; That's a great message to send them.</p> <p>Here in Hawea we are not all qualified experts in the demographic/geographic effects of isolated alcohol outlet placement, but we are concerned citizens of an engaged local community; our very isolation from other urban areas makes us so - just look at our fight against the fast-track application of Contact Energy.</p> <p>Now we are asked to pay a 22.3% increase in our rates, before they become capped next year. an increase QLDC can't seem to justify</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Barratt	Kevin		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I request that the council reduce non-essential expenditure where possible to reduce these very steep rate rises 2. Ensure that in future any foreseeable development cost that does not benefit existing residents is recovered in the form of development contributions from developers. Existing residents should not be burdened with development costs for things that often do not benefit them. 3. Provide clear evidence to show how development contributions from developers are spent 	<p>Significant work has been done to keep the average rates increases to the % as informed for Year 3 of the LTP202434. There has been close scrutiny of operating budgets to identify savings in order to achieve this.</p> <p>QLDC collects Developer Contributions under the Local Government Act 2002, which specifies that they must be ring-fenced for the specific purpose and geographic area for which they were collected. They are used to fund infrastructure built in anticipation of growth</p>

Barringer	James		<p>I attended a large meeting at the Lake Hawea Community Centre to try to learn more about the draft annual plan and in particular the very high rates increase proposed for Lake Hawea (22.3%). I understand this is driven by the council deciding that the bulk of the financial burden of the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyancing Scheme should be borne by the local communities directly benefiting from it.</p> <p>There were a great many valid points raised at the meeting - but the following seemed most relevant in terms of objecting to the proposed rates increase for Lake Hawea.</p> <p>Lake Hawea (and Luggate) have the lowest median property values in the district reflecting that they are communities of younger working families, trades people and retirees on fixed incomes not as able to afford such increases at any time let alone in the current cost-of-living crisis. There is considerable irony in the fact that the Longview development was pushed through planning in order to provide more affordable housing, despite the knowledge that the existing wastewater system could not support the increased number of homes. So the presence of this affordable housing area has resulted directly in the need for a new wastewater scheme which has lead directly to the proposed rates increase making that very housing considerably less affordable.</p> <p>In principle, being asked to pay extra for services I benefit from directly is not unreasonable. However, had the Longview Development not gone ahead this cost would have come later and presumably been considerably less. Given Longview is now a reality, I understand ALL of Lake Hawea township will need to operate through the new wastewater system. But it is not acceptable to lump such a high increase on a small community that has already been exposed to a cumulative rates increase of >30% in the last 3 years without at least making a clear and compelling case for why</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Bartlett	Catkin		<p>Perhaps a fund to respond to urgent community safety needs for roading/ footpaths etc so that changes can be made when they need to be made rather than expect individuals to make submissions on the annual plan making specific requests (meaning they won't bother because it is such an awful process). This would still be subject to a rigorous design process etc but could also yield more community engagement in managing safety and encouraging active transport.</p> <p>Consider developing a cycling code of conduct. There is increasing tension between those on e-bikes and other non motorised users (bikes/ pedestrians etc).</p>	<p>Urgent requests are dealt with through the Request For Services process.</p> <p>A code of conduct for active transport routes could be considered, but may already be present in some council documents. This would be a project across several teams and would need to be included as a line item in the next LTP round.</p>

Barton	Kirsty		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed increase in rates as outlined in the Annual Plan.</p> <p>As a resident of Lake Hāwea for the past 6 years, I have seen rates rise consistently over this time, with increases that are significantly outpacing wage growth and the general cost of living. These cumulative increases are placing growing financial pressure on households in our community, and the current proposal continues that unsustainable trajectory.</p> <p>Lake Hāwea has some of the lowest median property values in the district, yet residents are facing proportionally greater rates burden as higher-value areas. This creates a clear equity issue. A significant proportion of our community is made up of working individuals and families who live here full-time, contribute locally, and do not have the financial flexibility of the wealthier holiday home owners in higher-value parts of the district.</p> <p>For households like ours, the impact is immediate and tangible. An additional approximate \$900+ per year in rates is simply not sustainable for us as a young, working couple. This is not discretionary spending — it directly affects our ability to meet everyday living costs and plan for the future. The rates increase last year was bad enough - this one would be the icing on the cake.</p> <p>For many residents, including ourselves, the issue is not a single year's increase, but the compounding effect of repeated rises. What may appear manageable in isolation has, over time, become a substantial and ongoing burden.</p> <p>While I understand the need for investment in infrastructure and services, I do not believe the current approach sufficiently balances these needs with the ability of residents to pay. Greater</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
bayc	angie		<p>Reduce council salaries and pay increases should be suspended. Minimise outside consultant costs. Go back to basic services only and make spending on these more efficient</p>	no comment
Beable	Barbara	Aspiring Athletics Club Wanaka	<p>Inequality between budgets for the Wakatipu and Upper Clutha regions continues to be an issue. Although the Draft plan is promoted as a draft document and changes can be made this is in fact not what happens. The loss of priorities in the LTP 2023 - 2033 regarding development of Wanaka facilities has never been re-instated inspite of mutiple meetings and promises. It is impersative that Wanaka facilites are prioritised and that a plan B to replace 101 Ballantyne Road is actioned now should the greedy developers win their appeal!.</p>	<p>Due to submissions to the 2024-34 Long Term Plan, budgets were brought forward for Wanaka sports field projects including lighting at Wanaka Recreation Centre U14 field and Wanaka Recreation Reserve Field 1, and drainage of the premier field at Upper Clutha Rugby Club. These projects are currently underway. Council is in a legal process around Ballantyne Road Sports Hub and unfortunately we are unable to confirm any timelines around resolving this. Works have continued to remediate the Ballantyne Road site to a flat grassed site. Funding still remains in the 2024-34 LTP to advance sporting facilities on the site at the appropriate time.</p>
Bedggood	Hemi	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<p>Please see attached the submission from Federated Farmers of New Zealand regarding the proposed 2026-27 Annual Plan.</p>	no comment

BELL	Hamish	<p>Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>I am a Luggate resident/ratepayer and submit in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.</p> <p>My submission focuses on three core concerns:</p> <p>The affordability of consecutive year-on-year rates increases The fairness and transparency of wastewater infrastructure funding, including allocation between existing residents and growth The distribution of investment and whether local communities receive a fair share of funding</p> <p>2. Affordability – Consecutive Year-on-Year Increases</p> <p>Council's material indicates:</p> <p>District-wide average increase: approximately 11.7% Luggate connected properties: increases of up to 29.3% Previous year increase: approximately 17.8%</p> <p>Taken together, this represents a very significant cumulative increase over a short period.</p> <p>For many households this equates to:</p> <p>Increases of over \$1,000 in a single year Cumulative increases exceeding 50% over two years in some cases</p> <p>This level of increase is not sustainable and sits well outside the district average.</p> <p><u>In the current environment, where rates affordability is under</u></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>
Bell	Tracey	<p>I oppose the 22.3% rates increase in Hawea. I understand that one of the major factors that the rates are being increased is due to the installation of the new wastewater system that is currently being installed. The current proposed cost split between Wanaka and Hawea is 50/50. I feel that this is an unfair split of costs. Hawea has a population of 2500, Luggate approximately 1000 and Wanaka 17000 people. Hawea's population is 12.1% of the total number of residents for the greater Wanaka area and Luggate is 4.8% Wanaka makes up 82.9%. I feel that this is the way the cost of the wastewater upgrade should be split with the majority of users paying the majority of the cost. It seems as if Hawea and Luggate are subsidising the people in Wanaka whose rates are proposed to only increase by 13.2%</p> <p>Finally I feel that there is little to no transparency around how the figures for the rates increase that are currently proposed have been reached. I feel that the council should provide us with this information</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p>

Bell	Alexander		<p>I wish to express my opposition to the proposed 23.3% rates increase for Hāwea based on the lack of transparency from within the council as to how the amount of the rates increase has been arrived at.</p> <p>Although a 50/50 split between Wanaka and Hāwea has been suggested, Hāwea has a much smaller population and as can easily be found online a lower value of housing of the properties in the area. This seems to be a very unfair bias towards the people owning properties in Wanaka.</p> <p>Also the same consideration has not been given to Hāwea as has been extended to Glenorchy where the cost of their wastewater has been deferred until the project has been finished.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Bendle	Hannah		<p>I don't know where the rates feedback is meant to go I can't see it mentioned in any of the docs.. I don't have a house here, I have one in Wellington where our rates are pretty much the same. We don't have public transport, we don't host major events, political events, have as many residents to count for in our rates, we're not the capital city with museums, native and historic restoration projects, but somehow we are paying somewhat the same? I get the wanaka tax, I've grown up here and recently moved back, but it's so clear and obvious that there is a huge gap between people that live here and people that are investing/ holidaying here. The council is approving subdivisions for the investors & holidayers and then getting the people that live here to cover the upgrades needed. You say it's for first home buyers but it's only for first home buyers because the holidayers and investors are buying everything else. Stop approving developments and subdivisions without infrastructure to support it. Any cost of development & subdivisions should be past on to the owner, not past onto everyone else via rates. It really just seems like the council support wealthy people & bend over for them when they want anything. We need appropriate planning for slow growth that matches infrastructure growth.. we will be like Queenstown at a complete stop if the growth isn't planned accordingly (and it's not..) Look at what Mamdani just did in NY, anyone with a house sitting empty in QLDC over 5 mil should have their rates reflect that - this money can then go toward community projects and bringing forward projects. I don't feel comfortable talking at a hearing but I would love to get involved another way and understand more about how decisions are made knowing that its not as easy as i'm making it out to be...</p>	no comment

Blum	Urs		<p>From: Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.2. Stronger control of operational spending.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
------	-----	--	--	--

Blum	Doris		<p>From: Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Booiman	Arda		<p>I'm very uneasy about the proposed rates increase affecting the smaller villages like Luggate, Hawea, Kingston and Cardrona etc. What specific options did the Council consider to reduce the immediate impact on the these residents? Id like to request that the Council reconsider the scale and structure of these increases.</p> <p>I'm concerned about how costs are being allocated between existing residents and new development. (Proof of where the development levies went/go?)</p> <p>Overall I'd like to see greater transparency and more expeditious reactions to any information requests made by our community.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services.</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>Work continues across the organisation to create operational savings.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>

Bowden	Sera	<p>I am writing to oppose the rates increases proposed under the Draft Annual Plan.</p> <p>My partner and I live in Hāwea, where we own our first home. Like many in our community, getting into the housing market here took everything we had, and we have worked hard to build a life in this area.</p> <p>Over the past two years, we have experienced a 20% rates increase last year, followed by a proposed 22.3% increase this year. This amounts to nearly a 50% increase in a very short period of time. This level of increase feels overwhelming and ultimately unsustainable for households like ours.</p> <p>Hāwea is not a community of high-income earners. It is made up of young families, first-home buyers, and retirees on fixed incomes. Many of us are already carefully managing rising costs, including groceries, fuel, and mortgage repayments.</p> <p>At the moment, those pressures are being significantly amplified by global and local cost increases that are flowing through into everyday life. The result is that essential living costs are rising sharply across the board, and households are feeling this acutely. In that context, asking residents to absorb an additional \$952 per year in rates feels disconnected from the reality many of us are currently navigating.</p> <p>What concerns me most is the cumulative impact. These increases are not happening in isolation, and for some in our community, this could be the tipping point that forces them to leave the area altogether. That is a devastating prospect for individuals, families, and the fabric of our community.</p> <p>I understand that much of the increase is linked to the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. However, I am struggling to reconcile the approach being taken in Hāwea with that applied to Kingston.</p> <p>The Council has stated that it would be unfair for Kingston residents to begin paying the full cost of their water and wastewater schemes</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	------	--	--

Brake	Natalie	<p>I am writing as a resident/ratepayer of Luggate regarding the recent and projected rates increases under the Annual Plan and Long-Term Plan.</p> <p>While we acknowledge the need for investment in essential infrastructure, the scale and pace of increases being experienced in Luggate raise serious concerns about affordability, fairness, and transparency.</p> <p>1. Disproportionate impact on Luggate Luggate residents appear to be experiencing significantly higher effective increases than district averages. This is largely driven by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The accelerated delivery of the Luggate water supply upgrade •Targeted rates applied to a small local user base •Property valuation shifts <p>This creates a situation where a small rural community is absorbing a large and immediate financial burden.</p> <p>2. Timing of infrastructure investment We understand that the Luggate water upgrade was brought forward from a later date. However, this decision has had a direct and substantial impact on current ratepayers. We request clarification on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The justification for accelerating this project •Whether alternative staging or deferral options were fully considered •Why current residents are required to fund infrastructure designed for future growth <p>3. Growth vs. existing community burden A key concern is that infrastructure sized for future population growth is being funded primarily by existing residents. We ask Council to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increase the proportion of costs recovered through development contributions •Ensure that growth pays a fairer share of growth-related infrastructure 	see comment for Rachel Penfold
-------	---------	---	--------------------------------

Brake	Natalie		<p>We formally object to the 29.1% increase. It is disproportionate and reflects a lack of internal restraint, evidenced by the reported 33% increase in QLDC salary costs.</p> <p>Specific points the Council must address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternative Revenue: Why has a South Island tourist levy not been implemented locally to shift the burden from residents to visitors who utilize the infrastructure? - Enforcement Revenue: There is a significant loss of potential revenue due to the lack of enforcement of freedom camping bylaws at the Luggate Red Bridge Reserve. Recovering these fines should be a priority over raising rates for residents. - Rejected Funding: I request an explanation as to why the Council declined a third-party offer to fully fund a community walkway. Turning down external funding while asking residents for a 29.1% increase is fiscally irresponsible. - Valuation vs. Income: Rating based on paper wealth (QV) is pushing residents into "asset rich, cash poor" hardship. My property value increased 65%, but my income did not. Rates must reflect the community's ability to pay, not just theoretical land value. 	<p>1. QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure. Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network. Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p> <p>2. QLDC does not have the legal power to do it alone. In New Zealand, only the Central Government can pass the legislation required to allow a local council to charge a "tax" or "levy."</p> <p>3. Luggate Red Bridge Reserve is enforced by our regulatory enforcement team within the Freedom camping bylaw rules.</p>
Brockie	Christina		<p>Submission: I am not in support of the changes proposed to rates in the Hawea area. The increase is not comparable to inflation and too high for most home owners to manage.</p>	no comment
Brown	Lynette		<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.</p> <p>There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers.</p> <p>Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.</p> <p>Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment

Brown	Emma		<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers. Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.</p> <p>Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment
Brown	Ian		<p>I would just like to reiterate that before putting the hand out for more money from the rate payers reconsider the effectiveness of the council as a whole especially in relation to employees salaries use of council facilities and vehicles etc. Too often we hear stories from the building trade as an example of total inefficiencies, bolshiness and relationship breakdowns between ratepayers and QLDC employees. This is an area that needs total address.</p> <p>The overriding factor in many areas I believe is that employees of QLDC must remember who they work for and that it is not their position to work against rate payers not withstanding the fact that there are legal positions and policies that must be adhered to.</p> <p>.</p>	no comment

Campbell	Don		<p>I wish to implore the council and those involved in the decision making of the proposed rate increase at Lake Hawea, to reconsider their 22.3% increase.</p> <p>This suggested increase of about an extra \$950 pa. came as a shock. Folks on fixed incomes, of which there are many in the community, do not have the flexibility to cope with massive increases like this. Likewise, those working are already having to make sacrifices, re-prioritising spending currently in the economic climate. This is terrible timing.</p> <p>Some homeowners have already done away with their house and contents insurance (optional) to ensure they can pay the rates(compulsory). A sacrifice for the council in effect. One has to wonder how much in touch the council is with their community.</p> <p>We bought our property in Lake Hawea about 35 years ago. It came with a loan to pay for the sewerage and water schemes (additional to the rates) from the previous owners (previously on septic tanks). We had to actually convince the council to allow us to pay that loan off in a lump sum! The alternative was to take on long term payments along with a non-competitive interest rate. Please see attached documents. That upgrade was initially instigated by the old Vincent council (late 1980's) and continued by QLDC (early 1990's). There will still be many living in the Lake Hawea community who contributed to that upgrade. However, it is worth remembering many of those folk may now be 80 to 100 years old and they may not be able to easily submit about the rate increase, but it will likely affect them significantly.</p> <p>The lack of empathy with ratepayers continues, it would appear. Since then, there have been numerous upgrades with the water and sewerage with the promise of future proofing incorporated. Along</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Carrington	Carl	self	<p>The proposed average rates increase of more than 11% for the coming annual plan is simply unsustainable. Rates cannot continue to increase at this level year on year when inflation is running around 3%. If Council is unable or unwilling to manage its expenditure within a fiscally responsible envelope - which must take into consideration rate payers' ability to keep pace with the increases - then the sooner Government puts a hard cap on Council rate increases the better.</p>	Duplicate of q26 on Fees & Charges tab

Carroll	Grant	<p>I'm writing to oppose the direction of the proposed rates increases in this Annual Plan.</p> <p>As a single working professional in the IT industry, I don't have the buffer of a dual income household to absorb rising costs. Over the past few years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have increased to a point where they're becoming increasingly difficult to manage on a single income.</p> <p>Like many others, I'm already carrying the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgage, insurance, food, fuel, and everything that comes with day-to-day life. Rates are a fixed cost, and when they continue to rise year after year at this pace, it puts real strain on financial stability and long-term planning.</p> <p>I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth. But the current approach feels like too much of that burden is falling on existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether the increases can be justified — it's whether they are realistically affordable. From where I sit, they are not.</p> <p>There are a few areas where I think Council needs to reassess: Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.</p> <p>There needs to be a clear ceiling on what people can reasonably sustain, especially for those of us managing costs on a single income.</p> <p>Stronger control of operational spending.</p> <p>There needs to be visible discipline around costs, with clear evidence that efficiencies have been found before further increases are passed on.</p> <p>Prioritisation of essential infrastructure.</p> <p>In the current environment, the focus should be on critical infrastructure only. Non-essential projects should be deferred until there is more capacity to absorb them.</p> <p>Fair balance between growth and existing residents.</p> <p>Growth is clearly a major driver of costs, but existing ratepayers</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services.</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>Work continues across the organisation to create operational savings.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
---------	-------	---	--

Cassidy	Simon	<p>Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027 Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC)</p> <p>Position: Opposed to proposed rates increases (including cumulative impacts up to ~29.1%)</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed rates increases in the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.</p> <p>While Council frames this as a funding necessity, the evidence suggests the issue is not insufficient revenue, but rather inefficient spending, poor prioritisation, and questionable governance practices.</p> <p>1. The scale of spending does not reflect a constrained organisation</p> <p>QLDC is proposing:</p> <p>\$205.8 million in capital expenditure, and</p> <p>\$291 million in operating expenditure</p> <p>These are not the figures of a council facing austerity. These are the figures of a council continuing to operate at a very high cost base.</p> <p>Despite claiming “savings,” the reality is:</p> <p>Minimal reductions have been made relative to total expenditure</p> <p>No meaningful structural reform has occurred</p> <p>Spending remains historically elevated</p> <p><u>A genuinely constrained organisation would demonstrate:</u></p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services.</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>Work continues across the organisation to create operational savings.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Chave	Michelle	<p>The Rate increase for Hawea, I believe this needs to be reassessed. You can't keep throwing the increases as high as this every year. People are already struggling to make the payment to live here, and a 22.3% rate increase is well outside the norm.</p> <p>If infrastructure needs to be increased for new developments then why are the developers not getting increases in this when starting subdivisions? If you keep increasing rates you will be forcing people out of there homes and out of the area. I love Wanaka i have lived here for 35 years, i am excited to be a first home owner and reach my dream to stay here, however I feel the increase is passing on the increase fully to the owners and not be consumed in other areas. Put a visitor levy in for Tourists, and put that towards the future upgrades of the area, it can't all be put on people trying to make a living here and get ahead.</p> <p>I do NOT support the rates increase at 22.3%.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Chirnside	Craig	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-----------	-------	---	--

Clark	Stuart		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over recent years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have increased at a pace that far exceeds what most households can realistically absorb. These compounding increases are no longer a matter of concern — they are becoming unsustainable for many families, including my own.</p> <p>I also want to emphasise a fundamental issue of fairness. As ratepayers, we are being asked to carry a disproportionate share of the costs associated with rapid growth — growth that I did not vote for, and from which I receive little to no direct benefit. In fact, the scale and speed of this growth has had a consistent negative impact on my quality of life. It is increasingly difficult to accept that existing residents are expected to fund outcomes that primarily enable further expansion.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are already managing significant cost-of-living pressures — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and other essentials. Rates are not discretionary; they are a fixed and unavoidable expense. Continued increases at this level place real strain on household budgets and reduce our ability to absorb other financial shocks.</p> <p>While I recognise that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly in relation to infrastructure and growth, the current approach places too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified in principle — it is whether they are affordable in practice. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council must reassess its</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	--------	--	--	--

Clouston	Charlotte	on behalf of 812 Developments Limited	<p>Kia ora QLDC Annual Plan team</p> <p>This is a submission on behalf of 812 Developments Limited on the Annual Plan.</p> <p>The submission requests funding be allocated in the Whakatipu transport programme budget for upgrades to Anderson Heights. Anderson Heights is an existing no-exit road that serves residential and visitor accommodation activities. The top section of road adjoins Queenstown Hill reserve.</p> <p>The land either side is zoned High Density Residential – A in the District Plan, encouraging the highest levels of residential intensification. The District Plan permits a residential density of three houses and associated flats on each site, and there is no upper density limit.</p> <p>Through a recent resource consent process, Council land development engineers and consultant transport engineers have raised concerns with the compliance of the existing road formation with QLDC’s Code of Practice, and safety of vehicle and pedestrian movements.</p> <p>These are matters outside of the resource consent process for an individual landowner’s vehicle access.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency NZ have indicated that they are unlikely to be able to operate efficiently in an emergency given the manner the street has been designed, and likely could not get a fire appliance to the hydrant in winter conditions. This is the existing scenario and puts the houses on this street and access to the lower part of the reserve at increased risk in an emergency.</p> <p>Anderson Heights landowners are included in the mapped CBD zone for targeted rates including the Queenstown CBD transport rate.</p> <p>The submission seeks that Anderson Heights road improvements should be included in QLDC’s funding and works programme to improve resilience.</p> <p>Suggest that QLDC roading team should also be engaging with FENZ to discuss their concerns further.</p>	This project will be reviewed through the LTP process.
----------	-----------	---------------------------------------	---	--

Collins	Megan	<p>From: Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	-------	---	--

Colston	Adam		<p>Location: Lake Hawea Rate Type: Residential 20.5% increase</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. <p>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Cooper	Ben		<p>The 22% proposed increase in residential rates in Lake Hawea is absolutely disgusting. As is the proposed 29% increase in Luggate. Council cannot control its spending and developers such as Lane Hocking (who will make hundreds of millions from Longview) get a free ride at the expense of Hawea ratepayers. it is sickening.</p> <p>If either Cllr Cody and Cllr Gladding who both live in Hawea support this increase both need to go at the next election. How do they think people on fixed incomes/superannuation can suddenly find another \$1000 per year.</p> <p>The anger in the community about these proposed increases is palpable.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.</p> <p>The higher rates increase affecting many Lake Hāwea and Luggate 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.</p> <p>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.</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>

Copland	Ross	Southern Infrastructure Ltd	<p>Submission on the Queenstown Lakes District Council Draft Annual Plan 2026-27 Submitter: Ross Copland, Chief Executive, Southern Infrastructure Limited (SIL) Date: 23 April 2026 I make this submission on behalf of Southern Infrastructure Limited (SIL), a purpose-driven infrastructure company progressing the Queenstown Cable Car (QCC) project. This privately led initiative responds directly to long-standing transport challenges in the Queenstown area.</p> <p>The draft Annual Plan 2026-27 does not appear to make any specific provision for QLDC's Transport, Property, and Infrastructure teams to engage with or contribute to the development of the proposed Queenstown Cable Car project despite the QT Public Transport Business case indicating that Local Government would need to progress consideration of offline mass-transit infrastructure from 2027. I request that Council address this gap by making appropriate budget provision for external consulting support. The significant workload of current staff is occupied primarily on day to day Council business which is understandable, but leaves little capacity to engage on a project of this magnitude - likely Queenstown's biggest ever transport investment.</p> <p>The "offline mass rapid transit" option has been signalled for years in transport business cases involving QLDC, the Otago Regional Council (ORC), and NZTA. These studies, including the Queenstown Public Transport Business Case, have identified the need for high-capacity, reliable public transport solutions beyond traditional on-road bus services to address severe congestion on key arterials such as Frankton Road. An offline system like a cable car has been specifically referenced as warranting further investigation due to its potential to provide resilient, high-frequency service with minimal disruption to the existing road network.</p> <p>SIL has responded to this strategic direction by investing significant</p>	<p>A considerable amount of time has already been required across many teams through informal engagement, Fast Track Application and Infrastructure Commission processes. As a primarily transport matter, resourcing should be made available to respond, with an opportunity to recover costs where practicable. The proposed scheme has however not been adopted by Council as the only solution at this time. The most appropriate pathway to engage will be through the Transport Network Plan, a subset of the Regional Deal workstream.</p>
Cowie	Aaron		<p>I would like to submit that if rates increase at greater than inflation then the mayor has to publish a statement as to why this is happening and whether the mayor supports it. Rates should never increase above inflation unless there is an extraordinary reason and it is for the mayor to say why it has been allowed.</p>	<p>Refer to response to q26 on Fees & Charges tab</p>

Creighton	Philip	<p>As Lake Hawea residents for the past 35 years, we object to the proposed rate increase of 22.3%. We have in the past 35 years paid for sewerage disposal residential water connection, rubbish collection, etc and feel we have paid our part in Lake Hawea development of facilities.</p> <p>It is our view that this major increase in rates should fall squarely on the QLDC and the Developers of the new subdivisions. For QLDC Council to give these projects approval to go ahead without having the infrastructure in place is shockingly bad management</p> <p>It is the Developer's responsibility to provide this infrastructure before completing the project.</p> <p>As long term residents, we have paid our way and are not prepared to subsidise these developments. The Developers have made considerable profits from these subdivisions, and as stated above, the cost of this Upper Clutha Water and Sewerage Scheme falls solely on QLDC Council's poor judgement and Developers' failure to provide these facilities.</p> <p>This is not the first time Lake Hawea residents have been penalised with higher rates. I.e. Queenstown Leaky Home Syndrome for which we will still be charged for many years to come.</p> <p>Our Rates in 2026 were \$2,940. The new proposed Rates would be approximately \$7,500. This is totally unfair and completely unacceptable.</p> <p>We would strongly suggest a fairer proposal needs to be found similar to the Kingston Scheme.</p> <p>Nga mihi</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
-----------	--------	--	--

Crombie	Derek	<p>I write as a Trustee owner of the properties at 228 Lakeview Terrace and 46 Lichen Lane.</p> <p>My submission is that the proposed rate increase is unjustified, unreasonable, and unaffordable. It is premised on the need to pay for a very expensive upgrade to the water and wastewater services to meet future needs of the township.</p> <p>My reasons for this are: Justification-</p> <p>I have been a property owner in Hawea since 1975. I paid a lump sum full contribution for the construction of the water supply and wastewater reticulation and treatment as those services were installed- about \$6000 I recall. At the time the payments were substantial and almost 50% of the actual value of our land. We are being asked to pay again for no added benefit.</p> <p>Unreasonable</p> <p>The need for greatly increased rates is stated as being upgrading of the wastewater system. This upgrade is required as a result of the QLDC decision to allow further development of the residential area without the necessary services being available. Submissions made to QLDC by myself and other residents at the time pointed this situation out and we were overruled and ignored. The present outcome was obvious and results from negligent actions by Council staff. These costs should be paid for over the whole district as that was the intention of a Special Housing Area - to provide low cost housing for Wanaka and the District- not Hawea.</p> <p>Many residents of Hawea only use the township as a residence and they work in Wanaka, shop in Wanaka and use Wanaka for all other services. Hawea should be treated as a suburb of Wanaka not a</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	-------	---	--

Cross	Nicola		<p>Overall, the draft Annual Plan does not yet strike the right balance between necessary investment and what is realistically affordable for the community.</p> <p>While the direction of travel is understood — particularly the need to respond to growth, infrastructure demands, and environmental pressures — there is a clear gap between planning ambition and the financial reality facing households.</p> <p>A few key areas require further consideration:</p> <p>Affordability needs to be a primary decision-making constraint. Current proposed increases suggest affordability is being acknowledged, but not actively limiting decision-making. There needs to be a clearer framework that ensures rates remain within what households can sustainably absorb over time.</p> <p>Stronger cost control and transparency are needed. There is limited visibility for the community around what has been reduced, deferred, or removed to offset rising costs. A more transparent approach to trade-offs would build trust and demonstrate that all options have been explored before increasing rates.</p> <p>Greater scrutiny of operational and discretionary spending. There is a perception that not all Council spending is being sufficiently challenged. A more disciplined approach — including a thorough review of non-essential expenditure — should be prioritised before further financial pressure is placed on ratepayers.</p> <p>A more equitable funding model is required. The current system relies heavily on property owners, despite a broader population (including renters and visitors) placing demand on infrastructure and services. <u>More balanced contribution</u></p>	<p>Financial Constraints and Affordability The tension between required infrastructure investment and household affordability is a central component of the Annual Plan review. The Council is tasked with evaluating the sustainability of proposed rate increases against the long-term financial health of the community.</p> <p>Cost Control and Reporting The process for finalising the Annual Plan includes a review of project prioritisation. Information regarding project deferrals, budget reductions, and efficiency measures considered during the drafting phase is made available through the public agendas and the final Adopted Annual Plan.</p> <p>Operational Expenditure All areas of Council expenditure, including non-essential and discretionary spending, are subject to scrutiny during the budget-setting process. The Council seeks to ensure that operational costs are optimised before final funding requirements are confirmed.</p> <p>Funding and Revenue Mechanisms The Council utilises a Revenue and Financing Policy to determine how services are funded. This includes evaluating the balance between general rates, targeted rates, and user charges to ensure that those who benefit from or create demand for services contribute appropriately to their cost.</p>
Cross	Simon		<p>Yes. While I acknowledge the intent behind the draft Annual Plan, I have significant concerns about the level of proposed rates increases and the ongoing affordability challenges this places on households, particularly in communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>There needs to be a much stronger focus on affordability as a binding constraint, with clearer prioritisation of essential infrastructure over discretionary spending. The Plan should also demonstrate greater effort to identify efficiencies and reduce costs within Council operations before passing further increases onto ratepayers.</p> <p>In addition, there is insufficient emphasis on ensuring that growth-related costs are borne by those driving that growth. Subdivision and development should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure they require, rather than relying on existing residents to subsidise expansion. Similarly, tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it impacts.</p> <p>Finally, the Plan would benefit from greater transparency around trade-offs, including what projects have been deferred or removed to help manage affordability. Without this clarity, it is difficult for the community to understand how spending decisions have been balanced.</p> <p>Overall, I do not support the current level of rates increase and encourage Council to take a more disciplined, transparent, and affordability-focused approach.</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission

Cull	Rebecca		<p>I oppose the 22.3% rise of rates for Hawea. It is very unfair for the residents of Hawea as it is one of the least wealthy towns in the district. Also I believe it is paying for something that is not yet operational. Why have the residents of Kingston got a reduced rate rise?</p>	<p>The recirculated water rate applies only once council water services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service; instead, your rates will be closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for recirculated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston.</p>
Cull	Thomas		<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed rates increase for the following reasons.</p> <p>As a teacher soon to retire from over thirty years of teaching, the majority of this service in New Zealand in high and low decile schools, I am appalled that this proposed rates increase of 22.3% would be onto a significant number of families in our locality. I know from my experience of teaching at the local secondary school and driving a school bus from Hawea to Wanaka, to teach our students, that the majority of their families are not well off and that this extra average rates cost of nearly \$1000 a year will drive many into financial hardship.</p> <p>Living costs are already higher than average to other towns in New Zealand and as my wife is retired with a small pension from 30 years as a midwife and my own teacher pension, we will soon also find our modest life style to be comprised. Fortunately our grandchildren here do not rely on us financially, but there are families where pensioners do support their mokapuna.</p> <p>So please could you revise this proposal. It is not fair when compared to Kingston. It has been caused by poor decisions about wastewater service provision by developers and council, namely that the infrastructure will not be complete for at least another year.</p> <p>There is very little in the way of supporting expenditure data from the council and details of how this project is funded.</p> <p>So far the developers for the Longview site have been funding at cost of approx \$400K a year I understand, for the sewage waste disposal by tankers.</p> <p>With the new pipeline system the developers will not have such a</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>
Dawson	Masae		<p>Continuing to the answer to the above, we have been living here since the population was 7 or 8000 in wanaka luckily built a house in Luggate well settled in after 15years. Now because of more people wanting to live here we are asked to pay more rates especially the VILLEGE with such population we are trying and live in quiet area away from Wānaka or even Hāwea. we live here mostly pensioners or pre school kids I dont see many single workers in their 20s or 30s as they want to live closer to where everything is we just want to quite affordable even that means little inconvenient without a shop but what we get is high rates I can only see as bullying or if not it must be a mistake. water system isn't enough excuses. we really need some explanations WHY only Luggate residents need to pay high rates</p>	<p>see comment for Rachel Penfold</p>

Dawson	Joanne	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many, including me, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living pressures like mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified, it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>Key Concerns and Requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. The community needs confidence that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. Deferring planned staff hires is a start, but it is not a strategy. 3. Prioritise essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. <p>Approximately 20% of this year's \$233m budget is attributed to</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	--------	--	--

Devereux	Genevieve		<p>We are local Luggate residents and ratepayers and are writing in response to the proposed rates increase in the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027.</p> <p>Our main concern is with the affordability in the rates increases year after year. In our view this is unsustainable. We are first home buyers and are also parents to two small children. I am currently on maternity leave and the thought of our rates again increasing is very concerning. The cost of living is increasing at a shocking rate and wages are not keeping up. We are on a fixed income and there is no room in the budget for these proposed increases.</p> <p>An increase of up to 29.3% is a miles above the district wide average of 11.7%. We will be subject to an increase of well over \$1000. This is not sustainable.</p> <p>Firstly there needs to be transparency around the Water and Wastewater infrastructure funding, including allocation between existing residents and future growth. Also have the Luggate development contributions been allocated for our area or spread further afield?</p> <p>How have previous investment in Luggate Water and Wastewater infrastructure been funded? Can the council please clarify on what proportions were funded through Development contributions, debt and rates. We as a community deserve to see this breakdown so that we can confidently see that the costs are being spread fairly. we are not alone in our view that it feels as though a disproportionate share of investment is directed towards Queenstown. Our community may be small but we contribute through rates and growth and do not see equivalent levels of local reinvestment. This may be true or may just be a perception which reflects the lack of transparency in council spending and how funding is allocated across the area as a whole.</p> <p>This then leads on to Development contributions collected from Luggate growth. This should clearly support local infrastructure. So <u>where are these contributions ending up? Do they stay within the</u></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>
Devonda	Stevee		Yeah - it's bloated and unnecessary	no comment

Dickson	Kevin and Shirley		<p>We live on a metal road, Kennels Lane, similar to a road in a third world country. We need this road to be sealed in the near future.</p> <p>The dust clouds and corrugation from cars travelling the road create three main issues :</p> <p>1/ Visibility can be reduced very quickly to the point that it is a genuine safety issue</p> <p>2/ The dust clouds travel according to the existing wind conditions. The dust travels great distances and enters houses several hundred metres away. It coats the interiors of houses and makes a real mess meaning householders are unable to leave their windows open at times.</p> <p>3/ The dust can cause respiratory issues to humans and animals especially the elderly.</p> <p>The population that is fed by Kennels Lane has increased markedly in the last five years and is now home to over 50 people with provision for another eight sections. Everybody on Kennels Lane provides their own water supply and sewage system so we believe we are entitled to a decent standard of roading. We feel that the increase of rates collected from the properties down this road, isn't reflected in the services we receive</p> <p>We are disgruntled ratepayers</p>	<p>QLDC have a dust supression process that can be used to assess possible treatments, this site can added to that list for review. We should also look at whether any conditions of consent were applied around dust supression as the recent subdivison should probably have catered for this instance, but this needs to be verified.</p>
Doherty	Patricia		I am saying no to a 22% increase on my rates in Lake Hawea	no comment
Donaldson	Louella		<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea for the 2026–2027 year. This increase is significantly higher than the district average of 11.6% and sits well above the range proposed for most other communities in the district, which are between approximately 9.9% and 13%. While I understand Lake Hāwea is not the only area facing a large increase, it is one of the communities most heavily impacted by the proposed rate changes. This places a significant additional burden on local ratepayers at a time when household costs are already under pressure. Many young professionals and young families have already been pushed out of Wānaka and the surrounding areas due to extreme housing and living costs. A rate increase of this scale makes it even harder for those who want to stay, contribute to the community, and raise families here. I ask that Council reconsider the proposed increase and work toward a fairer, more balanced approach that acknowledges both the need for investment and the financial reality facing local households.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>
Drury	Michael		.	no comment

Dunckley	Heather		<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rate increase of 22.5% for Hawea residents. This increase is on top of large compounding increases in the last few years and myself (retired) and many others who live in this community are struggling to pay them.</p> <p>I consider them to be unfair for the following reasons-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -We are paying for services for new developments (which many campaigned against) despite having paid for our own system in the past. If these developments hadn't gone ahead the costs would be much lower. -We are paying a much higher proportion compared to Wanaka residents and hugely more than Kingston residents. -We do not get our fair share of rates compared to Queenstown . <p>Please reconsider the rate increase as it will make Hawea unaffordable for its residents and force them to move elsewhere</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on Kingston, it currently doesn't have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water supply charges can be applied. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
Edwards	Gareth		<p>We live in Hawea Flat on our own septic tank system. I object to paying increased rates to fund the sewage pipes running from Lake Hāwea to Wanaka.</p>	<p>Hawea Flat residents on private systems are not subject to the higher rates increase. The example property shown in the consultation document is a property connected to QLDC services.</p>
English	Sharon	NA	<p>Make increases fair and affordable so communities can continue living here.</p>	<p>no comment</p>
Evans	Kate		<p>The proposed 29% rate increase for Luggate properties feels excessive and disproportionate, especially when compared to other areas within the QLDC. It raises a fair question around how rates are being calculated—why aren't they based solely on land value, and why aren't increases applied more consistently across the district?</p> <p>It's difficult to understand how a smaller community like Luggate could justify such a significant percentage increase, particularly if the level of investment or services isn't comparable to larger or more central areas. The lack of uniformity in how these increases are applied creates a sense of imbalance.</p> <p>There's also a broader impact to consider. Luggate has become a more accessible option for families priced out of central locations, and a steep rise like this risks placing additional financial pressure on those who have already made compromises to stay within the region. An increase of this scale could undermine the very affordability that drew people to the area in the first place.</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>
Fifield	Sharon	Queenstown Business Chamber of Commerce	<p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	<p>no comment</p>
FOLEY	Patricia	Patricia Foley	<p>Good that the rate payers have an option to send in an opinion.</p> <p>Meetings regarding the upcoming changes to rates pre arranged with locals particularly in the smaller communities such as Hawea Flat, Luggate, & Kingston.</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Frazer	Jude	<p>I am totally against the proposed 22.3% rate increase for the residents in Hawea.</p> <p>I understand that most of the rise is driven by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme (UCCS) currently BEING BUILT between Hawea and Wanaka and the benefits from which the residents will not see until some time in 2027. In other words we (the residents) are paying in advance for something that is not yet operational. And nowhere do we see how that calculated increase has been determined.</p> <p>PLEASE EXPLAIN THIS OMISSION.</p> <p>On the Council's own figures, 47% of the UCCS cost is attributable to growth. Under the Local Government Act that portion - around \$23M - should have been covered by the several developers in the area, NOT existing ratepayer. PLEASE EXPLAIN THIS OMISSION QLDC has known for some years of the projected growth outside of Wanaka yet appears to have made no attempt to set money aside to increase in services to areas such as Hawea that growth demands. In 2006 there were approximately 506 residents in Hawea and the projected growth figures put that at 5,500. Double figure rates are not part of the Long Term Plan yet the council has decide to charge both Hawea and Luggage a double figure rates increase,. How can that be acceptable? I moved to Lake Hawea in November 2014 and in the last 5 years my rates have increased 95% . UNACCEPTABLE</p> <p>The conditions for the Longview development have yet to be met. What is the QLDC doing about this situation?</p> <p>The residents of Hawea are mainly working families, tradespeople (who cannot afford Wanaka housing prices yet contribute hugely to the establishment of many new subdivisions there) and retirees. Their houses have the lowest median property values in the district yet Hawea residents are expected to stump up and pay the huge increase in rates that QLDC has determined (by what means?) The</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
Fullerton	Sandy	<p>I oppose the proposed rates increase for Hawea for 2026/2027 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am deeply concerned about the methodology you are using to determine rates between Hawea and Wanaka – the population of Wanaka is much higher (and much richer) than that of Hawea. 2. You have allowed numerous large scale subdivisions to go ahead in Hawea, despite a complete absence of the necessary infrastructure. QLDC has collected millions of dollars from property developers in the form of development contributions. Where has this money been spent? 3. Hawea's population is comprised primarily of retirees / elderly and young working families on fixed incomes. Hawea is not a town of millionaires, and yet for many years now, Hawea ratepayers have – it would seem – been subsidising Wanaka and Queenstown; towns that are hardly short of money. How can you justify now increasing our rates by over 20%? <p>S A Lauder</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Gardner	Christine	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027. I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing. As a long time resident and ratepayer in Lake Hawea, I am concerned about the proposed rate rise for our area.</p> <p>As we are at John Creek, we will not be as affected as others in our area, but our concern remains for the community in which we live and are active, as retirees, volunteers, part time workers and community advocates.</p> <p>The growth in our area has exploded. It is of concern that the infrastructure has not kept pace with the growth. Our roads are suffering and require frequent patching, road users are less safe with the volume of traffic, our waste water system has been non-compliant for years - the reason for the proposed higher rates to support the new Waste Water Scheme (UCCS) for the area.</p> <p>It now seems unfair that the rate payers of Hawea and Luggate are having to pay such an increase in rates for work in progress/unfinished work. We have the lowest median property values in the district. Our community is made up of working families, people with small businesses, tradespeople and retirees. Hawea has been chosen, in large part, not only because of cheaper properties, but because of a green outlook, choosing sustainability and environmental principles. We have few luxury holiday homes.</p> <p>Attention and comparison has to be drawn to the deal given to Kingston, where it would be deemed "unfair to begin full cost recovery now", with the Kingston scheme not yet being functional.</p> <p>My request is that the rates increase for Hawea and Luggate be</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to properties, rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
---------	-----------	--	---

Gardner	Murray	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027. I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing.</p> <p>As a long time resident and ratepayer in Lake Hawea, I am concerned about the proposed rate rise for our area. Living at John Creek, we will not be as affected as others in our area, but our concern remains for the community of Lake Hawea, many of whom have moved here because of the unaffordability of housing in Wanaka. I am increasingly aware of relative poverty in this area with people forced to access community food banks, community firewood supplies. In the current economic environment it will be very difficult for many local residents to afford the normal annual rate, let alone the proposed 22.3% increase.</p> <p>I am aware that standards for the treatment of wastewater have continued to improve and this is to be commended, but it seems that the burden of paying for this and for the works associated with the pipeline from Hawea to Project Pure has fallen unfairly on the residents of Lake Hawea. The 50/50 split with Wanaka is grossly unfair when you consider the much smaller population in Lake Hawea when compared with that of Wanaka.</p> <p>The growth in our area has exploded. It is of concern that the infrastructure has not kept pace with the growth. Our roads are suffering and require frequent patching, road users are less safe with the volume of traffic and our waste water system has been non-compliant for years.</p> <p>We have the lowest median property values in the district. Our community is made up of working families, people with small businesses, tradespeople and retirees. Hawea has been chosen in</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to properties, rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
---------	--------	---	--

Gillet	Luke	<p>Submission: Opposition to Proposed 22.3% Rates Increase for Lake Hāwea Residents</p> <p>I was shocked and deeply concerned to learn of the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea residents. This represents an increase of approximately \$1,000 per year, on top of last year's increase. In just over a year, our household rates will have increased by approximately \$1,800, which is an extraordinarily high increase for a family with two children to absorb.</p> <p>While I accept that rates increase over time due to rising costs and necessary infrastructure investment, an increase of this magnitude is unacceptable. Such a sharp rise suggests that something has gone seriously wrong in QLDC's financial planning and cost allocation. No other essential bill, service, or tax imposes increases of this scale in such a short timeframe.</p> <p>Failure of Cost Allocation and Growth Funding</p> <p>A key concern is how the Upper Clutha Wastewater Programme has been funded. I question why this programme has not been adequately funded through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central government grants Previous rates collected over many years Contributions from developers, including those responsible for new housing developments such as Longview <p>Under the Local Government Act, the growth-related portion of infrastructure investment (estimated at approximately \$23 million) should be recovered from developers, not from existing ratepayers. Existing residents and families should not be expected to subsidise growth-related infrastructure that primarily enables new developments.</p> <p>Inconsistent and Unfair Council Logic</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned by QLDC's inconsistent application of cost recovery logic across the district.</p> <p>Council has stated that Kingston does not face comparable rates increases because "it would be unfair to begin cost recovery while</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
--------	------	--	--

Goldthorpe	Colin		<p>A 22.3% rate rise is proposed for Lake Hawea for 2026-27. This appears to be largely driven by the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme (UCCS) which is required by the growth that has been forced on Lake Hawea by the demand for workers in Wanaka and the need for cheaper housing areas. It has also been driven by developers determined to gain personal profit. Why are the developers who mostly live elsewhere not paying the cost that their developments have forced on Lake Hawea ratepayers? Most of us expect some rise in rates but it is a patently unfair approach to increase the rates for Lake Hawea and Luggate at, or more than, twice the rate of increase of other communities in the area when the median value of the properties in Hawea and Luggate fall below that in Wanaka.</p> <p>It is also short sighted not to recognise the close relationship that Wanaka has with Hawea and Luggate. This rate increase coming on top of the recent significant cost of living increases will unfairly penalise and may drive away some of the young families, working people and tradespersons that predominantly live in these two areas that financially and physically enable the ongoing growth of Wanaka. Finally some of us are retired, living on modest or fixed incomes and spend some of our time volunteering for many projects around the Wanaka, Hawea and Luggate areas that improve the amenities and natural environment. In planning for retirement and choosing to live in Hawea we budgeted for some increase in all of our expenditure but not at this ridiculous level. Some will not be able to absorb such increases.</p> <p>One could be forgiven in this instance for thinking that QLDC's planners are incompetent in not recognising that this situation was going to occur and in not developing a plan that made this more bearable.</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability and the current economic reality. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers the essential infrastructure costs and the associated loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this initial transition year, residents in these specific areas will notice a more sizable increase as the council moves toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant water services.</p>
------------	-------	--	---	--

Graham	Dough		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for me, being retired and on a fixed income, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. <p>It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Stronger control of operational spending. <p>There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. <p>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. <p>Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Clearer communication of trade-offs. <p>Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Grant	Sue		<p>I see no reason to increase the rates as there isn't anything that warrants paying more rates when there are so many new subdivisions already a hit going ahead</p>	no comment

Green	Natasha		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the rates increases for the Lake Hāwea district, proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have grown year after year they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on us</p> <p>The current pattern of rates increases is just not sustainable for locals.</p> <p>As a Lake Hāwea rate payer where does our rate payer money go within Lāke Hawea, there doesnt appear to have been much of our rates invested in our area for quite sometime, yet other districts get heavily invested in, so maybe those other districts can do without so we can have a turn, without the increase, surely it's our time.</p> <p>I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.</p> <p>Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	---------	--	--	--

Hall	Hill	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under the Annual Plan.</p> <p>As a couple approaching retirement, we are becoming increasingly concerned about the direction rates are taking in the Queenstown Lakes District. The proposed rise will take the rates well beyond what we — and many others — can realistically absorb. They are now reaching a level that feels simply unsustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are facing the full pressure of the current cost of living. We are planning for a future on a fixed income, while still managing food, insurance, fuel, and everyday expenses, others will have their mortgages in the mix too. Rates are not optional — they are a fixed and unavoidable cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, they place real strain peoples' ability to remain financially secure in the place they call home.</p> <p>We recognise that the Council is under genuine pressure, particularly with infrastructure demands and growth. However, the current approach appears to be shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The question is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable. From where we stand, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where we believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <p>Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. As we move into retirement, our income will not rise to meet increasing costs. There must be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.</p> <p>Stronger control of operational spending. We need to see clear evidence that every possible efficiency has been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. At present, that</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services.</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>Work continues across the organisation to create operational savings.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Hamilton	Daniel	<p>Actually listen to the locals who live here. The ones who build this region. Be realistic with what you're putting forward. Currently it is unrealistic, this must be seen.</p>	no comment
Hamilton	Daniel Jordahn	.	no comment

Hanlin	Suzanne		<p>As a long term home owner in the Hawea township, I do not support the apportioning of a 22.3% rate rise for Hawea and a 29.3% rate rise for Luggate. I ask council to provide a clear (transparent) breakdown of how costs were apportioned and to justify the differential treatment across the region in the current proposed annual plan rate rises.</p> <p>I am one of the many older Hawea residents who are on a fixed income and have little flexibility to absorb continual large and insufficiently explained increases to living costs in an already unstable economic environment. Hawea and Luggate are small communities that have supported regional development for many years since the amalgamation with QLDC. The ongoing upgrading of infrastructure in the Hawea and Luggate areas is the responsibility of the QLDC. QLDC has been remiss in not fulfilling its responsibilities of infrastructure maintenance for these communities over a number of years.</p> <p>Burdening a small population base of approximately 2,500 people with the funding requirements for infrastructure as a result of QLDC sanctioned current and projected housing development is onerous in extreme. The largest proportion of these costs should be borne by the developers who have benefited in these communities largely at the expense of the broader population. The majority of these developers do not live in these small communities.</p> <p>The forward payment towards the Upper Clutha waste water convenience scheme (UCCS), (at a disproportionate 50% with Wanaka), in advance of a projected 2027 completion date, is not warranted given the dispensation that council has seen fit to provide for the community of Kingston. This is indeed a double standard.</p> <p><u>With the projected move to a separate water entity for the region in</u></p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to properties, rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
harding	jennie		<p>As per above. Roading in and out of Hawea to Hawea Flat needs addressing with the growing demand on the road and the heavy use of trucking for subdivision in and out of the area.</p>	<p>QLDC uses a variety of programmes to respond to growth pressures in a planned and evidence based manner balancing funding constraints and network wide priorities. Data driven models inform our roading pavements forward works programme, and our minor improvements programme (MIP) addresses localised safety concerns and targeted network improvements. There are upcoming MIP works in the Hawea area in the current 24-27 LTP cycle to address safety at the school and windmill corner. While roads in the area mentioned may have localised maintenance required and planned the roads do not yet feature on our 10 -year forward work programme for a complete renewal.</p> <p>No plans for any significant transport improvement projects in Hawea.</p>
Harrison	Chris		<p>Do not feel the council has gone far enough to highlight cost reductions. There are potential assets which can be sold. Cutbacks made such as not renewing council car parking. Potential role reductions. Rate payers are not an open cheque book.</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Hartley	Mike		<p>I would like to make a submission regarding the varying and wildly unfair rates changes in the QLDC area. I strongly oppose the way the rates increases are being allocated with the region, particularly with places like Luggate and Lake Hawea experiencing the highest rates increases by a huge margin.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.</p> <p>The higher rates increase affecting many Lake Hāwea and Luggate 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.</p> <p>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.</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>
Hartley	Mike	#N/A	<p>I have a few questions:</p> <p>Point 1: Why isn't there a flat rate increase in rates across the district?</p> <p>Why are there so many different rates increases across different areas and sectors of the region. I can partly understand why there may be a difference between land uses such as commercial, accommodation and residential, but I cannot see any reason to have different areas of residential properties subject to wildly different rates increases. Surely if QLDC has a budget then QLDC works out how much to increase rates by and then apply it to achieve this goal, fairly.</p> <p>Point 2: Why are the least affluent areas being targeted with the highest increases?</p> <p>On the assumption that there is a valid reason for a varied rates increase why are you targeting places who can least afford it?</p> <p>People moved to these areas because they could not afford to live in the more expensive areas closer to the town centres of Wanaka and Queenstown. This means you have targeted elderly people and young families who are already struggling to make ends meet. The highest rates increases in the entire QLDC catchment are in Luggate and then Hawea and are being imposed on properties below the median property value. How does this make sense?</p> <p>Point 3: How much did it cost how many people to calculate all the different percentages of rates increase?</p>	<p>Significant work has been done to keep the average rates increases to the % as informed for Year 3 of the LTP2024-34. There has been close scrutiny of operating budgets to identify savings in order to achieve this. Rates and who should pay starts in the Long term Plan (LTP) and the Revenue and Financing Policy. Previous Councils have elected for a very targeted approach so that the community that benefits from the service is charged the cost. This LTP QLDC is again reviewing this Revenue and Financing Policy and the follow onto rating. This will be available for community consultation in early 2027 as part of the next LTP.</p>

Hewson	Trevor		<p>My thoughts and concerns are not just for myself but for my family members who also reside here in Hawea and all the other locals who will struggle to pay these extra costs which the proposed increase in the rates for the Hawea community will incur.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate there are extra costs involved with the wastewater improvements, I believe these should not be lumbered in this way on ratepayers.</p> <p>In 2023 my family completed 2x subdivisions in Hawea and the wastewater contribution at the time was \$38,000k per section.</p> <p>If all the Longview sections contributed the same then there would be in excess of \$20 million and there's the Kareke rise, Tim's field and other subdivisions all which have contributed no doubt and I assume they paid the same per section.</p> <p>I believe we should be paying the same increase as other suburbs in the area and not the anticipated rise the council is proposing.</p> <p>Therefore my submission is that the rates for Hawea be inline with the other areas surrounding Wanaka.</p> <p>Thankyou for this opportunity.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>Development Contributions are calculated based on the infrastructure costs in each targeted community to ensure growth pays for growth.</p>
Hirst	Dexter		<p>Specifically for Kingston - there is a delay in a higher increase in rates. The reason for this is stated as "The new water supply is not yet being used by the wider community / existing township. Because residents are not yet receiving the full benefit of the new service, Council has decided it would be unfair to begin full cost recovery now". Council has acknowledged it is "unfair" to charge for a benefit that residents are not yet receiving. So why then are all Kingston residents rates going up when not all residents will receive the benefit of the new water and wastewater supplies? Individual residents will need to pay to connect, at which point rates should increase. If not, there shouldn't be an additional rate hike.</p>	<p>Kingston's rates do not include water supply or wastewater charges. The current % increase is driven by servicing district-wide pressures, including rising interest rates, inflation, increased compliance costs, and the maintenance of shared community assets.</p>
Hoskin	Susan		<p>I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing, however, I strongly oppose the proposed increase in rates. Many who make up this community are already living on a tight enough budget and this kind of increase is neither fair nor affordable.</p> <p>Increased costs should be passed on to developers and or subsidies from council / government Thank.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration to this matter.</p>	<p>no comment</p>
Howard	Alex		<p>Once again you screw the working people of this community,</p>	<p>no comment</p>
HURLEY	ROBERT WILLIAM & JULIA MARIE		<p>THE PROPOSED WATER RELATED RATES INCREASE OF 29% AT LUGGATE IS TOO BIG FOR ONE YEAR. IT NEEDS TO BE BROUGHT IN GRADUALLY AT SAY 3 LOTS OF 10% PER ANNUM.</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Iredale	Claire	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Jackson	Bruce	<p>Just like to add my name to those opposed to the proposed rates increase to the Hawea and Luggate areas.</p> <p>This will add nearly \$1000 dollars per annum to our existing rates of \$4000 dollars. (To put that in context, that's \$100 a week)</p> <p>This is not a fair means of paying for the new wastewater scheme for those paying an existing mortgage or trying to live off a fixed retirement income.</p> <p>I think you need to go back to the drawing board and let us all know where these figures are coming from.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Jackways	Abby		<p>I am writing to seek clarification and express concern regarding the recent proposed rates increases in Luggate, which appear to be significantly higher than those in surrounding areas.</p> <p>These increases feel disproportionate and are becoming increasingly difficult for families to manage. With the ongoing rise in the cost of living, many households are already under financial pressure, and further substantial rate increases are simply not sustainable.</p> <p>I would appreciate a clear explanation as to why Luggate has been subject to such a comparatively high increase. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•What factors have contributed to these rises in our area?•How are these increases being justified relative to other communities?•What consideration has been given to the financial impact on residents? <p>Additionally, I would like to know whether there are any measures being considered to ease the burden on ratepayers, such as phased increases, support options, or alternative approaches.</p> <p>I urge the Council to carefully consider the cumulative impact these costs are having on families and to ensure that any future decisions are both fair and equitable.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider this submission. I look forward to your response.</p>	see comment for Rachel Penfold
----------	------	--	---	--------------------------------

James	Anthony	<p>Submission on Proposed Rates Increase – Lake Hāwea To: Queenstown Lakes District Council I am writing to submit my opposition to the proposed rates increases affecting Lake Hāwea residents under the current Annual Plan. My concern is not simply the level of the increase, but the underlying rationale used to justify it — specifically, that existing residents are now being asked to fund infrastructure that has arisen as a direct consequence of recent and ongoing development. Lake Hāwea has experienced rapid growth, much of which was approved prior to the necessary wastewater and infrastructure systems being in place. This raises a fundamental question of fairness: if the infrastructure was not available or affordable at the time, why was such development permitted to proceed? The current approach effectively shifts the financial burden of growth onto existing ratepayers, many of whom purchased or built in Lake Hāwea under a very different set of expectations regarding infrastructure and costs. Retrospectively applying these costs creates a situation where long-standing residents are subsidising development outcomes they did not drive and may not directly benefit from. Furthermore, I note that in Kingston, Council has taken a different and more balanced approach to infrastructure funding. There, costs associated with new water infrastructure have been deferred on the basis that the service is not yet fully operational, the wider community is not yet receiving the full benefit, and the ratepayer base is not sufficiently developed to fairly absorb the costs. This demonstrates a clear recognition that it is inequitable to require existing residents to fund infrastructure ahead of growth or before benefits are realised. In contrast, Lake Hāwea residents are being asked to absorb significant costs tied to growth-driven infrastructure without the same consideration. This inconsistency raises further concerns about <u>fairness and equity across communities within the district.</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Jannink	Remedios	<p>I want to express my OPPOSITION to the 22.3% rate increase for Hawea and it should be brought into district average rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As mentioned, the bulk of the rate increase is due to wastewater system upgrades (Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme) driven by 47% growth in the area, why is it that existing ratepayers are the ones shouldering the cost instead of those who profited from the development? - As mentioned, these upgrades are essential to protect the environment, meet the consent requirement and ensure the community has reliable wastewater conveyance and disposal. Just wondering if QLDC or the government even reviewed the existing infrastructure and the effect on environment before approving all the consent applied by the developers. - Hawea has the lowest median property values in the district. Not everyone here is a millionaire—most are working families or retirees, not wealthy holiday homeowners. - When comparing Hawea and Wanaka, we're paying nearly the same rates, yet most of the developments and improvements seem to be happening in Wanaka. Looking at things like the Community Centre, playground, park, and street maintenance (with overgrown grass), it feels like Hawea has been overlooked. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Johnson	Mari		<p>Kia ora, I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed 22.3% residential rates increase for Lake Hāwea for the 2026-27 financial year.</p> <p>While I understand the necessity of infrastructure development, the scale of this increase - which is nearly double the district average of 11.6% - is disproportionate and places an unreasonable financial burden on our community.</p> <p>Reasons for opposition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The primary driver for this increase is the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme (UCCS). Under the Local Government Act, these costs should be recovered from developers via development contributions, not shifted onto existing ratepayers through interest on borrowings. 2. Inequity compared to other schemes - There is a clear lack of consistency in how costs are being recovered across the district. For example, Kingston is receiving a water and wastewater scheme significantly larger than the UCCS, yet their median rates rise is only 11.1%. 3. Socio-economic impact - Lake Hāwea and Luggate have the lowest median property values in the district. Unlike other areas with high proportions of wealthy holiday-home owners, Hāwea is home to many working families, tradespeople, and retirees on fixed incomes. A median increase of \$952 per year is significant to household budgets during a period of high living costs. <p>I ask that the Council: Re-evaluate the funding model for the UCCS to ensure developers bear the appropriate share of the \$23 million growth cost. Apply the same "operational readiness" logic used in Kingston to Lake Hāwea, deferring full cost recovery until the scheme is actually delivering service in 2027.</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
Joll	Linda	Cardrona Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association	there is not enoudepth of information provided to thoroughly understand the full proposal of the annual plan, it is very vague for eg the 6% for parks and reserves management covers what? and where? to enable a useful response to this opportunity requires council to provide more indepth analysis.	no comment

Jones	Kath	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I am a single parent, home owner living in Longview, Hāwea. I am writing to ask QLDC to reconsider how rates increases are applied for Hāwea.</p> <p>I generally believe Council does a good job and I appreciate how clearly the information around this rates increase has been presented. However, I have the following concerns.</p> <p>A 22.3% Rates Increase Conflicts with QLDC's Vision and Purpose:</p> <p>QLDC's Vision Beyond 2050 describes a district with "a strong heart and whānau roots that run deep", where quality of life is enhanced, equity is championed, and community wellbeing is prioritised.</p> <p>A rates increase of this magnitude directly undermines that vision for residents like me. As a single parent already just coping financially, a sharp increase in fixed housing costs has the potential to push me from just coping into hardship. Being pushed to the brink of having to leave the area, like so many failures already have done, is the opposite of growing roots that run deep.</p> <p>Rates are not a discretionary expense and increases therefore disproportionately harm modest-income households like mine, directly contradicting Council's stated commitment to equity and wellbeing. QLDC's strategic framework makes it clear that growth should be thoughtfully managed, not pursued at the expense of residents' security and stability.</p> <p>Longview Was Promised as Affordable Housing: Longview was approved as a Special Housing Area, explicitly intended to increase housing supply and improve affordability under</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	------	---	--

Kearns	Brendan		<p>As Above: Zoning Change I would like to submit this request to change the current Rural Residential zoning in specific areas of Luggate to a more enabling zoning (such as Rural Lifestyle or Settlement) that allows for smaller, more efficient section sizes (e.g., 1 acre/4000m² or less). This request is prompted by the proposed 29% rates increase for our community in the 2026/27 Draft Annual Plan. The current rural residential zoning forces large landholding costs on residents, which, when coupled with excessive rate hikes, threatens the financial viability of long-term residents, including young families and those on fixed incomes.</p> <p>2. The Need for Change: 29% Rates Hike & Affordability Unsustainable Costs: A ~29% increase in rates is not affordable for many Luggate residents. Inefficient Land Use: Large rural residential blocks are becoming financially unsustainable to maintain, with high rates and high living costs (petrol, food, mortgage) creating a "not affordable" living environment. Affordable Housing Solution: Enabling the subdivision of 1-acre blocks allows homeowners to sell portions of their land, creating smaller residential lots suitable for more affordable, high-demand housing while retaining a semi-rural feel.</p> <p>3. Alignment with Community Vision & Infrastructure Infrastructure Ready: The recent Luggate Park and Mckay Station development have shown that smaller lots (down to 800m²) are compatible with the local environment and that servicing, such as the new treatment plant, can be extended. Previous Planning Recognition: The Luggate Community Plan has previously noted that to provide for future growth, the zoning of Rural Residential areas could be changed to enable smaller sections. Improved Connectivity: Further subdivision of these areas allows for better pedestrian, cycling, and road connectivity between existing</p>	<p>District Plan is currently subject to a plan stop, which limits Council's ability to initiate plan changes. Any changes outside of those required to meet statutory obligations would require the approval of the Minister for the Environment, and Council is not seeking such approval for additional rezonings at this time unless they relate to areas of land not already brought into the Proposed District Plan. Requests for further rezoning, including in Luggate, will instead be considered through the next Spatial Plan, which is the appropriate plan for evaluating land use changes and infrastructure capacity across the District in a strategic manner.</p>
Kelly	Jason		<p>Ban freedom camping, model it on places like France with their aires de camping location, provide clean safe areas that you pay to enter that have basic amenities like toilets and showers and kitchens, these are basic models that the QLDC can gain ideas from. Most of our problems have been solved overseas but kiwis tend to not look beyond their own shores.</p>	<p>The bylaw is constrained by the Freedom Camping Act 2011 (the Act) that permits freedom camping on most council land in New Zealand. This means a council can only restrict or prohibit camping to protect an area, protect health and safety of visitors to an area, or protect access to an area. Bylaws may not consider the wider impacts on private property and other land not managed by QLDC (this includes amenity or economic values). The Act does not allow councils to impose blanket or district-wide bans on freedom camping.</p>
Kenney	Jean		<p>I object to the high rates we are already paying in Wanaka for tourism and high end infrastructure. I further object to any increase in rates.</p>	<p>no comment</p>
Kitto	Sharryn		<p>I think the proposed rate rise is a huge amount and is far too much, as a retiree I have worked in this area for all my life and was born and schooled in this area. As for the young families in the area they will be forced out of their homes. The QLDC should have been more proactive in securing funds before the work was started. I live beside a playground in the area and the rubbish is never cleaned up with all the contracts employed it should not be too hard.</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Knight	Mandy		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>I would like to see more transparency as to where the developer contributions are allocated....</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <p>1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Knight	Jo		<p>Key themes for our household are prioritising basic services and communities, including sport and recreation services and facilities. This space is important for thriving, healthy communities.</p>	no comment
Krogh	Marian		<p>There needs to be more advocacy for a local visitors levy. I've recently been to Germany, Austria and Switzerland where this was very clearly implemented and resulted in great public transport services. It would also mean less rate hikes - which so many are opposed to.</p>	no comment

Laing	Trevor	<p>My concern is firstly the fairness of the methodology to calculate the 22.3% rise reportedly required to fund the wastewater pipeline and pump station servicing both Hawea and Wanaka. We have been told the fifty odd million required has been split 50/50 between the rate payers in Wanaka and Hawea, (twenty-five million each). Clearly the number of rate payers in Hawea is significantly less than the number in Wanaka resulting in a disproportionate burden on the Hawea rate payers because of the much lower number available to meet the twenty-five million being one half of the total cost.</p> <p>I also have concerns relating to the fairness of the situation where current ratepayers for many years are now expected to meet the infrastructure costs of new development and extensive growth whereas this should in my view be funded by the persons undertaking the development for profit. Additionally, this increase is being levied before the scheme is even operational. There is also a further concern where there are numerous sections that are yet to obtain titles and are immune from any contribution to a scheme they will shortly take advantage of.</p> <p>I am also confused as to the funding of the wastewater scheme. We have been told that when the affordable housing area was approved by the Labour administration it was also agreed that central government would contribute an amount of twenty-two million towards infrastructure for this development. There was apparently an unusual proviso that this would only be available on completion of the wastewater project. If this is the case, then my question is what happens to these funds when they are paid on completion of the scheme. It occurs to me that the increase in rates of 22.3% to fund the wastewater scheme is in effect a Hawea rate payers advance until the funds become available from the government on completion. In addition, if the rates do not decrease following the completion of the scheme, then another twenty odd million will be</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
-------	--------	--	--

Lavery	Philippa	<p>I submit that the Draft Annual Plan as currently presented includes a rates rise which unfairly burdens the small communities of Luggate and Lake Hawea by being approximately twice that of the district average. (Sorry, would like to add macrons on Maori placenames but my computer is not yet set up for this).</p> <p>I have lived in the Luggate and Lake Hawea areas for the past 24 years. In my experience (both personal and observational), these are communities of people who are raising families, mortgaged, and running or participating in businesses that are essential to the welfare and growth of the area but not necessarily well-remunerated. Those living here are generally unable to afford the costs of living in, for example, Wanaka or Queenstown, although often have to travel there for work and schooling, and in today's economic situation are struggling financially. Therefore, it seems unfair to place the burden of rates-financed development and growth on us, leaving the wealthier parts of the region with significantly lower rates increases. While it could be argued that we will benefit from the schemes being developed (specifically the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme) these have been required as a result of population growth (which was actually opposed by us) and, as they are not yet operational, are of no current benefit to us.</p> <p>I understand that the small town of Kingston had a similar issue and the conclusion reached by the Council was that it would be 'unfair' to begin cost recovery on something not yet operational, and as a result the cost recovery would be deferred. I would be grateful if something similar could be considered for Luggate and Lake Hawea, with a resulting rates rise in line with the district average.</p> <p>I also submit that the Council, in their planning for the future, should review the contribution fees paid by developers and the timing of these contributions, so that the costs of infrastructure development</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on Kingston, it currently doesn't have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water supply charges can be applied. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
--------	----------	--	--

Lester	Sarah		<p>1. Introduction We are ratepayers in Luggate and are submitting in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027. We support investment in essential infrastructure and understand that growth needs to be funded. However, the scale, speed, and structure of the proposed rates increases raise significant concerns for us as a household. Our submission focuses on three key areas: - Affordability of consecutive rates increases - Fairness and transparency of wastewater funding - Whether smaller communities like Luggate are receiving a fair share of investment</p> <p>2. Affordability – Consecutive Increases The proposed increase for Luggate-connected properties of up to 29% follows an increase of approximately 17.8% the previous year. For our household, this represents a very sharp and cumulative rise in a short period. It is not a gradual adjustment but a substantial and ongoing increase in living costs. As a family with young children, we are already managing the pressures of a high cost of living. Costs across essentials such as food, housing, and childcare continue to rise, and there is limited flexibility in our budget. An increase of this scale adds meaningful financial pressure and is difficult to absorb without impacting other areas of family spending.</p> <p>3. Wastewater Charges – Sudden Step Change We understand that wastewater charges are the primary driver of this increase. However, the jump in costs in a single year is extremely difficult to reconcile from a household perspective. This is a step change rather than a phased increase, and it places a disproportionate burden on a relatively small number of connected properties in Luggate.</p> <p>4. Fairness of Cost Allocation We are not opposed to funding infrastructure. However, we are</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>
Lin	Eric		<p>Overall, my main concern with the draft Annual Plan is that affordability does not feel like the primary constraint guiding decisions. Lake Hāwea has experienced one of the largest increases, at around 22%, which is a significant and unexpected jump. Increases of this scale are difficult for households to absorb, particularly when they come on top of several years of rising costs. Rates increases over recent years have already put significant pressure on households, and this plan does not give enough confidence that this trend will be contained...</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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. There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>

Lobb	Richard		<p>My submission is that the proposed rates increase for Lake Hawea residents is inconsistent with the strategic planning for the area and unfair in its timing.</p> <p>First, the Longview subdivision has Special Housing status, intended to provide lower-cost housing to support young families and retirees. These residents make a valuable contribution to the community but often have limited financial resources and operate close to the edge of financial viability. Having been attracted to the area by the promise of affordability, they now face a significant financial burden imposed with little warning. This represents a harsh and abrupt shift in strategic direction, and I question how it aligns with QLDC's stated planning objectives.</p> <p>Second, QLDC proposes to levy this charge for a service that has not yet been provided. This stands in contrast to the approach taken for Kingston residents and raises concerns about consistency and fairness.</p> <p>Taken together, this draft plan undermines the image of a fair and reasonable council that QLDC seeks to portray.</p> <p>I respectfully ask that you reconsider this aspect of the plan.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Macdonald	Jacqueline		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. <p>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.</p>	See comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Mackay	Donald		<p>It is with surprise and disappointment that I read the information contained in the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027 regarding the proposed increase in rate for the Hawea area.</p> <p>This is for a number of reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The QLDC are requiring the Hawea rate payers to bear the burden and recover the costs of the wastewater scheme when the cost, of establishing previous schemes such as QLDC Shotover scheme were spread across the whole district. 2 It appears to me that the QLDC Waste Water Scheme has been one full of fault and the cost of repairs and rebuild were also paid for by the the entire body of rate payers, not only those living in the Queenstown. 3 According to the Councils figures 47% of the Upper Clutha Waste Water Scheme is due to growth in the area. Why was the cost of increasing the waste water scheme not met by the developers ??, and not expecting the rate payers to bear the cost. This amounts to \$23 million is a sizeable amount to be recovered. 4 There seems to be different rules for different areas. The Upper Clutha Scheme is no where near completed as is the Kingston Scheme, our rates are to rise, however they have had a deferment, ????? 5 It is my understanding that in the past developers paid the fees to enable their developments to proceed. For reasons only known to the QLDC this seems to have changed and the rate payers now bear the brunt of these costs. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	--------	--	--	--

Mannerings	Paul		<p>To the Mayor and Councillors, Queenstown Lakes District Council,</p> <p>I am a Luggate resident writing to formally oppose the proposed rates increases for Luggate in the 2026-27 Annual Plan, which see approximately 180 of our 320 households facing a 29.3 % increase. This level of increase is unaffordable and will have real consequences for families in our community.</p> <p>My key concerns are:</p> <p>Lack of transparency on developer contributions Large subdivisions including Luggate Park and Lake McKay Station have been developed in Luggate over recent years. Under the Local Government Act 2002, developer contributions collected from these developments must be used to fund the growth component of infrastructure in the area they are collected from.</p> <p>Before Luggate ratepayers are asked to fund a 29.3% increase, Council must provide a full public breakdown showing:</p> <p>Total developer contributions collected from Luggate Park and Lake McKay Station to date, by contribution type.</p> <p>Exactly which Luggate water and wastewater projects those DCs have been spent on, with dates and amounts.</p> <p>If DCs have not been spent on Luggate infrastructure, charging existing residents for that same infrastructure would be unlawful. We should not be asked to pay increased rates until QLDC confirms compliance.</p> <p>Oversized infrastructure and cost allocation – Church Road pipeline & airport reservoir</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
Marshall	Melvinne		<p>I oppose the 22.3% rise in rates for Lake Hāwea residents, and request it to be brought into the district-average range. A 22.3% rise in our rates would put more pressure on the already strenuous financial situation for our young family.</p>	no comment
Marshall	Daniel		<p>I oppose the 22.3% rise in rates for Lake Hāwea residents, and request it to be brought into the district-average range. A 22.3% rise in our rates would put more pressure on our already strenuous financial situation for our young family.</p>	no comment
Masters	Hayden		<p>Improve reading in the local areas and think ahead. Add multi lanes when improving roads to allow for the growth. I.e through 3 parks should have been 2 lanes each direction minimum.. force developers to improve the area not just get best price</p>	no comment
Masters	Cole		<p>We love this area and love our local facilities. If I use a facility, I do not mind paying for it.</p> <p>However, The rates increase trajectory is a big worry for me. Having grown up and started a family here in Lake Hawea, we would love to stay in the area and contribute to the community. However if these costs continue to increase at a +20% rate. We will have to sell and move to a more affordable area in NZ.</p> <p>For context, my wife and I are in our first home with our two young boys. I build houses for our community and make what I see as an average salary while my wife is home looking after our boys. Forking out an extra \$1000+ for our rates is daunting. I can't imagine what it must be like for those working hard in below average wages trying to get there foot in the property ladder.</p> <p>Please reconsider the proposed changes to be more affordable for rate payers</p>	no comment

McAuley	Sandra		<p>1. Position on Proposal I strongly oppose the proposed 22% rates increase for Lake Hawea as outlined in the Draft Annual Plan.</p> <p>2. Reasons for My Position I have been a ratepayer in Lake Hāwea for over 40 years and am deeply concerned about the scale of this proposed increase, particularly as it follows a significant rise in rates last year. The justification for such a substantial increase remains unclear. It appears that the financial burden for an incomplete or ongoing project is being placed disproportionately on the relatively small communities of Lake Hāwea and Luggate. Many residents have consistently raised concerns about the pace of residential development in these areas, which has proceeded without adequate forward planning for infrastructure, and without sufficient consideration of long-term social and environmental impacts.</p> <p>3. Impact on Me and My Community As someone living on a fixed income (New Zealand Superannuation), I will struggle to absorb this additional cost. At the same time, there has been little improvement in essential services and infrastructure. There is no access to public transport, and footpaths and roads are in a deteriorating condition. Ongoing development has also resulted in constant dust and disruption from heavy machinery, further affecting quality of life.</p> <p>4. Concerns About Council Priorities It is difficult to reconcile this proposed rates increase with other areas of Council spending. Planned expenditure on new council buildings in Queenstown, along with ongoing costs related to leaky building issues, raises concerns about financial priorities and overall fiscal management. Greater emphasis should be placed on maintaining and improving core infrastructure and services for existing communities before committing to significant new capital projects.</p> <p>5. Suggested Changes</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
McCall	Carmen		<p>I am advising the QLDC that I am opposed to the intended luggate rates increase.</p> <p>The calculated, proposed percentage of increase in inaccurate and looking at all the current, available information smacks of double dipping and lack of transparency.</p> <p>I am single, work two jobs to pay my mortgage and kept on top of my living costs.</p> <p>Apart from being unfair, this increase will put me in extreme financial difficulty.</p>	no comment
McCarroll	Colin		<p>I oppose the 22.3% rise as it is unfair and ask for it to be brought into the district-average range, as Kingston's has been.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Ross McCarroll</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	no comment
McCarroll	Delwyn		<p>I oppose the 22.3% rise as it is unfair and ask for it to be brought into the district-average range, as Kingston's has been.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Delwyn McCarroll</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	no comment

McCaughan	Mark		<p>As a home owner in Lake Hawea the last 11 years, recently retired, and facing substantial increases in the cost of living of everything in the last five years , I believe a 23% increase in rates is unacceptable given the current circumstances. To use a water analogy , its like trying sucking too much water out of an almost dry well. As with when you are looking for a water source , you go for a substantial body of water for your primary supply source , not smaller ponds. Hawea and Luggate are communities with lower cost properties that service the Wanaka area by providing housing for working families that provide tradesmen and services etc. for the area, as Wanaka is unaffordable for many of these people as well as retirees. I feel that our lower cost housing in these communities will become unaffordable as well, resulting in working families departing the district and leaving a shortage of skilled workers. I would suggest a greater portion of the cost be born by Wanaka residents, rather than a 50/50 split—perhaps combined property values of the three communities could be used apportion the percentage of how much each community pays ?</p> <p>I do realise it's a worldwide problem in developed countries funding infrastructure in general , particularly when there is rapid growth in both communities and project costs and growth being difficult to forecast.</p> <p>Long term rate payers should not be paying for growth and tourism development.</p> <p>When looking for money—go where the money is , property developers , land speculators , empty houses with a multi million dollar price tag, not smaller affordable communities with limited services.</p> <p>4. QLDC managing Hawea and Luggate is a bit like comparing</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
McKie	Katrina		<p>We are totally opposed to the proposed rates increase for the Lake Hawea area.</p> <p>We have been ratepayers in the area since 1995 and are appalled at the proposed rates increase for our area.</p> <p>As a retired couple relying on New Zealand Superannuation as our only income we find the prospect of not being able to afford to live in the area we have loved a frightening prospect.</p> <p>We are not opposed to a modest increase in rates but think the proposed 22% is not affordable for many residents and will cause us personally much hardship.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>

McLean	Rebecca		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
McMillan	Peter		Prioritise basic services before new projects	no comment
McMillan	Don		<p>Luggate Rate Increases: When buying our property in Luggate, we paid, through the developer, our share of Development Contributions. This enabled us to connect to the water and sewage systems. These systems seemed to work perfectly well. I understand that the water may have been required to be upgraded to meet central government requirements and allow for future development. However, as it was working perfectly well, it appears the only reason we needed the sewage upgrade was to allow for future development. I fail to see why a small section of ratepayers should be required to fund this. At no stage were we consulted as to whether we supported an upgrade that appears to be unnecessary or whether we were prepared to pay for it. Someone in Council must have recognised the obvious substantial cost of this upgrade, and its effect on ratepayers. This was not brought to our attention before work began as perhaps it should have been.</p> <p>As this cost is being lumped into annual rates, and not be treated as a standalone surcharge, it would seem that the compounding effect of this has not been taken into consideration. This being the case it seems that a small section of ratepayers will have to keep paying more and more each year for something that appears unnecessary and largely unwanted.</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

Mewhinney	Judith		<p>The increase in Hawea rates is appalling. QLDC is going to drive out locals who have been here for 20+ years and turn it into another Queenstown. We cannot afford this increase. We are pensioners. Why are the developers not paying more to cover the cost of their housing. Your priorities are not in line with what the community can afford or are interested in.</p> <p>We dont need more people out here, it's why we moved here.</p>	no comment
Miles	Lynette		<p>Please do not "save up" these increases in our rates. A smaller increase most years would be preferable.</p> <p>Ours is a holiday house, and even though that makes no difference to the amount we pay, it's pretty tough when we are here for only around 6 times each year.</p> <p>I also believe that Lake Hāwea should not be subjected to the same increases as Queenstown as we do not draw such large services as those who live there.</p>	no comment
Miles	Brent		<p>We have owned our property for a little over 20 years and whilst we are very satisfied generally with the services provided by QLDC and the Otago regional councils we have seen significant increases in both rates charges over that period of time. The increase proposed for 26/27 is extra ordinally high which we understand relates to the significant infrastructure requirements to service our rapidly expanding town, primarily for affordable housing in Timsfield and Longview subdivisions. Such cost should have been in part catered for by the developer together with a subsidy by the central government which we understand is available but not until the works are completed.</p> <p>It seems therefore that the existing ratepayers particularly those of longer residential standing are being required to fund the infra structure thorough rates. We are prepared to contribute a fair share for the benefits of improved infrastructure but the increase to be applied is in our view exorbitant and will only compound when the rates for following years are established. Could not the increase in rates be established more in line with the district average and a levy be set to pay for the infrastructure until the central government funds are available .</p>	<p>While it may appear that existing ratepayers are subsidising new developments like Timsfield and Longview, it is important to note that Development Contributions (DCs) are already levied on developers. These fees are specifically designed to ensure that "growth pays for growth." However, DCs are legally restricted to funding the capacity for new residents. The ongoing operation, maintenance, and the legislative requirement to upgrade aging infrastructure (such as the Hāwea wastewater scheme) remain the responsibility of the collective rating base.</p> <p>QLDC is currently evaluating the potential impact of the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) grant on the 2026/2027 rates. We are investigating how the approval of this grant could reduce total project costs and, consequently, the associated interest expenses. However, as these grants are typically milestone-based and distributed in stages, any potential reduction in rates would be applied incrementally as those project milestones are achieved, rather than as an immediate total offset. As new services such as recirculated water are added to your property, you may see an increase in your rates. This adjustment covers the Level of Service (LOS) infrastructure costs and associated loan repayments required to maintain these systems. During the initial transition year, you may notice a sizable increase in your rates.</p>

Miller	Leah		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Molnar	Dee		<p>Could the Kawarau Falls Scenic Playground on Remarkables Cres. Frankton be put forward for consideration for playground equipment upgrades, please?</p>	<p>This playground is approximately 30 years old and is currently assessed as having a number of years of remaining service life. Across the network, a number of playgrounds have equipment reaching the end of its lifecycle at a similar time. While budgets are being developed for LTP renewals, a detailed programme of works has not yet been finalised. As a result, this playground is not currently prioritised for replacement within the upcoming Annual Plan, but will be considered as future renewal priorities are confirmed.</p>

Molyneux	Lesley		<p>Queenstown District Council: I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed 22% rates increase for our area for the 2026/2027 year. In summary, I urge the Council to reconsider the scale and timing of the proposed rates increase. A more measured and equitable approach is needed—one that reflects the financial realities of the Lake Hāwea community; aligns costs with delivered benefits and ensures that growth is funded fairly.</p> <p>Lake Hāwea comprises predominantly working families, many with young children facing considerable cost-of-living challenges. The recent fuel crisis exacerbates these pressures; due to its location outside of major urban areas and the absence of public transport, residents face higher weekly commuting expenses. A substantial portion of the population is employed in the hospitality, tourism, and trade sectors—industries critical to the broader district but not typically associated with high wages. Consequently, these households are particularly susceptible to sharp rises in fixed costs such as rates. Rate's pressure may result in young adults and families choosing to leave the area and that would put more pressure on those that stay. Additionally, Lake Hāwea has a significant number of older residents, myself being one of them, many on fixed incomes, for whom increases of this nature are especially burdensome and may result in genuine financial hardship.</p> <p>According to Council documentation, this project is not scheduled for completion and operation until 2027. It is therefore unreasonable to require ratepayers to fund this infrastructure prior to its delivery. Like paying for a car that you don't have access to. Corresponding rate increases should be deferred until the project is completed and tangible benefits can be realised by the community.</p> <p><u>In conclusion, we respectfully urge the Council to reconsider both</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Molyneux	Mike		I oppose the increased rate for infrastructure improvement because I don't believe payment should be required before the service has been completed and made available to rate payers.	no comment
Morgan	Corina		<p>I oppose the 29.3% rates increase for Luggate and the 22.3% rates increase for for Hawae and ask the rise to be bought into the districts average of 9.9%to 13%.</p> <p>Luggate and Hawae has the lowest median value properties, I myself am a single mum raising two teenage boys, my neighbours are all families and or pensioners. The massive proposed \$1342 extra a year is absolutely unfair and unacceptable.</p> <p>From what I understand nearly half 47% of the cost is attributable to growth, why are existing rate payers paying for it?? Surely that's developers??</p> <p>The way they are managing Kingstons scheme seems alot lot fairer. As you can most probably tell I have never made a submission before, have lived in luggate for 19 years !! I'm in absolute shock that it's even been allowed to come to print 29.3 % increase, I'm sure their must of been a typo!!!</p> <p>Take me back to my first house in Reid Avenue, cheap as chips with a septic tank.</p> <p>Please please reconsider the massive hike, as makes me want to sell up and move off grid</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

Morgan	Rod		<p>I'm a single parent of two boys I just received a 2% pay increase this week. Cost of living is through the roof it's totally unfair to increase rates of this magnitude. People live in Hawea and Wanaka because they can't afford Wanaka With food and fuel costs how are people supposed to survive How can it be right to raise rates 23% and 29%. Thanks for allowing me to raise my concerns.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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. There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>
Moser	Jill		As below	no comment
Mueller	Tim		<p>Need to reduce costs, lower rates, increase 3rd party funding/contributions to reduce costs to rate payers. Our small rating base cannot subsidise international visitors, the service providers that cater to visitors. they must pay their way and then some.</p>	<p>Visitor Levy: QLDC has been the country's most vocal advocate for a visitor levy for years, QLDC cannot implement it unilaterally because the legal "power to tax" rests solely with Parliament, meaning specific enabling legislation must be passed by the Central Government before such a fee can be realised. Fees & Charges: The council is exploring a more equitable fee structure by investigating targeted surcharges and tiered pricing for tourists to ensure that visitors contribute a greater share toward the maintenance and enhancement of the public facilities they enjoy through the Long Term Plan.</p>
Muir	Madeleine		<p>The rates rise of up to 29% is not acceptable. This will cripple most households. I am a resident that has not benefitted from sewage mains, roading improvements and with very little attention from our local government I am horrified to see this fee being lumped on us. This expense should be passed on to new developments in the area, not the residents. Expansion is expensive, pass in these costs to the developers/new residents.</p>	no comment
Musfelt	Charlene		<p>After last years Rates increase, I believe this is a very bad idea for all . Why was Money not put aside over the years for needs, such as this. and expect the tax payer, whom are already struggling to big buck up. I believe there has been alot of wasteful spending and who shall we say is accountable for this act? To many bosses and not enough Chiefs, I Vote No</p>	no comment

Nimmo	Ross	<p>Objection Ground: I am writing to formally object to the proposed 11.6% rates increase for the 2026–2027 financial year for Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Reasons for Objection:</p> <p>Financial Impact: My total annual rates have increased from \$3,747.20 in 2021 to \$5,715.99 for the current 2025–2026 year. With the proposed 11.6% increase, my rates will rise to approximately \$6,380 per year, equating to roughly \$123 per week.</p> <p>This represents an increase of over 70% in just a few years, far exceeding inflation and income growth, and is not sustainable.</p> <p>Inflation Comparison: Current inflation in New Zealand is approximately 2.5%–3%. The proposed 11.6% increase is therefore around 3–4 times the rate of inflation, and cumulative increases in my rates since 2021 far exceed inflation over the same period.</p> <p>This highlights a clear lack of proportionality.</p> <p>Development Contributions Already Paid: When I built my property and later added a small unit, I was required to pay development contributions totaling approximately \$5,775.31. These contributions included charges toward water, wastewater, transportation, community facilities, and reserves, and were required to obtain final sign-off, & code of compliance.</p> <p>Given this, it is unreasonable to now face further rates increases to fund the same infrastructure, particularly where costs are driven by new developments.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Growth Funding: The Council has cited wastewater upgrades as a key reason for increasing rates. However, Lake Hāwea properties such as mine have been connected since 2019, and the system functioned adequately prior to new subdivisions such as Longview.</p> <p>Infrastructure required for growth should not be retrospectively funded by existing ratepayers.</p>	See comment for Rachel Penfold. Note Luggate Red Bridge is an NZTA asset.
-------	------	---	---

Nimmo	Ross	<p>Objection Ground: I am writing to formally object to the proposed 22.3% rates increase for the 2026–2027 financial year for Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Reasons for Objection: Financial Impact: My total annual rates have increased from \$3,747.20 in 2021 to \$5,715.99 for the current 2025–2026 year. With the proposed 22.3% increase, my rates will rise to approximately \$6,990 per year, equating to roughly \$134 per week. This represents an increase of over 85% in just a few years, far exceeding inflation and income growth, and is not sustainable.</p> <p>Inflation Comparison: Current inflation in New Zealand is approximately 2.5%–3%. The proposed 22.3% increase is therefore around 7–9 times the rate of inflation, and cumulative increases in my rates since 2021 far exceed inflation over the same period. This highlights a clear lack of proportionality.</p> <p>Development Contributions Already Paid: When I built my property and later added a small unit, I was required to pay development contributions totaling approximately \$5,775.31. These contributions included charges toward water, wastewater, transportation, community facilities, and reserves, and were required to obtain final sign-off, code compliance, and insurance. Given this, it is unreasonable to now face further rates increases to fund the same infrastructure, particularly where costs are driven by new developments.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Growth Funding: The Council has cited wastewater upgrades as a key reason for increasing rates. However, Lake Hāwea properties such as mine</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	------	---	--

Noble	Philip	<p>Lake Hawea/Hawea Flat median residential rates rise for 2026-27 is proposed at 22.3% or about \$952 extra per annum on a median home (Luggate \$1,342) Is even Higher. Every other community in the district sits between 9.9 and 13.0%. We are the only two communities outside this band.</p> <p>Most of this rise is said to be to fund the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme (UCCS). On QLDC.s own figures,47% of the UCCS cost is attributable to growth. Under the Local Government Act, that portion (around \$23M) should have been recovered from developers, not existing ratepayers.If a ratepayer is 'behind' with their payments they face (I believe) a 10% interest charge added to their account with a further 10% after 3 months. What steps have been taken by QLDC to recover such debt from developers, past, present and from future developments.</p> <p>The current rate of inflation in March 2026 for New Zealand is 3.1%, this proposed rate increase is over 7 times the current rate of inflation. Lake Hawea has one of the lowest median property values in the district. Working families, tradespeople and retirees struggle constantly to pay the seemingly ever higher annual rate rises imposed on the village. I have been a resident of Hawea at this address for 20 years and cannot recall many single digit rate increases in all that time. It appears that QLDC is unable/unwilling to rein in its spending.</p> <p>Kingston is getting a new water and wastewater scheme roughly 75% larger in capital terms than UCCS. Their rates rise for 2026-27 is 11.1%, half of Hawea. The Council's own Kingston Rates Fact Sheet (March 2026), Council says it would be "unfair to begin full cost recovery now" because the Kingston scheme "is not yet operational". Council has deferred \$130,000 of cost recovery on that basis.</p> <p>It seems that an element of bias against Hawea could be construed arising from the above actions by QLDC, by the recent overruling against a proposed "Liquor Store" to which Hawea residents very</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Noble	Susan	<p>I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13-14 May 2026.</p> <p>As a retired person living on the state pension this proposed rate increase is extremely anxious and upsetting to me. From where are we expected to find this extra expense. The inflation rate in New Zealand for March 2026 was 3.1%. You have set an increase 7 times that at 22.3%.</p> <p>Hawea has one of the lowest median property values in the district and is populated mainly by tradies, families, many on the minimum wage and retirees.</p> <p>Tradies, Landlords etc can/will pass on or increase fees, rents etc to recoup such extra expense. Pensioners can not.</p> <p>This leaves people like myself, families on minimum wage/low incomes bearing the brunt of all increases.</p> <p>This is extremely unfair.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that QLDC needs to reconsider the effect this will have on us all and look at different ways to fund this.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>

Norrie	Michael	<p>My feedback is primarily regarding the rates increase for the Luggate community.</p> <p>Last year, we saw a 19% increase, and this year the proposed increase is 29%, which totals a ~54% increase over the last two years. This is absurd. My water worked fine two years ago; what value is my extra \$3,000–\$4,000 providing that I didn't have then?</p> <p>In the FAQ, a key theme seems to be supporting growth, and the budgeting relies heavily on development contributions. Can we increase the "development contributions slice" by increasing the amount of subdividable land in Luggate?</p> <p>We have approximately 40 one-acre sections that are currently zoned Rural Residential, despite being surrounded by residential sections; as such, they aren't subdividable. There are also dozens of ~2,000 sqm sites with the same problem.</p> <p>If we rezone all of Luggate to be Residential, it would make those sites available to be subdivided, increasing the number of properties that can contribute via development contributions. This could significantly mitigate the rates increase for existing residents.</p> <p>Given the huge investment in water and wastewater surely there is now capacity for extra homes - if not then why are we spending so much money?</p>	see comment for Rachel Penfold
Norris	Ollie	<p>Hi I would like to make a submission against the rates increase this year as I feel it's getting completely out of hand year on year. We are in the hardest economic time and most people are struggling to put food on the table so let alone find more money to give the council is just unacceptable.</p> <p>Why can't we have a minimal increase like what they have done up north. People will loose their houses over this I am almost certain. In the time where we struggle we need local councils to help out the community.</p> <p>I am against any increase to rates this year especially the proposed amounts.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>
O'Callaghan	Kate	<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.</p> <p>There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers.</p> <p>Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.</p> <p>Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment

O'Callaghan	Stu		<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.</p> <p>There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers.</p> <p>Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.</p> <p>Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment
O'Donnell	Sarah	Wakatipu Pony Club	<p>Please find attached a submission to the annual plan from Wakatipu Pony Club. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Kind regards, Sarah O'Donnell President Wakatipu Pony Club 0272255206</p>	no comment
O'Donnell	Sarah	Destination Queenstown & Lake Wānaka Tourism	<p>RE: Destination Queenstown and Lake Wānaka Tourism submission to QLDC Annual Plan Please accept the accompanying document as Destination Queenstown and Lake Wānaka Tourism's submission to Queenstown Lakes District Council's Annual Plan. Destination Queenstown and Lake Wānaka Tourism are sharing the RTO's FY26-27 Business Plan to seek continued funding, through the targeted tourism promotion levy on commercial, accommodation and mixed-use rates, for DQ and LWT's role of destination marketing and management activity. DQ and LWT have followed a robust process of engagement and consultation with our members and community during the development of the business plan. The regional tourism organisation's (RTOs) FY26-27 business plan was endorsed by its Strategic Review Board at a meeting held on 21 April 2026. At the SRB meeting two resolutions were successfully passed: (i) That the SRB Members approve the Business Plan FY26-27 presented by the DQ and LWT Boards and Management (ii) That the SRB Members approve the financial resources to be sought from the Queenstown Lakes District Council Based on support from both the DQ and LWT membership we make this submission to QLDC to uplift our funding for the 2026-27 financial year. If more information is required please contact CEO Mat Woods on mat@queenstownnz.co.nz or 027 530 6265.</p>	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.

Oliver	Richard		<p>I'm concerned at the rates differential proposed for Hawea 22% increase being double the suggested average rate of 11% for the whole of QLDC area.</p> <p>The increase in rates some years back to cover Queenstown leaky buildings was spread over the whole of QLDC.</p> <p>The same principle should apply to all infrastructure upgrades. Hawea is being penalised for the lack of infrastructure improvements and investments over many decades. The Council has allowed development to take place without investment in appropriate infrastructure for many years.</p> <p>Now the chickens have come home to roost. The proposed 22% increase is unaffordable for many families in Hawea.</p> <p>Housing for all should be affordable. The current rates increase proposed in the long term plan would have serious consequences for many people in this community.</p> <p>The current councillors need to have a good understanding and rethink on this rates increase issue.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Overton	Tom		I support a visitor levy to fund infrastructure to deal with tourist demand within the District. This should not fall on local rate payers.	no comment
Parker	Pamela	Private	We need to fund only the most essential items for the immediate future. That is 3 waters, roading and waste.	no comment
Partridge	Fran		<p>I strongly believe that the voices of the community should be heard and taken seriously.</p> <p>Unfortunately this has not been my experience to date.</p> <p>There are many reasons why the proposed Rates increases are being objected to and others will speak to those.</p> <p>Who can afford to bear this cost?</p> <p>How to do more than pay lip service to fact that there is great wealth disparity within our region - the gap grows. The proposed ask for more rates is going to hurt some - stretch other community damage control measures further.</p> <p>The developers, for example, push past our town plan boundaries, carve up the landscape, without the infrastructure to cope with the numbers, and leave us to deal with the consequences. QLDC allows this.</p> <p>The costs are unreasonably loaded on the rate payers.</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	no comment
Paterson	Cara	Creative New Zealand	**Received via Let's Talk email and submitted by QLDC.	no comment

Peltzer	Nicholas		<p>From: Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.2. Stronger control of operational spending.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	----------	--	--	--

Peterson	Abby		<p>Hello, Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027. My submitter details are: Abby Peterson 21 Jackson Rise, Luggate 021 248 2424 absta99@hotmail.com I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13-14 May 2026.</p> <p>I oppose the proposed 29.3% rates increase for Luggate. Every other community in the district has an increase between 9.9 and 13%, except for Luggate and Hawea. Most of the rise has been attributed to the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. The growth portion of this should have been funded through developer contributions, not financed by debt. If you compare it to Kingston, they also have a new water and wastewater scheme but only a rates rise of 11.1%. Luggate has the lowest median house prices in the district with a population of working families, retirees and tradespeople who cannot afford to bear the burden of this cost, unlike other parts of the district which is populated by many wealthy holiday home owners. Why is the cost not absorbed evenly throughout the district?</p> <p>Thank you, Abby Peterson **submitted via email, entered by Let's Talk team</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure. Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network. Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
Price	Noel		<p>I believe that an increase of 22% is quite unacceptable. The need for much of the new infrastructure is due to new subdivisions. I believe that the developers of these should bear a greater part of the cost and that council should consider this when granting initial consent.</p>	no comment
Pullar	Megan		<p>I believe the current proposed level of rates increase in Hāwea is unfair and unaffordable. 22% annual increase on top of large increases across recent years during a cost of living crisis is unaffordable. Longview was set up as a "affordable housing zone" and now is proposed to have levels of annual rates comparable to areas such as Lake Hayes and Wanaka, albeit with lower median property values. How is this affordable? Believe a large amount of development levies were collected as part of new development to contribute to the funding of water infrastructure, on top of this there is a significant increase in population in the lake Hawea area. The development levies and increased population (and hence rates collected) should funds a large chunk of this infrastructure cost. Additionally the infrastructure cost is a long term asset, so whilst I agree this necessary the cost of this should be spread across a long term horizon. This system is not even operational yet and yet we are being told we will be paying hefty fees towards this. I oppose this level of rates increase for the Hāwea area.</p>	<p>While it may appear that existing ratepayers are subsidising new developments like Timsfield and Longview, it is important to note that Development Contributions (DCs) are already levied on developers. These fees are specifically designed to ensure that "growth pays for growth." However, DCs are legally restricted to funding the capacity for new residents. The ongoing operation, maintenance, and the legislative requirement to upgrade aging infrastructure (such as the Hāwea wastewater scheme) remain the responsibility of the collective rating base.</p>

Quayle	Karl		<p>From: Karl Quayle Location: Lake Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
RADLEY	Michael		<p>We had a public meeting attended by the Mayor, the deputy, councillors Nicky Gladding and Nicola King and they were unable to answer questions on Development Contributions spent, the over capacity of the pipes, allocation of costs for Luggates 300 houses vs airport vs Corbridge estate. Proposed subdivisions, Industrial development.</p> <p>At the meeting on 2nd April, they agreed to answer by email any questions we sent to them. On the 17 th April the Mayor stated in the Wanaka Sun, that Luggate Ratepayers would be paying a "fair share". In order to make this statement he must know how the costs are attributed. Yet he refuses to tell us publicaly. AS of 23 april there is no reply. This is a breach of the LGA</p>	no comment
Rainsford	Scott		<p>Please consider this time we are in as an emergency. We live in a world effectively at war - while not directly we are literally being affected financially and considerably. This will not go away easily any time soon. Treat priorities wisely and remember that while there is some extraordinary wealth visiting our region on a casual basis, a vast majority of residents are not so fortunate and will be driven out, if not already. You will be left like many others with a beautiful town that no one is left to run the services of.</p>	no comment
Raynes	Chris		<p>I oppose the 22.3% planned increase on Lake Hawea rates as well as the even higher increase planned for Luggate. Please see attached document.</p>	no comment

Reymann	Ulla	<p>As a resident of Lake Hāwea I would like to express my opposition to the proposed rates rise of 22.3%.</p> <p>Hāwea is one of the less wealthy parts of the district with a high proportion of young families, trades people and retirees.</p> <p>The recent massive growth of our township hugely compounded by the SHA Longview necessitates the enormous investment in water infrastructure which is the main driver for the rates rise.</p> <p>Several problems arise from this:</p> <p>Nearly half the cost of the project falls onto Hāwea rate payers, the rest paid by Wānaka despite Hāwea population being only about 15% of Wānaka's.</p> <p>The Hāwea water infrastructure is designed for an estimated population of up to 5500 houses (future development taken into account), but there will not be any development contribution paid until these proposed dwellings gain title.</p> <p>This leaves us - the current residents - to pay the bill for future development!</p> <p>The construction of the new waste water scheme is not going to be finished until well into 2027, which means we are supposed to pay rates for a non-functioning enterprise.</p> <p>Comparing this situation with Kingston, another part of the district in need of expensive upgrades, the QLDC proposed to delay rates rises as the infrastructure will not yet be operational.</p> <p>Why them and not us?!</p> <p>Why aren't the developers made to pay the bill for the infrastructure structure needs of their developments?</p> <p>How can consent be given to "affordable housing" and subsequently impose impossibly high rates on these?</p> <p>For years now the council has pushed housing development especially to service the ever growing tourist industry.</p> <p>Why is there no bed tax (like everywhere else in the developed</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	------	--	--

Riley	Lisa	<p>I am writing as a Lake Hāwea ratepayer to strongly oppose the proposed rates increase for our community in the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.</p> <p>What really bothers me about this consultation is the way the reality for Hāwea is being softened by district-wide averages. Council keeps talking about an average increase across the district, but the indicative increase for a median Lake Hāwea residential property is 22.3%. That is not a small difference. That is an enormous difference. It is the difference between something being hard and something being plainly unaffordable for a growing number of households. Council's own material also makes clear that Lake Hāwea is among the areas seeing a significant increase because of higher wastewater charges.</p> <p>District averages do not pay anyone's bills. Real households do. Real families do. And for many of us, costs have already been rising on every front for years now — mortgages, rent, food, insurance, fuel, power, everything. Rates are not optional. They are one more unavoidable fixed cost, and there is a point where local people simply cannot keep being treated as the financial shock absorbers for every problem that lands on Council's desk.</p> <p>I want to be clear: I am not arguing against necessary infrastructure. I understand that wastewater and other core services matter. I understand that growth and compliance pressures are real. But affordability has to mean something. It cannot just be politely acknowledged and then brushed aside. If Council knows an increase of this scale is brutal for the people who actually live here, then affordability should act as a real limit on what is being proposed. Not just a sad footnote.</p> <p>One of the most frustrating parts of this is timing. The Upper Clutha</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
-------	------	--	--

Roberts	Paula		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>I, like many in our community, am dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. 	<p>Significant work has been done to keep the average rates increases to the % as informed for Year 3 of the LTP 2024-34. There has been close scrutiny of operating budgets to identify savings in order to achieve this.</p> <p>With regards to growth, Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) operates under the financial philosophy that "growth pays for growth." This principle ensures that existing ratepayers are protected from subsidising the infrastructure required for new developments, such as pipes, roads, and parks.</p> <p>To manage this, assets are categorised into three distinct funding streams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Level of Service: Improvements to existing services, funded by current ratepayers. •Growth: Infrastructure for new developments, funded through Development Contributions (DCs). •Renewal: The replacement of aging infrastructure to maintain current standards
---------	-------	--	--	--

Robinson	Hilary	<p>I am a Luggate resident/ratepayer and submit in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.</p> <p>My submission focuses on three core concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The affordability of consecutive year-on-year rates increases The fairness and transparency of wastewater infrastructure funding, including allocation between existing residents and growth The distribution of investment and whether local communities receive a fair share of funding <p>1.. AFFORDABILITY – CONSECUTIVE YEAR-ON-YEAR INCREASES</p> <p>Council’s material indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-wide average increase: approximately 11.7% <p>Luggate connected properties: increases of up to 29.3%</p> <p>Previous year increase: approximately 17.8%</p> <p>Taken together, this represents a very significant cumulative increase over a short period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases of over \$1,000 in a single year <p>Cumulative increases exceeding 50% over two years in some cases</p> <p>This level of increase is not sustainable and sits well outside the district average.</p> <p>In the current environment, where rates affordability is under increasing national scrutiny, increases of this magnitude create both financial stress for residents and reputational risk for Council.</p> <p>2. WASTEWATER CHARGES</p> <p>Council has confirmed that the primary driver of these increases is wastewater and water supply charging.</p> <p>For connected properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater charges increase from approximately \$782 to \$1,757 <p>This represents an increase of over 120% in a single year</p> <p>This is a step change rather than a gradual adjustment.</p> <p>The impact is amplified because:</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>
----------	--------	---	---

Roelofs	Lily		<p>Submission on Proposed Rates Increase 2026 2027 Location Lake Hāwea Longview subdivision</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the proposed rates increase under the 2026 2027 Annual Plan.</p> <p>I am a relatively new homeowner in the Longview subdivision in Lake Hāwea. Like many others, I chose to build here because it was positioned as a more affordable way to get into the market and build a future in this region. That is becoming increasingly difficult to reconcile with the level of rates being proposed.</p> <p>Longview was approved as a Special Housing Area to increase housing supply and improve affordability in the district. However, the outcome for many buyers is now moving in the opposite direction. Rapid and ongoing rates increases are undermining the very goal that developments like this were intended to achieve.</p> <p>While the average rates increase across the district is 11.7 percent, Lake Hāwea residents are being asked to absorb significantly higher increases. For a median property in Hāwea, rates are proposed to increase from around 4,259 dollars to 5,209 dollars in a single year. That is a substantial jump, especially on top of last year's increase, and it feels out of step with the idea of this area being an affordable place to live.</p> <p>I understand that there has been significant investment in wastewater and water infrastructure, and that these upgrades are necessary. However, it is clear that these costs are largely being driven by borrowing decisions, project timing, and the way growth has been managed. Nearly half of the wastewater costs are attributed to growth, yet the burden is falling heavily on current and new ratepayers.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Ryan	Maggie	N/A	More rubbish bins, in accessible, high use areas.	no comment

Ryde	Eric and Jane	<p>Please accept this as my formal submission to the draft annual plan 2026-2027. Eric and Jane Ryde 4 Jackson Rise Luggate Otago 9383 eric.ryde@icloud.com Phone (+64) 0272911442 I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing 13/14 May 2026.</p> <p>Core issues; The council does not appear to have any documentable accounting information to back up the draft rates increase for the Luggate community that we live in. The lack of transparency from the Council in respect of how the rates increase was calculated and allocated to areas and individual residences. The lack of communication in respect of the breakdown of costs from the waste water and new water supply being sent to the ratepayers who attended the recent Luggate meeting with the Mayor and Councillors. The short time frames around the release of the draft plan and submissions closing date.</p> <p>Key issue; The council did not appear to have any specific accountable numbers as to the costs of these projects or how they are allocated. This has meant there has been a lot of conjecture from the ratepayers about these costs and how they directly impacted the rates increase. So now we can only assume that the council have simply plucked a figure from the air as the basis for the proposed rise in Rates. In respect the new water supply for Luggate it appears that Luggate Village rate payers are carrying the entire cost for this, despite the fact that the Wanaka Airport and the Project Pure treatment plant have also been included in this scheme. Is this because Q.L.D.C. who</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>
------	---------------	--	---

Ryder	Jackie & Greg	<p>My main concern is with the proposed 22.3% rates increase for residents of Lake Hāwea township. This is disproportionately high to what our community receives in LakeHāwea. At best the main street in our town has a rudimentary footpath on one side of the road, often with a ditch acting as a gutter.</p> <p>Most of the rise is attributed to the UCCS which will not be operational within the 2026/27 period, therefore of no benefit to the residents, making cost recovery unfair. I note council says it would be "unfair" to recover the cost from Kingston residents due to their waste water scheme not yet operational. The same rule should apply to the rates calculation for Hāwea residents.</p> <p>The need to have the UCCS built, has been driven by council approval for several new subdivisions in the Hāwea township. These should never have been approved without future planning and finance to provide the infrastructure needed to serve the increased population. As it stands today existing residents are left to pay the deficit resulting from irresponsible planning and a lack of long term vision. A higher percentage of the cost should have been recovered from the developers, not existing rate payers. I understand around 80% of the cost increase is interest on borrowings to fund the scheme. This has been debt funded rather than developer funded. I also understand council will receive 23 million dollars from the government after completion of the UCCS, will we get a rates refund ? Unlikely.</p> <p>The fact there is a rates cap of 2-4% for the next period begs the question, is the proposed 22.3% increase just a chance for the council to grab the money while it can? Lake Hāwea has one of the lowest median property values in the region and I propose you reconsider the rates rise for Lake Hāwea residents and bring it into line with the average increase of 11% proposed for the rest of the</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston.</p>
-------	---------------	--	---

Sarginson	Rebecca	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to formally express my concern regarding the proposed 22.3% rate's increase for the Lake Hawea community, and the significant impact this will have on my family and many others in our area.</p> <p>I was fortunate to be born into the Lake Hāwea community in 1978. I attended primary school in Hāwea Flat and later Mount Aspiring College. Like many young people, I left the area for work in my late teens, but returned home within a few years because this is where I belong.</p> <p>Through hard work, I built my own home here and continue to raise my family. Lake Hawea has provided stability and security for my two daughters, and it is deeply concerning to now feel that this security is under threat.</p> <p>Over the past 10 years, I have also worked hard to co - found Food for Love Wanaka and support the Upper Clutha community through times of real need. This has included supporting families facing cancer, dementia, grief, childhood illness, injury, and new parenthood. Through this work, I have helped organise and provide over 10,000 meals in the past year to people in our community facing tough times and I see my fair share of how people in the Lake Hawea area are living day to day and it's a really tough to know what that looks like on a personal level unless to see it through your own eyes.</p> <p>This experience has been mind blowing . It has shown me just how many people in our area are quietly struggling—especially in a region where access to major hospital care, treatment, and urgent maternity services requires a 3.5-hour journey. The level of need in this community is real, and it is significant.</p> <p>That is why this proposed rate's increase is so deeply concerning. We are being asked to absorb a substantial increase, yet many <u>basic infrastructure needs remain unaddressed. These include street</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Sasse	Ron	<p>We would like to make a submission on the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Hāwea</p> <p>We would like to know how the rates increase for Hawea was calculated</p> <p>Our estimate is that there are currently 12,000 households in Wanaka but only 1,500 in Hawea. Therefore a fairer split of the Waste Water Project costs between the two would be 85% Wanaka and 15% Hawea. Assuming the Waste Water Project is costed at \$50 Million payable over 20 years Hawea share per year would be \$375,000. This cost would be a fixed charge of \$70 per titled sections (5,500) in Hawea.</p> <p>We appreciate our figures are based on estimates as actual figures are not available to us. Could you please supply us with a copy of your actual calculation.</p> <p>We believe that current ratepayers should not be paying for future growth</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Sasse	Christine	<p>Greetings, Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027. I do not wish to speak in support of my submission.</p> <p>I am retired and on a pension, living at Lake Hawea. I believe that the proposal to raise Lake Hawea Rates for 2026-2027 year by 22.3% should not happen. In the last 5 years my rates have already increased by 95%. With respect to the Waste Water for the Wanaka & Hawea area. I don't believe that the current rate payers should be burdened with paying for future growth. Also, the proposed 50/50 split between Wanaka (5,000+) to Hawea (1,200) households, is a completely unfair burden on Hawea residents. Finally, the QLDC needs to be mindful of the harm caused by inflicting large rate rises on their ratepayers, particularly those on fixed and low income.</p> <p>Sincerely C A Sasse ** submitted via email, entered by Let's Talk team</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
Schmidt	Lorna	<p>I'm emailing my arguments for why I conclude that QLDC proposed rate increases are insane.</p> <p>1. Each year QLDC works out what it thinks it needs for a total budget and uses alot of person power to calculate that out & charge rates. This thinking is in fact backwards. QLDC needs to use less person power and calculate what Ratepayers can afford to pay. I am on Super only and can't afford any increase, but I will accept to pay the increase equivalent to QLDC's own Inflation Adjustments calculated on their Development Contribution pages. Stated as 3.77% over 2 years, that makes it that I will pay a 1.885% increase in my rates bill.</p> <p>2. QLDC has been collecting rates from all its areas & pooling them to plan infrastructure builds as per the 10 year plan as long as the Council has existed. Different areas benefit from this process each year & I as a Luggate person pay into that each year. Waiting patiently for our turn to get infrastructure, pay rates for it, pay Wanaka storm water levy, have absolutely no infrastructure, as an example. Now we have potable & wastewater upgrades. Slightly ahead of scheduled, but fixes long ongoing need & sensibly, scaled for future development here. So the Development Contributions from New Settlers development & Developers, they actually will pay their part & we, current Luggate residents, have actually already paid our part for this infrastructure. Paid as "time payment" in "the pot". I hear that QLDC has worked out Luggate Rates including an additional payment for this new water infrastructure. That is "double dipping" and unacceptable. There has been no discussion around changing the way infrastructure is charged. QLDC may have convinced itself that's OK to shift the goal posts, behind closed doors. But Ratepayers have never been privy to these discussions. I'm not going to pay twice.</p> <p>3. QLDC has failed for many years to balance it's books. This is a dire situation. QLDC has used to run itself. an ethos akin to the developmental</p>	<p>The rates rises are driven by several non-negotiable factors, including external economic pressures that have significantly inflated the costs of materials and labour over the years, as well as new central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. The Annual Plan figures represent the minimum required to maintain current service levels and meet our legal obligations. We remain committed to efficiency, regularly reviewing our staffing and organisational structure to ensure we operate as leanly as possible while delivering our Long Term Plan.</p> <p>With respect to rates paid in Luggate, when a developer builds a new house or subdivides land, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network. In addition to upfront fees, new residents contribute to the long-term sustainability of the network through their annual rates, which include specific charges for interest on the debt used to build the infrastructure and depreciation to ensure funds are available for its future replacement.</p>

Schmidt	Lisa		<p>I am Opposed to the goal of 29% Rates increase for Luggate because of the unaffordability and strain it will have on my family. This will make it very hard to afford school uniforms and other important costs that will effect my family's life. Each year we get an increase in rates and now QLDC is wanting a 29% increase. This will equate to over \$2000 a year that we will have to stretch to find the money from somewhere.</p> <p>We are already struggling to pay our rates as it stands now.</p> <p>I am also opposed to the Wastewater charging. Our family does not require wastewater infrastructure, as we are self contained with our well maintained septic tank. We are not prepared to pay for a wastewater system for new properties that the developer of these new areas should be responsible and billed for.</p> <p>We do not wish to be connected to a new wastewater system, as we can manage our wastewater with our septic tank for many many years into the future.</p> <p>Regards, Lisa Schmidt.</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure. Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p>
Schmidt	Genevieve		<p>What is all this nonsense about? Why do you perceive this massive rates rise to be a good idea? If this increase goes ahead, my parents won't be able to afford any new school uniform items for me, as we are only just staying on top of important bills, this rise will cause our family to slip below that line. Many are struggling, and may be forced to make the decision to sell their only house to stay afloat. Aren't you trying to stop the homeless crisis? This is NOT helping.</p> <p>I want to be able to complete my education, I don't want to have to work full-time just to help my family stay afloat during this crisis! Please help us by doing the small task of halting this plan where it is, or even lowering it so we can actually live, not just survive.</p>	no comment

Schmidt	Daegal	<p>To whom this will concern, Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan for 2026 - 2027. My Submitter details are: Name: Daegal Schmidt Address: 40 Kingan Road, Luggate, 9383, Wanaka. Phone: 021 066 7761 Email: daegman@gmail.com</p> <p>I am opposed to the Targeted 29% rates increase for Luggate. Apparently there will be an average Rates increase of 11% across the whole QLDC. Statistically this means that some areas will be experiencing significantly less than the still very high 11% increase. I expect this increase is to cover the growing Potable and Wastewater demands as more and more subdivisions pop up around Luggate and other areas. Surely these upgraded infrastructure costs should be put squarely on the shoulders of the developers, we never asked to have huge numbers of houses pop up all over the surrounding farmlands.</p> <p>Our property enjoys having its own self-contained septic system which is healthy and works very well. I prefer keeping all the water I can on the property. I do not wish to connect to any external wastewater system and therefore expect to not have to pay for such a system.</p> <p>This is the largest rates hike I have ever heard of. Plenty of other major upgrades have taken place around the QLDC, (not just Luggate) and our Rates have been increasing to cover these costs. This Targeted increase seems like 'Double dipping' making us pay for other areas And charging us extra specifically for our infrastructure upgrades on top.</p> <p>I'm not impressed as we already struggle to pay council rates as they currently stand.</p> <p>Kind Regards Daegal</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>
Schurink	Carl	<p>Why the unexplained exorbitant rate rise for Luggate Why had this come with note to future proofing our water and sewer , surely the developers need to be paying for the upgrades 100%. With out the development there would only be a need to maintain and meet health standards not grow the system for future connections. Open up on developer contributions , not as a percentage in a pie graph but in real dollar figures. Tell us exactly where it's being split and spent. This proposed rate rise had not been effectively broken down and explained. Where did this exorbitant figure come from.</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Scott	Eva		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what many households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families and retirees, like myself, we are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Inflation pressure is real with increased food prices, other goods and services. On top of this, the fuel price shock is unlikely to wind down and will drive inflation up even more. High inflation erodes real incomes.</p> <p>Many businesses/firms don't have much wriggle room to absorb financial pressure. Households, most probably, have even less capacity to cope with constant increases.</p> <p>Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing financial pressure.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Scott	Nicholas		**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.	no comment
Scott	Julie	Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust	**Received via Lets Talk inbox and submitted by QLDC.	no comment

Sedon	Jo	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan, in particular Lake Hawea's increase.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	----	--	--

Sedon	Mark	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan, in particular Lake Hawea's increase.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. <u>Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current</u> 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Simon	Melanie	<p>I am writing as I oppose the 22.3% rates increase proposed for 2026-2027. This amount is well above the proposed rates increase for every other community in the district. The community is made up of people who are not affluent holiday home owners, and who not able to afford to live in more affluent areas, such as Wanaka, and who consist of tradespeople, retirees and hard working families who provide services in the region and who are not in a position to financially cover such an excessive increase in rates. The Hawea area is being expanded by developers, who will be making large profits and should be paying for the cost of infrastructure development, in particular the wastewater project. Any rates increase should be brought into line with line with the district-average range.</p> <p>**Received via Let's Talk email. Submitted by QLDC</p>	no comment

Sinclair Irwin	Isabella		<p>For years my rates have contributed to the running and developments in the whole QLDC. That should be the way. The rates increases proposed for Hawea are way out of kilter with this approach. Your council agreed to 'affordable housing' in this area and now you hit them with an inequitable and horrendous rate increase. Council budgeting has pretty much ignored this area. Please don't try to bleed us dry when families are struggling to make ends meet, paying increased fuel charges and there is no alternative form of transport to get to work and there are only single lane bridges to get out of this valley. Spread it evenly please.</p> <p>I'll be interested in how much the draft changes from this consultation. I've owned property in Hawea since 1968 and so far very little/no notice has been taken of the communities wishes. BUT ILL BE THE FIRST TO PRAISE YOUR APPROACH AND CONSULTATION IF THERE ARE TANGIBLE CHANGES AS A RESULT OF THIS PROCESS. Thank you.</p>	no comment
Smith	Mark		<p>I would like to see an end to the urban sprawl and traffic congestion that is spoiling our region. It is essential that we have public transport and active transport routes that work for locals to get from their homes to work, school and places of recreation. For this to work effectiently, we need to increase density along existing transport corridors, not just increase urban sprawl, with no plan to provide the services and transport for all the new, detached, single-family dwellings.</p>	no comment
Smith	Rushlee		<p>Submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •QLDC cannot provide any clarity around calculation of costs that have lead to the proposed 22.3% rates increase and exactly what that figure relates to. •There is an inconsistent and unfair treatment of Hāwea ratepayers who are being asked to pay rates for infrastructure that has not yet been delivered and potentially won't be delivered in this rating year/s. This is in stark contrast to the decision made for Kingston ratepayers where it was clearly stated that they should not be charged additional rates for infrastructure that was not yet operational. •Hāwea rates increases should be inline with the district average range - as Kingston's have been. •We see absolutely no value to the rates we currently pay. We have no street lights, no footpaths, public water leaks, uneven roading, 2 road speed signs. Our rates are not being directed into providing the basic infrastructure that we already pay for. •Hāwea is a lower socio-economic area with the lowest median property values in the district. There is simply not the money available to meet these proposed outrageous rates demands. This puts families and children at risk and is ill-considered. 	see comment for Tracey Bell submission
Spackman	Angela	Lakes Sports Trust	Please see our pre-prepared submission attached.	no comment

Spence	Jack	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	------	--	--

Spence	Joanna		<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Spence	Richard		<p>I wish to STRONGLY OPPOSE this proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Our rates increased last year by 19.79%, add this years proposed 22.3% that is a 42.09% increase in 2 years. What planet are you people living on if you believe ratepayers on fixed incomes can afford these increases?</p> <p>Why is the Upper Clutha scheme not being treated the same as the Kingston scheme. Our scheme is not yet operational, we should not be being charged for it.</p> <p>Existing ratepayers should not be paying for greedy developers pushing through schemes that the council knew full well there was not the capacity in the infrastructure to be able to handle. The council have known for years the Hawea wastewater scheme was non-compliant.</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.</p>	no comment

Starkey	Sheryl		<p>I am writing to object to the proposed rate rise in Lake Hāwea. I am a ratepayer of around 20 years and find this proposal objectionable.</p> <p>My objections are</p> <p>The increase is partly to fund upcoming wastewater infrastructure. This is not connected and only being constructed. We should not be funding this until it is operational to ratepayers.</p> <p>The size of the increase is HUGE on top of previous rate rises. If this number emerged after the numbers were crunched I would have thought commonsense would prevail and some adjustments would have been made to budgeted items. The residents of Hawea are retired, (some on single pensions), families with young children, trades people and the inhabitants of SHA homes. None of the above have a spare \$1000 approx or the means to generate. Heating and food budgets being trimmed could well prove costly to the Health budget. This increase needs to be readjusted to a reasonable sum.</p> <p>Why were Kingston residents treated differently? I think Hawea should be treated to the same process delaying payment.</p> <p>Hawea has a very small footprint of services .. the community centre upgrade was funded within the community. No millions given here for a new facility. The playground was fundraised by some committed parents. The library facility is open part time hours. The footpaths desperately need an upgrade in the area around facilities such as shops, hotel , library, community centre etc. people are being encouraged to walk, bike but this is difficult for pram, walker, mobility scooter, family residents given the uneven surface. I see many preschoolers learning the bike skills fall when they</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p> <p>Regarding your comment on Kingston, it currently doesn't have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water supply charges can be applied. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
Stenson	Bruce	None	<p>I note that operating expenditure across the district continues to increase and appears to have nearly doubled since the 2020 Annual Plan. In this context, I believe there is scope to place greater focus on managing and reducing operating costs, including reviewing staffing levels where appropriate. I would also be interested to see how QLDC's operating expenditure benchmarks against comparable councils in New Zealand and internationally. Given the current cost pressures, a strong focus on efficient delivery is essential, and benchmarking provides a valuable opportunity to identify improvements and learn from best practice elsewhere.</p>	<p>While we understand that any increase in costs places pressure on households and businesses, the current "jump" in our budget is driven by a complex financial landscape rather than discretionary spending. This adjustment is driven by several non-negotiable factors, including external economic pressures that have significantly inflated the costs of materials and labour over the years, as well as new central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. Furthermore, our region's growth requires critical infrastructure investment in projects like the Town Centre Arterials and Water/Wastewater upgrades; these carry essential ongoing costs, such as interest and depreciation, which are vital to serving future generations. Although these figures represent the minimum required to maintain current service levels and meet our legal obligations, we remain committed to efficiency, regularly reviewing our staffing and organisational structure to ensure we operate as leanly as possible while delivering our Long Term Plan.</p>

Stenhouse	Ann	<p>My submission relates to the proposed rates increase in Luggate I oppose this part of the plan change My reasons for opposing this part of the plan change are</p> <p>When I purchased my home in 2015 water and waste water were already connected</p> <p>Due to increased development and other concerns council decided that wastewater needed to be directed to project pure, despite the fact that we already had an existing waste system. The developer of Luggate village had offered to add the new stages of development to the existing waste water treatment plant and continue maintaining this system. The council decided instead to connect Luggate wastewater to project pure.</p> <p>Continuing development in the Luggate area has meant that the existing water capacity was not adequate to service the area so a new bore was required to service Luggate.</p> <p>These changes have incurred a financial outlay which should have been offset by the developer contributions, instead existing ratepayers in Luggate are being charged for this.</p> <p>The proposed increase of 29% to the annual rates for Luggate is financially straining on an already very tight budget for someone who is on a very limited income.</p> <p>The decision i seek from council is to reduce the rates increase for the coming financial year below 10% because we had such a significant rates increase last year. This would bring Luggate in line with the rest of the QLDC district.</p> <p>Nga mihi</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure.</p> <p>Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p>
-----------	-----	---	---

Stewart	Denham		<p>To whom it may concern, I am a local resident and ratepayer and oppose the proposed 29% rates increase for Luggate outlined in the Draft QLDC Plan.</p> <p>A rates increase of this scale is excessive and unaffordable for many residents, particularly given the current cost-of-living pressures faced by households, retirees, and families on fixed or moderate incomes.</p> <p>There is a clear lack of transparency around how rates collected from Luggate have been spent to date. Residents are unable to see a clear connection between the rates paid and tangible improvements to local infrastructure or services. Without this information, it is difficult to justify such a significant increase.</p> <p>Luggate has experienced recent growth, yet there is limited clarity on developer contributions collected and how those funds have been allocated. Growth-related infrastructure costs should be met through developer contributions, not disproportionately shifted onto existing ratepayers.</p> <p>The proposed increase also raises concerns about fairness and equity, particularly for a small rural community that receives fewer services than larger urban centres within the district.</p> <p>I urge Council to reconsider the scale of the proposed increase and to provide clear, Luggate-specific reporting on:</p> <p>Rates collected and how they have been spent Developer contributions paid and how they have been used</p> <p>Rates must be fair, transparent, and proportionate to local benefit. Until this information is provided, the proposed increase should not proceed.</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>
Stuart	Jodie		<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>An increase of this scale is well above normal levels and is not sustainable for every day individuals and families living in Lake Hāwea. It risks causing real financial strain as well as potentially displacement for some of our long-term residents.</p> <p>A rates increase of this magnitude is not simply another cost increase. It risks pushing working families and pensioners beyond what they can reasonably afford. In practical terms, it is becoming increasingly difficult for people such as teachers and essential workers to live in the communities they serve.</p> <p>In addition to the scale of the increase, I also strongly disagree with the rationale behind it. It appears to be driven in part by the need to fund infrastructure that is not yet in place. This raises serious concerns about fairness, particularly when that growth-related infrastructure should be primarily funded by developers who are creating the demand for it, rather than being passed on to existing ratepayers. This inconsistency is further highlighted when compared to places such as Kingston, where development-related costs are not being passed through in the same way to existing communities. I know of families who have been here their whole lives who are already incredibly stretched. If they are forced to leave due to affordability, not only is it unfair the impact will be felt across the entire community including schools, services, and local resilience. I urge you to reconsider both the scale of this increase and its broader social impact.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>
Suggate	Helen		<p>See attached</p>	<p>no comment</p>

Tattersfield	Trevor		<p>Appreciate if you would acknowledge receipt , and ensure gets to Mayor and Councillors. Further to below I re-submit my previous submission - as the cost of living crisis is today even more relevant . Your proposed rates increases are simply not acceptable - and following your election promises, should be capped at the CPI. You need to take hard decisions and make drastic cuts in expenditure. My previous submission still stands.</p> <p>8 February 2026: FEEDBACK In this day of cost of living crisis, and rate capping, the following are clearly in the 'nice to have basket' only.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council should defer/cancel the entire Bio-diversity programme - including all staff and overheads. Most ratepayers don't know what it means, nor what are the measurable outcomes. It will not be missed. Probably save \$Ms 2. Council should defer any further expenditure on walking or cycling projects. In this region walking and cycling are largely recreational, and have had no impact on traffic reduction, or pollution. 	<p>Thank you for your submission and for sharing your views on affordability, rates, and Council spending priorities.</p> <p>Council recognises there are differing perspectives across our community, from those wanting to see much greater investment in climate action, biodiversity, environmental restoration, and active transport, to those wishing to see these programmes reduced or deferred. We appreciate hearing these views.</p> <p>Council also notes that many of these programmes are intended to support the future resilience of our community through reducing climate and natural hazard risks, protecting our environment, and providing safer transport choices for our communities. Progress against these projects and outcomes can be found on https://climateaction.qldc.govt.nz/</p>
Taylor	Donelle		<p>As a resident and ratepayer in Luggate. I am submitting my opposition to the 29.1 % rates increase for Luggate under the draft annual plan 2026-2027.</p> <p>The reasons for my opposition are as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the 29 % increase is not affordable for young families such as my own or persons on fixed incomes given the current rising costs of food, mortgages and petrol. Its is inherently tone deaf in the current economic climate. - Luggate residents are bearing the brunt of infrastructure costs (water upgrades) which may benefit future development rather than current residents. Such a disproportionate burden is unfair and unacceptable. - There has been inadequate information on how these rates compare to other urban areas and exact justification for the Luggate specific spike (the additional information provided after the mayor visited the community have done nothing to justify the rates increase). <p>To sum up- the proposed increase falls outside what is a reasonable or justified increase.</p> <p>The appropriate course of action for the a council now is to look for alternative funding options as the current proposal to lump this debt burden on 189 rates payers in Luggate is unacceptable.</p> <p>I suggest the Council look for further operational savings or extend the loan pay back periods similar to how they reduced the district wide increase forecast from 19 % to 11.7%.</p> <p>You need to cap the Luggate increase to the district average of 11.7. %</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>

Thomas	Lizzie		<p>I think that the proposed rates increases for Hawea, Luggate and Cardrona are untenable. As a person who currently rents in the area, with a view to buying here, 22.3% rates increase is concerning. For most folk that will be approx an extra \$1000 a year in rates. How do people on fixed incomes eg; pensioner's cope with that? Not everyone in the region is rich.</p> <p>Hawea is lacking in infrastructure, footpaths, functional sewerage systems etc; Essentially it appears that the council is making small communities subsidise development. Those developers should be paying for it (or should have been contributing to it) not existing homes.</p> <p>There also seems to have been a disproportionate allocation of funding over the years, with much of the focus going into developing the Queenstown, despite Wanaka and Hawea's growth outstripping that over the Crown Range. Where we have to walk in ditches, central Queenstown has been getting pounamu embedded in their footpaths. Brand new arts centres and sporting facilities have gone to Queenstown, yet we are the poor cousin receiving very little in comparison to our contributions.</p> <p>It's about time that the smaller communities over this side got some support and love, rather than having rates gleaned to support predominantly based Queenstown projects. Don't punish small communities for the poor choices made by Mayors, CEOs and Councillors in the past. If the rates need to be increased, the balance should be shared across the board to make it fair and equitable.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	--------	--	--	--

Thompson	Jamie		<p>I am writing as a father who is deeply concerned about the direction of the proposed rates increases under this Annual Plan, and what they mean for families like mine trying to make a life in this district. Over the past few years, we've done everything we can to stay on top of rising costs. Like many households, we budget carefully, make trade-offs, and do our best to provide stability for our kids. But the continued increases in rates are starting to push beyond what we can realistically manage.</p> <p>Every month, we're juggling mortgage payments, groceries, insurance, fuel, and the everyday costs that come with raising a family. Rates are one of the few expenses we can't adjust or plan around—they just keep rising. At a certain point, it stops being about tightening the belt and starts becoming a question of whether we can keep up at all.</p> <p>I understand that Council is facing real pressures, especially with infrastructure and growth. But from where I stand, it feels like more and more of that burden is being placed on families who are already stretched. The issue isn't whether these increases can be justified on paper—it's whether they are actually affordable in real life. For us, and many others, they are becoming increasingly difficult to absorb. As someone trying to support a family and build a future here, I ask that Council consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep increases within what families can genuinely afford. There needs to be a clear recognition that households have limits. When costs go beyond that, it puts real pressure on families trying to stay afloat. 2. Show strong care and discipline with spending. Families are having to be more careful than ever with their budgets. It's important that the same level of care is clearly applied to how public money is being managed. 3. Focus on the essentials and pace everything else. Right now, the priority should be maintaining critical services and infrastructure. Other projects, while worthwhile, can be timed more <p>See attached submission</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Thompson	Judy		See attached submission	no comment
Thomson	Melissa		<p>I am writing this email today to show my concern about the rates increase</p> <p>I live in Hawea Flat with my husband and three sons. The cost of living has become so high and buying food and fuel is getting ridiculous.</p> <p>The wages and salaries are not increasing.</p> <p>The interest rates have increased. Mortgages are really stretching for some people.</p> <p>The rates increased not that long ago.</p> <p>The last thing we need is another rates increase!</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>

Thomson	N		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties put out on the back burner. 	see comment on Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	---	--	---	---

Trott	Laura		<p>I'm writing to oppose the continued scale of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past few years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen far faster than many households can reasonably keep up with. Each year the increases stack on top of the last, and for families like my own the cumulative impact is now becoming extremely difficult to absorb and makes living in the area unsustainable.</p> <p>Like many people in this district, we're already dealing with the reality of rising costs across the board. Mortgage payments, food, insurance, fuel, and everyday household expenses have all climbed significantly. Rates are not something we can opt out of, they're a fixed cost, and when they continue increasing at the current pace, it puts real pressure on the ability of ordinary households to stay financially afloat, to feed their children, to get by day to day.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Council is facing genuine challenges, particularly around infrastructure and managing growth. However, from a resident's perspective, it increasingly feels as though existing ratepayers are being asked to carry too much of that burden, and little responsibility is being taken by the council as council management wages increase to an astronomical level.</p> <p>At some point, the conversation has to move beyond whether increases can be justified in theory and ask a more practical question: can residents actually afford them? For many households in this district, including my own, the answer is no.</p>	<p>QLDC acknowledges that 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>There are practical steps people can take, including talking to us early about whether you are eligible for rates rebates or a payment plan. There's more information on this at qldc.govt.nz/services/rates-property/rates-rebates-remission-postponement</p>
-------	-------	--	--	---

Tsuyuki	Katie	<p>I am writing to share my concerns regarding the proposed rates increases under this Annual Plan, and to encourage Council to take a more cautious and balanced approach.</p> <p>Over recent years, rates in our district have risen at a pace that is becoming increasingly difficult for many households to keep up with. For families like mine, these increases are no longer just noticeable—they are starting to feel unsustainable when combined with the wider cost of living pressures we are all facing.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are managing rising mortgage costs, higher food prices, insurance, fuel, and everyday expenses. Rates are a fixed cost we cannot adjust, and continued increases at this level place real strain on household budgets. There is a growing sense that we are nearing the limit of what people can reasonably absorb.</p> <p>I fully appreciate that Council is dealing with genuine challenges, particularly around infrastructure and growth. However, the current approach risks placing too much of that burden on existing ratepayers. The question is no longer just whether increases can be justified, but whether they are affordable in practice. For many, they are not.</p> <p>With that in mind, I encourage Council to consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Treat affordability as a firm boundary. Acknowledging pressure is important, but it should also guide decision-making. Setting a clear and realistic limit on increases would demonstrate that affordability is being taken seriously. 2. Strengthen confidence in cost control. Ratepayers need to see clear evidence that every effort has been made to manage and reduce operational spending before additional costs are passed on. 3. Focus on essential infrastructure. <p>In the current environment, prioritising critical services over non-essential projects would help ease pressure while still maintaining what matters most. Some initiatives can reasonably be deferred.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Tucker	Carla	<p>I do not support the proposed rates increase for the smaller communities that is well above the average.</p> <p>I don't see how the Hawea rates rise can be so much when it was not predicted in the long term plan or when the project is coming in under budget. I don't see how the wastewater project being built is not funded properly by the new sections and the central government funding. I also don't believe we should be paying for a service that is not operational yet. How can we be expected to pay for a system that we are not even connected to or get to benefit from. I also don't understand why there is a need to increase the rates that much to cover water assets when the whole system is being moved to a CCO and will be recalculated and removed from rates in the short term and can be resolved if there are any discrepancies at that point.</p>	see comment for Tracey Bell submission

Vallillee	Evelyn	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan for Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living; mortgages, food, insurance, fuel and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not and I don't see any relief coming soon.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-----------	--------	---	--

Van der Heyden	Jack		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. <p>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.</p>	See comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------------	------	--	--	--

Vasquez Torres	Claudia		<p>Location : Hawea</p> <p>To whom may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living (mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses). Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------------	---------	--	---	--

Veal	Yolanda	<p>From: Yolanda Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.2. Stronger control of operational spending.	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
------	---------	--	--

Wagner	Lisa	<p>When I first heard of the intended 22.3% rates increase for Hawea residents, I was shocked and horrified. There are no other scenarios where such a drastic increase is imposed in other bills, services or taxes, this is around \$1000 per year on top of the increase last year, this means our rates have increased by \$1800 in over a year. This is an absurdly high increase for a family of 2 children to absorb.</p> <p>I do expect to see rates increase due to rising costs and improving infrastructure, however this amount cannot be accepted in my opinion. This amount means something has gone severely wrong with QLDC financial planning and spending. How has the wastewater programme not been funded by grants, previous rates bills and the developer who is building the new houses in Longview? Furthermore, I have discovered that Kingston does not have such a high rates proposal because 'it would be unfair to begin cost recovery now because the Kingston scheme is not yet operational' these are from QLDC's own words - Upper Clutha Wastewater scheme is also not yet operational so why is this not also being applied to Hawea? I would expect fair logic to be applied within the same council.</p> <p>Hawea has some of the lowest median property values in the district, we purchased our section in 2017 because it was more affordable, there are many young families and retirees in Hawea, this is a community who cannot withstand large increases at a time when we are in a cost of living crisis in New Zealand.</p> <p>Lake Hawea also has very limited social infrastructure, we have a part-time library only, and no transport options. Our rates increase and total rates should be far lower than other areas in the QLDC district.</p> <p>You should be able to obtain the cost of required new infrastructure from the new developments and from developers themselves, and from government schemes. Existing residents and families should not bear the brunt of these costs, this is incredibly unfair. Under the <u>local government Act the growth portion (around \$23M) should have</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Watkins	Natalia	<p>The proposed rate increases for Hawea (and other small communities, such as Luggate) are tone deaf. These communities are supposed to be supporting families to be able to live and work in the region. It's as though there is no awareness of the cost of living challenges - this plan punishes those areas that are needed to provide affordable housing.</p> <p>@John Glover - this is not why you were voted in. Please review the details of the proposal and think again.</p>	no comment

Watson	Philip	<p>1. Campaign commitments vs current proposal At the most recent local body election, several councilors campaigned on ensuring that rates increases would remain affordable for residents. The proposed increase is, in my view, not consistent with that commitment. For many households, particularly those on fixed or moderate incomes, the scale of the increase places real pressure on cost of living. I ask Council to clearly explain how this proposal aligns with their conscience and prior commitments to affordability.</p> <p>2. Growth-driven infrastructure costs and fairness to incumbent residents A significant portion of the proposed expenditure appears to be driven by infrastructure required to support future population growth and ongoing development. This raises a fundamental issue of fairness for existing residents.</p> <p>The current and planned growth of the district is not something that incumbent residents have actively requested, and many current ratepayers may not directly benefit from the scale of development being enabled. Despite this, existing residents appear to be carrying a disproportionate share of the cost of infrastructure required for future population growth.</p> <p>This raises several important questions: Why are existing ratepayers bearing such a large share of the cost for infrastructure that primarily enables future development? Why are the costs not more fully recovered from those directly benefiting, including developers, new subdivisions, and incoming residents through development contributions and targeted growth funding? What mechanisms are in place to ensure that growth pays for growth? At the same time, many existing residents are not seeing proportional improvements in core services. This disconnect between increased cost and perceived benefit needs to be</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability and the current economic reality. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers the essential infrastructure costs and the associated loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this initial transition year, residents in these specific areas will notice a more sizable increase as the council moves toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant water services.</p> <p>Councils use long-term debt and depreciation to spread infrastructure costs over several decades, ensuring that those who benefit from the assets both now and in the future pay their fair share.</p> <p>While Level of Service (LOS) funding is sourced from existing ratepayers to upgrade or maintain current standards, Development Contributions (DCs) are paid by developers to fund the additional infrastructure capacity required to support growth pay for growth. QLDC are currently reviewing these projects as part of the consultation.</p> <p>Kington does not currently have any properties eligible for recirculated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges are being applied.</p>
--------	--------	---	--

Watson	Catherine	<p>A 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea is not just a difficult adjustment—it is an inequitable outcome that risks undermining confidence in how QLDC allocates the costs of growth. Residents are being asked to absorb a significantly higher increase than most of the district, despite having had limited influence over the development decisions and infrastructure planning that have led to this situation, and not being provided with sufficient transparency around costing to assess its fairness, or lack of.</p> <p>1. Growth and Infrastructure Planning (Longview Development)</p> <p>The Longview subdivision was progressed under the Special Housing Area framework and supported by QLDC despite well-documented concerns from the Hāwea Community Association regarding the adequacy and timing of supporting infrastructure, particularly water and wastewater services.</p> <p>The Draft Annual Plan acknowledges the district is experiencing rapid growth that has “consistently exceeded predictions” and is placing significant pressure on infrastructure and services (p.5). In addition, major investment is now required to upgrade wastewater infrastructure in the Upper Clutha, including connecting Hāwea to the Project Pure treatment plant (p.8).</p> <p>This reinforces that growth has outpaced infrastructure delivery, and current residents are now being asked to fund the consequences of those earlier planning decisions despite having limited influence over them.</p> <p>2. Equity of Rates Relative to Services Provided</p> <p>Historically, Lake Hāwea rates have been lower than other parts of the district, reflecting both lower capital values and a lower level of service provision.</p> <p>The proposed increase would bring Hāwea rates closer to those of higher-service areas without a corresponding increase in services or amenity. This creates an inequitable situation where residents are effectively paying more while continuing to receive fewer services.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	-----------	--	--

Weir	Michael		<p>Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth, the current approach is shifting too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified — it is whether they are actually affordable in reality. At present, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit. It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. 3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only. In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Whitaker	Jenny		<p>I am writing to oppose the large rate increases for residents in Lake Hāwea .</p> <p>It is too much, especially when it's hard to see what we're actually getting for it . There's very little visible investment back into the area.</p> <p>What's also worrying is the amount of development happening, and the sense that existing residents are the ones effectively paying for the infrastructure that supports that growth. Roads, services, and upgrades are needed and this cost should be carried by the developers.</p> <p>On top of that, the proposed rise simply isn't affordable for many house holds. I strongly ask that you reconsider the scale of this rates increase.</p> <p>Right now, this increase just feels hard to justify.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Wieben	Sanne		<p>Subject: Submission on QLDC Draft Annual Plan 2026/27 – Inequitable Rates for Luggate To Queenstown Lakes District Council Tēnā koutou, Re: Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026/27 I am a Luggate resident and oppose the proposed rate increases of 29.3% for Luggate. I do not wish to speak at a hearing.</p> <p>Concerns: Unfair burden on working families Luggate faces a 29.3% median rates rise, an increase of \$1342.00 per year for our household. Hāwea faces 22.3%. Lake Hāwea and Luggate have the lowest median property values in the district. Working families, tradespeople and retirees bear the burden — not wealthy holiday-home owners. Inconsistent treatment vs Kingston Kingston’s new water/wastewater scheme is ~75% larger in capital cost than the UCCS, yet its rates rise is 11.1% — a third of Luggate’s. Council’s Kingston Rates Fact Sheet, March 2026, says it would be “unfair to begin full cost recovery now” as the scheme is “not yet operational”. \$130,000 was deferred. The UCCS is also not operational. Council’s September 2025 note confirms completion in early 2027. Yet Hāwea and Luggate are charged in full now. Affordability and social impact Rates for many Luggate families , rate will be a cumulative increase of 51% in 2 years if this proposed increase comes into place. As a young family with 2 young kids how does this council think we can pay an extra \$ 1342 annual ? With the cost of living , mortgage petrol cost and food prices rising how can we afford to live in Luggate ? <u>We moved here from Queenstown because Luggate was affordable</u></p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems. As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure. Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network. Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average. Kingston does not currently have any properties eligible for reticulated water because the titles have not yet been issued; as a result, no water charges can be applied for water supply. No wastewater service is currently available in Kingston. This work is still in planning.</p>
Williams	Amy		<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers. Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on. Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment

Williams	Kawhata		<p>Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers. Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.</p> <p>Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p>	no comment
Williamson	Liz		<p>Rates increases Location: Hawea</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure</p> <p>While I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth. It seems for Hawea that we are being asked to pay for infrastructure to support expansion that its community neither asked for nor is sustainable. Fast tracking by government has led to a Developers extravaganza in our region leaving existing ratepayers holding the bill.</p> <p>However the issue is beyond whether increases can be justified — now whether they are actually affordable in reality. As proposed, they are not. As a long term Hawea property owner we have not seen an increase in council services to match the huge increase in rates. I expect we will be paying for the Wanaka-Hawea road to be widened next as the developers disappear off into the sunset</p> <p>There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Winton	Patricia		<p>I strongly oppose the proposal for a 22.3% increase in our rates. We have been rate payers here since 1981 and paid for connection to water and sewerage sometime later now you are expecting us retirees and many others on fixed incomes to add to our already exorbitant rate bill to complete infrastructure that should have been in place before developments such as Longview were allowed to take place.</p> <p>I ask that any rate rise be brought into the district average range as Kingston's has been.</p> <p>I Remain Patricia Winton</p> <p>**Received via Lets Talk email. Submitted by QLDC.</p>	no comment
Wither	Deirdre		<p>My submission relates to the proposed rates increase in Luggate (I would like to note that Hawea is facing a similar financial burden but as a ratepayer from Luggate I feel better informed to speak to the Luggate scenario)</p> <p>I oppose this part of the plan change</p> <p>My reasons for opposing this part of the plan change are</p> <p>When I purchased my property in the Luggate village subdivision in 2011 water and waste water services were provided and functional. Luggate and Hawea at the time were the affordable options to buy and build for those who had to work and save to buy their own home.</p> <p>After some years council decided that wastewater needed to be redirected to project pure, despite the fact that Luggate village already had an existing waste system. The developer who took the Luggate village subdivision over from Jim Boult had offered to add the new stages of development to the existing village waste water treatment plant and continue maintaining this system. The council decided instead to connect Luggate wastewater to project pure. This decision ensured that the new Lake McKay subdivision had wastewater treatment - (they were not part of Luggate village) and also provided for future developments in the area and the new hall. It also gave an opportunity for a few of the older homes in Luggate to move from the septic tank system.</p> <p>Continuing development in the Luggate area has also meant that the existing water capacity was not adequate to service the expanded number of households, new proposed developments such as Corbridge estate and the airport. This necessitated a new bore to provide a sufficient supply to the existing residents as well as</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure.</p> <p>Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p>

Wither	David	<p>Kia ora, Please accepted this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027 My submitter details are: Name: David Wither Address: 36 Alice Burn Drive, Luggate 9383 Phone: 027 8139 666 Email: davidwither@gmail.com</p> <p>Submission on QLDC Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027 My submission relates to the proposed rates increase for Luggate properties. I oppose this part of the plan. My reasons for opposing this part of the plan My mother is a ratepayer in Luggate Village. She purchased her property in 2011 when the subdivision had functional water and wastewater services. I am submitting separately because I want to support my mother and the other residents of Luggate who are being asked to shoulder costs that should not be theirs to bear. The core problem is cost allocation, not cost Council acknowledges that the infrastructure driving Luggate's above average rates increases — the connection to Project Pure, water supply upgrades — is growth-driven. Deputy Mayor Quentin Smith has described the Upper Clutha wastewater investment as "largely to accommodate growth." Councillor King told the Luggate Community Association the town would "bear the brunt" of costs linked to water upgrades, Project Pure, and future development.</p> <p>The Development Contributions Policy under the LGA 2002 exists to ensure that parties who create additional demand on infrastructure contribute to the cost they impose. If this infrastructure is largely for growth, the cost should be largely recovered through developer contributions — not loaded onto existing ratepayers at nearly three times the district average increase.</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>
--------	-------	--	---

Wolfen	Rosemary		<p>I am writing to oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>As a young, working family based in Hāwea, with a child attending Hāwea Flat School, we are already feeling the cumulative impact of rising costs across every part of daily life. Over recent years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have increased well beyond what households like ours can reasonably keep up with. These increases haven't been one-off — they've compounded year after year, and they are now reaching a level that feels unsustainable.</p> <p>Like many others in our community, we are managing mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and childcare alongside the general cost of living. Rates are a fixed cost — we don't have the option to reduce or defer them. When they continue to rise at this pace, it creates ongoing pressure on our ability to stay and thrive in the area.</p> <p>We understand that Council is facing real challenges, particularly around infrastructure and growth. However, the current approach appears to be placing too much of that burden on existing ratepayers. The question is no longer whether increases can be justified in theory, but whether they are genuinely affordable in practice. From where we stand, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where we believe Council needs to reconsider its approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordability must be treated as a firm limit. Acknowledging that increases are difficult is not enough. There needs to be a clear boundary around what households can realistically sustain, regardless of future plans. 2. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be greater confidence that all efficiencies have 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	----------	--	---	--

Yarrell	Peter	<p>Introduction . Be assured I am cognisant of the complexities of establishing and maintaining a fair and balanced intake stream of funding that covers costs necessary for the functioning and well being of the citizens your Council oversees.</p> <p>What I question and discuss in this document asks the question; "Is this the time to review the rating system so that it speaks fairly and equitably to those who shudder annually at the thought of clicking on their Rates Demands to ascertain if they are signalling to the owner "you will have to sell" it is all getting too unaffordable to live here... or don't sell and try to stay another year if we possibly can in this treasured location.</p> <p>' How long can we afford to live in this gorgeous place we have invested in years ago, and grown to love, amongst neighbours, friends and family.</p> <p>An example. But representative of many rate payers on fixed incomes.</p> <p>My wife and I decided to retire here in Queenstown in 2016. We were 75 and 73 respectively. We looked at the costs of home build and land purchase and rates. Then we did our sums and felt that if the Council rates if adjusted up in line with our Govt super we could live with that. We purchased in Threepwood where Body Corporate rates are added on top of your Council rates, as the body Corp looks after some assets that otherwise QLDC would.(so this is reflected in a slight reduction in our Council rates) totally that is now approaching \$13000 a year.</p> <p>In total the payment of our rates takes 35% of our Govt Super. So we naturally ask ...</p> <p>What has happened to cause this?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cost of services increasing. 2. The rating system the Council uses to tie the provision of its services to the current market value of everyone's property. <p>In this area, as you know, Hungry wealthy overseas buyers with unlimited funds. spending up large. are in effect piggy backing</p>	<p>QLDC is bound by the Local Government Act and Local Government Rating Act. QLDC is required to produce a Long Term Plan (LTP) for ten years and QLDC is currently in the process of developing the next LTP for 2027-37. Annual Plans such as this one are used in the interim two years to adjust for any unforecasted changes. Part of the LTP is to review the levels of service and capital projects that are provided and who should pay. A key principle in the current LTP is that growth pays for growth via the Development Contributions Policy. All these policies and the Financial Strategy will all be out for community consultation in early 2027.</p>
---------	-------	---	---

Yates	Luke		<p>The proposed Rates increases for Luggate seem entirely disproportionate to the scale of the services required for the community. The majority of residents moved here because it is relatively affordable compared to the rest of the region and to expect a family to sustain a 29% increase in the current financial climate is insane. Overall, I support development and understand that it must be paid for, but an increase on this scale just can't be right. I have a few thoughts outlined below.</p> <p>1. I don't understand how an increase of 29% can be justified. Surely the scale of the wastewater upgrade is vastly too big for 185 households if a cost of this magnitude is required to cover it. The planning and communication around Rates rises seems to be a total mess as well.</p> <p>2. Why are developers not paying more of the infrastructure bill? They are planning the subdivisions that require massive upgrades in systems and stand to make profits from the developments. Surely the burden should fall mainly on them.</p> <p>3. How does this region not have a tourism levy? The stress on systems is massively increased by tourism and second-home owners, but locals are left to cover the infrastructure costs. Soon there will be no service workers left to cater for the people visiting the region because they can't afford to live here.</p> <p>4. Council need to make it easier to pay, and to defer payments when the cost of living continue to climb. Late penalties and credit card fees make the problem worse. Help people to pay when they can - very few people want to be late.</p> <p>5. Households not connected to the wastewater system should not be expected to contribute to the costs for it unless they choose to connect. Increasing their rates would be charging them twice. Either for the cost to connect, or the costs for running a septic system - plus a rates increase.</p>	<p>QLDC recognises the importance of affordability in the current economic climate. While the district-wide average rates increase is 11.6%, some smaller communities are seeing increases above 20%. This is primarily driven by a significant lift in the Level of Service (LOS) as several townships transition to modern reticulated water and wastewater systems.</p> <p>As these new services are connected to your property, your rates adjustment covers essential infrastructure costs and the loan repayments required to build and maintain these systems. During this transition, residents in these areas will see a more sizable increase as we move toward providing safer, more resilient, and fully compliant services. Projects are divided into Level of Service (LOS), which uses ratepayer funding to maintain and improve existing assets and bring new services to existing properties, and Growth, which is funded by Development Contributions (DCs) to support new infrastructure.</p> <p>Development Contributions: When a developer builds a new house or subdivides land in Luggate, they must pay a one-off fee called a Development Contribution. This money is ring-fenced to fund the capital projects needed to expand the capacity of the network.</p> <p>Important: The reticulated water rate applies only once services become operational and available at your property. Until that connection is accessible, you will not be billed for this service, and your rates increase will remain closer to the council average.</p>
Youngman	Ben	Wai Wanaka	<p>Please see attached our submission, outlining our position and recommendations to council.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you further and look forward to working with QLDC in the successful achievement of the outlined objectives and outcomes.</p>	no comment