

Surname	First Name	Organisation	Response	Contribution	RO Comment
Anderson	Lynnette		Neutral	N/A	no comment
Aotearoa	Protect Our Winters	Protect Our Winters New Zealand incorporated	Support	<p>1. The lakefront and town centre development. This means more recreation, closer to town, and easily accessible by locals and visitors without having to drive. A pedestrian friendly lakefront-downtown connection will be good for everyone, and the climate.</p> <p>3. Shared paths and active transport. It's essential that an active transport network be planned and implemented now, before significantly more development happens and an active transport network has to be retrofitted. A safe and separated network will provide more choices for how people can get around, and means more people will be able to bike and walk safely and efficiently. POW also specifically supports a Ballentyne rd active transport corridor.</p> <p>10. Timsfield Park. This is important to provide outdoor recreation for everyone who lives in and visits Hawea.</p> <p>12. Community communication and engagement. POW would like to see more opportunities for people of all ages and income levels, permanent and seasonal locals to engage with the local leaders on the WUCCB. POW supports the proposal for both participative and deliberative engagement approaches, and also supports wider educational campaigns for civics and sustainability. POW would love to be specifically consulted with, and have our members engaged with. We have many members who have spent a lot of time in other similar mountain towns around the world.</p> <p>13. Public transport. YES! The current fuel crisis is highlighting how few choices people who live in Wanaka have for how to get around. It is unfortunately a town designed for driving. It is very challenging to live in Wanaka without a car and this shouldn't be the case. Seasonal employees should be able to move to Wanaka for the winter and not have to buy a car. Visitors should be able to come to Wanaka and not have to rent a car. The QLDC and the WUCCB need to be loud and clear with their</p>	The Wānaka Lakefront Development Plan (stages 1-5) focuses on enhancing amenity, access, and public space for the local community. Stage 4 is the only uncompleted stage. The Stage 4 pathway project aims to improve safety and connectivity by providing a wider, more direct route for commuters away from the playground area. This upgrade aligns with the wider Development Plan's objectives for better wayfinding while maintaining flexibility for future innovative designs. Currenly Stage 4 of the plan is in years 8-10 of the (24-34) LTP. No budget has been allocated for the Stage 4 pathway.
Barratt	Kevin		Support	Priority must be given to minimise any non-essential rate rises in 2026-2027. We are pensioners and struggling to pay these	no comment
Barry	Robert		No response	In response to the Annual Plan consultation I'd like to let you know that I support the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board's priority projects as part of the Draft Annual Plan 2026/27. In particular, I support investment in active transport, including expanding shared paths, completing missing links in the walking and cycling network. These projects are important for improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, and supporting a more connected and accessible community.	no comment
bayc	angie		Oppose	Rates should be kept to basic services- water, rubbish, library etc The community board can be funded by community users.	no comment

Beable	Barbara	Aspiring Athletics Club Wanaka	Oppose	I have concerns that rugby and football are prioritised ahead of other equally important infrastructure requirements that have been ignored and neglected over time - such as an all-weather athletics track. These male dominated sports have not considered the female sporting youth who have chosen not to play a contact sport or feel uncomfortable in the male dominated football environment. Athletics should not be penalised because of this. Has any thought been given to supporting the truly global sport of athletics that caters for all sizes and shapes while developing the basic platform essential to provide safe and rewarding sporting activities whether it be competitive or recreational? As our national sport, Rugby receives support from multiple sponsors and have facilities that are far superior to any other sporting code in the region and yet still get priority treatment in allocation of these community funds.	The 2020 Regional Sport & Recreation Facility Strategy supported the 24-34 Long Term Plan and priority investments for Council, based on current demand and future needs. Sports clubs (including athletics) were consulted with to understand immediate and future needs in order to prioritise investment. The report identified a number of gaps in the provision of sporting facilities across the region and short, medium and long term recommendations were produced. Council Officers are currently underway with an update to this strategy to inform the Long Term Plan.
Beacham	Jason		Oppose	Not a single project is benefiting Luggate. Most of the projects are supporting tourists and tourism. Yet we are paying for it. Can them or at least postpone them until a better funding solution is found.	no comment
Beacham	Joanne		Oppose	A lot of this is just to make Wanaka more "beautiful". How about this money go towards what is really needed by upgrading Wanaka, Luggate, Lake Hawea's infrastructure. Everyone who lives and visits here will benefit. Things don't	no comment
Bell	Ronald		Support	Lets work on infrastructure first.	no comment

Bendle	Hannah		Support	<p>Some -Some projects I just don't think are priority enough to be shifting funds away from our future selves..</p> <p>1a. Roys Bay Jetty/ pier - in favour. The wharf needs an upgrade, it looks shabby as heck and used to be more of an icon than that tree... I agree that it needs to be done and the earlier it happens the cheaper it'll be. Something cool but not OTT expensive. The floating stairs are pretty cool and would become a pretty cool photo op for tourists.</p> <p>1b. Wanaka Lakefront dev - unsure, stage 4 in favour as a stand alone. A quick win potentially. Stage 6 hard to talk to without any costs. DOn't think it needs to be a priority to move forward? Helwick street dev - can some budget be pulled forward to keep this moving... been spoken about for years... use some budget for detailed design and then have construction in the next budget?</p> <p>2a. Artificial sports fields - opposed - not a priority to bring funds forward. I would be interested in seeing who wants a rugby field made of turf.. can we extend the current hockey to a full size? What is the expected return on this? So over seeing 'not suitable for full sized games' man either we are doing it once and doing it right or we are not doing it...</p> <p>2b.. I think opposed - great idea for the future, how can we relocate rec centre and make it bigger and better.. any traffic we can take out of three parks the better. We are hosting more and more tournaments in lots of sports and having a space that supports large numbers will be a fantastic selling point and bringing people into town. The rec centre is screaming out for new floors and a new roof now, can we just get this fixed before thinking of bringing budget forward for a massive project?</p> <p>3. Shared paths and Active Transport - In favour - wanaka is such a fantastic town for active modes</p> <p>9. . Wānaka Performing Arts Centre - in favour</p>	<p>2a. The proposed investigation into a new artificial turf is focused on a longer pile multisport surface for sports such as football and rugby not a hockey/short pile field like what is currently at Wānaka Recreation Centre. Artificial turfs deliver approximately 40 hours of use per week compared to a soil-based field which has 10-15 hours of use and can be used in all weathers unlike soil fields. The draft Wanaka Recreation Centre Masterplan indicated that in the long term a full sized hockey turf would be required at either Wanaka Recreation Centre or elsewhere in the Upper Clutha area due to increased player numbers and population growth. 2b. The Ballantyne Road Sports Hub has been proposed as the future recreation and sporting "green space" for the Upper Clutha area and is based on the current and future needs of the sporting clubs and community groups of the Wānaka/Upper Clutha area. New wooden sports flooring at Wānaka Recreation Centre is programmed to be installed in December 2026 and Council officers continue to work with the contractor around fixing any roof leaks and this should be concluded by the end of the year.</p>
Booiman	Arda		Oppose	we can't stand still	no comment
Brake	Natalie		Oppose	<p>We support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board in part.</p> <p>We support the Community Board's role in identifying local needs, but we strongly object to "bringing forward" funding for discretionary projects while the district faces an affordability crisis.</p> <p>Council must prioritize essential infrastructure and maintenance (like the water upgrades) over "nice-to-have" projects. Until the financial discrepancies mentioned in community meetings (such as the unaccounted \$4 million and the use of the \$8 million surplus) are resolved, and until the 29.1% increase is significantly lowered, we cannot support the allocation of resources to new priority projects that aren't critical for safety or basic service.</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>

Brown	Lynette		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment
Brown	Emma		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment
Brown	Ian		Support	<p>Local council members should be in touch with their community and have far more idea of what it is the specific community wants as opposed to Queenstown counsellor's who focus on their own specific area and have for too long fed off the rates paid by the local Wanaka community.</p>	no comment

Burgess	Emma		Oppose	<p>It is difficult to justify supporting a higher rates burden when a portion of that increase is tied to “priority projects” that are not relevant or accessible to my local area. At the same time, there are clear opportunities within Hāwea—such as improvements to the Main Street, including safer and more accessible walkways—that would have a direct and meaningful impact on residents here, yet do not appear to be prioritised.</p> <p>I would strongly encourage a more equitable approach to planning and funding, where “priority” reflects the needs of all communities contributing to the rates pool. Ensuring that Hāwea also receives visible and practical investment would make any proposed increases feel more balanced and justifiable.</p>	<p>The QLDC rating system uses a model that balances property value, location, and fixed service fees.</p> <p>Capital Value (CV) based rates covering General, Roothing, Stormwater, and Governance ensure that higher-value properties contribute more to infrastructure and district-wide services, though Roothing and Stormwater costs are ring-fenced to specific Wards.</p> <p>Fixed Annual Charges, such as the UAGC, Waste, and Library rates, act as a "flat fee" where every household contributes equally regardless of wealth.</p> <p>Water and Sewerage are Location-Based, meaning the costs of local upgrades are borne specifically by the residents connected to those schemes; this creates a high financial burden on smaller communities like Luggate and Hawea, as there is a smaller ratepayer base to absorb significant infrastructure investment.</p>
Cooper	Ben		Support	Some of these projects are nice to haves and can be cancelled while proposed rates increases in Hawea and Luggate are 22% and 29% respectively	no comment
Cotter	Guy	Adventure Consultants Ltd	Support	Would rather funds were used to cover infrastructure costs so we can avoid ongoing rate rises for projects that developers should have paid for. Do we really need to spend more on Wanaka lakefront while areas like Hawea are neglected (while being lumped with 11+% rates rises?)	no comment
Cranfield	Jose		Support	Although I would argue that a Stage 4 pathway only project should not be a priority as access already exists in this area and it could inhibit innovative design of the full stage 4 lakefront development. Development of a Stage 6 to the lakefront development and the design of the jetty should both draw from Manawa Kai Tahu as a starting point. And I am in favour of point 15 being further developed with a strong focus on nature-based Infrastructure projects that align with climate adaptation (we need to start building with the research already available).	<p>The Stage 4 pathway project is intended to provide a wider, safer, and more direct route for active and shared path users by offering an alternative commuter route away from the playground. It will improve connectivity between different stages of the lakefront and provide clear wayfinding for the community. This pathway upgrade aligns with the objectives of the Lakefront Development Plan and enables the community to be better provided for during planning and design phase of the wider Stage 4 development.</p> <p>The pathway upgrade does not preclude innovative design for the broader Stage 4 development. Further design work and community consultation will continue as part of the future Stage 4 process.</p> <p>The Stage 6 design will be developed in partnership with mana whenua to appropriately reflect the cultural and environmental significance of the area. While aspects of the jetty design may be pre-designed or prefabricated, Council will work with mana whenua where opportunities arise to meaningfully incorporate cultural artwork and design, reflecting mana whenua connections to the lakefront.</p> <p>Council also supports the further development of nature-based infrastructure initiatives and recognises the importance of aligning lakefront projects with climate adaptation principles informed by existing research and best practice. These principles will be incorporated into design briefs for all project teams.</p>
Cro	Hayden		Oppose	Were already in a extremely pricey area you gota give the average worker a chance to catch up just do projects slowmey	no comment

Cross	Nicola		Oppose	<p>I would like to acknowledge and express support for the priority projects identified by the Wānaka–Upper Clutha Community Board.</p> <p>The Board is uniquely positioned to understand the needs of the Upper Clutha community. As local residents themselves, members of the Board live and work within the district and experience firsthand the pressures, growth, and infrastructure challenges facing Wānaka and surrounding areas such as Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Importantly, the Board maintains a direct and ongoing connection with the community. Through regular engagement with local residents, businesses, sports groups, and community organisations, they have a clear and grounded understanding of what is genuinely needed versus what can wait.</p> <p>For this reason, their prioritisation of projects reflects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real, on-the-ground community need, rather than top-down planning Direct feedback from local groups and stakeholders who actively use these facilities An understanding of how growth is impacting daily life in Wānaka and the Upper Clutha Practical insight into what infrastructure will deliver the most value to the community <p>There is strong value in trusting this locally informed perspective. The Board provides a critical link between Council and the community, ensuring that decision-making is informed by those who are directly affected.</p>	no comment
-------	--------	--	--------	---	------------

Cross	Simon		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary funding decisions remain transparent and justified affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one <p>If you want, I can turn this into a strong “yes/no submission statement” or a more critical response depending on the stance you want to take.</p>	no comment
-------	-------	--	--------	--	------------

Dempster	Gina	Wastebusters	Support	<p>Lease for an expanded Wastebusters site</p> <p>We have much appreciated the formalising of Council support for the expansion of Wastebusters during the past year. We look forward to completing this process with the signing of the lease in the near future.</p> <p>The support of the Wānaka Community Board has been a highly valued part of this journey.</p> <p>Receiving a Letter of Intent in October 2025 to expand Wastebusters site enabled the team to progress relationship-building with funders and applications for external funding to build Wastebusters 2.0, with the goal of raising around \$15 million to build the new facility.</p> <p>Wastebusters 2.0 will be a flagship zero waste hub encompassing resource recovery (reuse, recycling, repair, upcycling), a construction and demolition hub, and education centre and remakery (workshops, school groups, tours, skill-sharing etc). The new facility will future-proof Wastebusters delivery for the next 25 years, and divert significantly greater amounts of waste, increasing to over 5,000 tonnes from landfill per annum from 2034.</p> <p>Support of active travel We support the expansion of shared path networks, increase safety and support active travel in the Upper Clutha. Wastebusters employs a team of 55, and welcomes 130,000 visitors to our site every year. We encourage our team (and visitors) to choose active travel options where possible, and many of our staff bike to work regularly.</p>	The proposed "Wastebusters 2.0" concept aligns strongly with Council's WMMP 2025–2031. Wastebusters is identified in the WMMP as a key delivery partner and has played a significant, pivotal role in resource recovery, reuse, education, and community engagement across the district for the last 25 years. Following discussions with, and support from the WUCCB, in September 2025, Council issued a non-binding Letter of Intent confirming its support for Wastebusters pursuing external funding, including from the Ministry for the Environment's Waste Minimisation Fund, and committing to work collaboratively to identify additional land on the Ballantyne Road site to support their future expansion plans. The Letter of Intent was explicitly provided to enable funding applications to progress and does not pre-determine any future Council decisions in relation to lease amendments or land allocation. The Ballantyne Road site is also in the planning stages of reconfiguring the existing Wanaka Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) and the potential future development of a new Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). The RTS construction completion is forecast for December 2027 and the MRF procurement outcome due August 2026. The timing, scale, and location of any additional land available to Wastebusters therefore remain subject to further operational planning, statutory requirements, and formal Council decision-making processes.
Devonda	Stevee		Oppose	Doesn't affect me	no comment
Doherty	Patricia		Oppose	As I live in Lake Hawea we are part of the wanaka ward so I am paying for things in an area i dont live in.	no comment
Dowsett	Adam		Support	Fully supportive to realise funded community projects where the need is now.	no comment
Drury	Michael		Oppose	Nice that some of the funds were used for the Luggate Community Hall; it would also be nice if some funds were allocated to the Luggate park and tennis courts. But up to the	no comment
Eden-mann	Oliver		Neutral	<p>I support the Wānaka–Upper Clutha Community Board's priority projects as part of the Draft Annual Plan 2026/27. In particular, I support investment in active transport, including expanding shared paths, completing missing links in the walking and cycling network. These projects are important for improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, and supporting a more connected and accessible community.</p> <p>If you want it reworded, shortened, or adapted for a formal submission, email, or public comment, just say the word.</p>	no comment
English	Sharon	NA	Oppose	Unaffordable	no comment

Fernandez	Eva		Support	I believe most of the projects are based on the waterfront for tourists not really for locals...	The Wānaka Lakefront Development Plan (2016) was shaped through public consultation. While the lakefront is enjoyed by visitors, the intent of the Plan and associated upgrades is to enhance amenity, access, and the quality of public space for the Wānaka community, both now and into the future. The area is heavily used by a wide range of local community and sports groups, as well as for passive recreation by residents. Any upgrade plans continue to be shared and communicated with the community, and Council remains committed to ongoing engagement to ensure proposals are appropriate and reflect community needs.
FOLEY	Patricia	Patricia Foley	Oppose	I do support most of these projects, however a bit concerned about the Helwick st project, will this allow for any flood banks in the future. Helwick street can flood and has flooded in the past up to Brownston st. There is a need for transport network in the Wanaka upperclutha area this should take priority due to risking petrol costs and cost of living. Priority over such things as the park in Tims Field and the pathway from Mt Aspiring to Wanaka water park.	no comment
Forrest	Michelle		Oppose	I do not support progressing any of the proposed priority projects in the current Annual Plan. Residents are already facing significant cost-of-living pressures, higher interest rates, and rising essential expenses, and this is not the right time to add further financial burden. While I support the long-term intent of these projects, the priorities and timing are not appropriate in the present economic environment. These costs should only be incurred when the community can reasonably afford them, not during a period of financial strain. Council should focus on essential infrastructure, compliance obligations, and core services, and defer all non-urgent or lower-priority projects until economic conditions improve. Doing so would reduce pressure on ratepayers and demonstrate responsible financial management.	no comment
Gabbusch	Christine		Oppose	The economy is going into a recession. Like many people have had to cut back and put plans on hold. The council also need to reflect on the economic climate and put money into needs not wants.	no comment
Galland	Lucy		Oppose	Yes but there needs to be clearer transparency on what part of the community these projects relate to and where existing funding from these communities (i.e. development contributions) are being utilised towards these projects	no comment
Gasson	Craig		Oppose	I support the idea of integrating the lake connection to Helwick street with a new Jetty. Sports fields for a growing town must include more than just the fields themselves.	Council officers have developed a Sports Field Plan 2024 which looks at the development of new fields, renewing existing fields and development of new artificial turfs/fields. This will form the basis of future investment into new/existing sports field developments. Along with the fields themselves ancillary facilities such as changerooms, toilets, floodlights, carparking, storage for equipment etc has also been identified for investment.
Grant	Sue		Oppose	Only some of the suggestions are worthy.	no comment

Green	Shane		Oppose	I have read the plan and personally there is no benefit to me but see how it can benefit others.	no comment
Hall	Nicholas		Neutral	See attached	no comment
Hamilton	Daniel		Oppose	Priority should be on infrastructure and not nicety's. This is what needs to change. We need to stop spending on the wants and only move forward with the needs until rates and spending is brought under control. It is out of hand and qldc needs to address this.	no comment
Hamilton	Daniel Jordahn		Oppose	Only Priorty should be for infrastructure. Nothing else at this stage until rates are under control. No new nicety projects.	no comment
harding	jennie		Support	seems well thought out and good projects to be focusing on	no comment
HOLDOM	Jan		Neutral	Because Wanaka-Upper Clutha area deserves to be a priority for a change.	no comment
Hopper	Saskia		Oppose	These can wait until our economy is stable.	no comment
Howard	Ant	Lake Wānaka Arts and Culture Charitable Trust	No response	Please find a letter outlining the Lake Wānaka Arts and Culture Charitable Trust's submission to the Annual Plan.	no comment
Joll	Linda	Cardrona Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association	Neutral	Development Plan, A new jetty proposal, deserve larger community consultation rather than decisions by the upper clutha community board. These are all community assets, and community consultation should include all communities. Our Cardrona community would like to see accessways for our village, safe accessways to connect our village to residential areas, and back to Wānaka, the focus of the board is centred on the CBD.	The Wanaka Lakefront development plan has previously sharerd with community for feedback.Woprkshops are scheduled for the jetty and 'stage 6' May 2026 and officers will seek direction about the level of engagment with the community. While location of the jetty replacment may change the intenention is to build a 'like for like' replacement.
Jongeneel	Gijsbertus		Oppose	Too much development money has gone elsewhere but not to Hawea for years.	no comment
Knight	Jo		Neutral	I think we should be utilising these funds for shared pathways and sports fields.	no comment
Krogh	Marian		Support	Delaying these projects will result in extra costs later on and more community disconnect. Specifically I would like to support the lakefront and town centre re-development. I would love to be able to easily connect downtown with the lakefront, cross the road easily, bike easily, and have a beautiful scenic area that is car-free. Visitors would also like the same. It will mean less driving from both locals and visitors, increased business to the downtown area, healthier communities and environment. Item number 13 - public transport needs to continuously and persistently be advocated for by the community board. It's unacceptable that there's still no public transport in or connecting Wanaka. Secondly I would like to support the active transport corridors, especially Ballentyne road and the new roundabout. This is going to be way easier to do ASAP, rather than wait for development along Ballentyne rd and then trying to retrofit bike paths later on. I support and underpass at the roundabout so that you can easily and safely bike from Albert town to three parks.	The Wānaka Lakefront Development Plan (stages 1-5) focuses on enhancing amenity, access, and public space for the local community. Stage 4 is the only uncompleted stage. The Stage 4 pathway project aims to improve safety and connectivity by providing a wider, more direct route for commuters away from the playground area. This upgrade aligns with the wider Development Plan's objectives for better wayfinding while maintaining flexibility for future innovative designs. Currently Stage 4 of the plan is in years 8-10 of the (24-34) LTP. No budget has been allocated for the Stage 4 pathway.

Ledgerwood	Jim		Support	<p>There is a real problem with this survey. Every time you look at the summary involved then try to go back to the submission, all the previous material is wiped and you have to start over again.</p> <p>Interesting that you say the council's is influenced by material gathered at the election. Councillors. MAY. have listened but council officials certainly do not. Much of what we the voters suggested, was completely ignore. Council keeps on conducting surveys that are ignored in favour of being twisted to give the results council wants Why ask us, or even conduct the survey ??</p>	The priority projects included in the consultation summary were recommended directly by the Wanaka-Upper Clutha community board following their own engagement with the community. The issue with the survey could have been browser related but generally speaking, testing indicated this should not have been happening as summary documents are set to open in a new window.
Lin	Eric		Support	<p>I do not support bringing forward funding or additional resourcing for these priority projects at this time.</p> <p>While I understand the intent behind progressing community projects, the current financial environment needs to come first. Many households are already under significant pressure from rising costs, and accelerating spending will likely translate into further rates increases.</p> <p>In my view, priority should be given to essential infrastructure and safety-related work only. Non-essential or discretionary projects should be deferred until there is greater financial capacity and affordability improves for ratepayers.</p> <p>At the moment, bringing projects forward risks adding to an already unsustainable cost burden for the local community.</p>	no comment
Macdonald	Jacqueline		Support	<p>Wanaka is growing quickly, any extra resources are appreciated to support the community</p>	no comment
Matheson	Liz		Neutral	<p>Cost</p>	no comment
Mcneill	Kirsty		Support	<p>I dont know enough about this at this point</p>	no comment
Meredith	Dave		Support	<p>They have very great ideas that need funding but for some reason all the money and resources goes to Queenstown instead of being divided up</p>	no comment
Mewhinney	Judith		Oppose	<p>There are better priorities that should be looked at</p>	no comment

Meyer	Andre		Support	<p>As a resident of Hāwea, I'm concerned that the current proposal places significant focus on Wānaka, with only limited benefit for Hāwea—primarily a children's playground.</p> <p>For many years, Hāwea residents have paid comparable rates while receiving fewer services and infrastructure. Given that context, it would be fair to see more meaningful investment directed toward Hāwea, particularly in areas that address long-standing gaps.</p> <p>The shared cost of the wastewater upgrade, split 50/50, adds further pressure. For many in Hāwea, this feels disproportionate and contributes to a growing sense that the community is being overlooked.</p> <p>I also note that there were expectations of stronger advocacy for Hāwea at the council level. Recent decisions have made it harder for residents to feel confident that those concerns are being fully represented when the Mayor supported the proposed rates in small communities.</p> <p>If this funding is intended to benefit the wider district, then there should be clear consideration for communities like Hāwea that have historically had fewer resources. Targeted investment here would not only address existing inequities but also recognise the significant effort local residents already put into building and supporting community facilities.</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>
Moser	Jill		Oppose	As below	no comment
O'Callaghan	Kate		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment

O'Callaghan	Stu		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment
O'Connor	Amy		No response	<p>I support the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board's priority projects as part of the Draft Annual Plan 2026/27. In particular, I support investment in active transport, including expanding shared paths, completing missing links in the walking and cycling network. These projects are important for improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, and supporting a more connected and accessible community.</p>	<p>A programme of interventions including active travel elements has been formulated and is being put forward into the long list of proposals for the LTP. These are intended to start in 2027 but are subject to both QLDC funding availability and NZTA funding assistance being provided.</p>
Overton	Tom		Support	<p>Wanaka is usually overlooked in favour of Queenstown therefore prioritising funding to Wanaka is supported</p>	no comment
Parker	Pamela	Private	Support	<p>Given the current financial situation of many people in the area, all non-essential items should be deferred. Vanity projects across the district (including the QEC squash courts) should be shelved until the district has a handle on rates.</p>	<p>The annual plan does not include a project for squash courts at QEC. We do have a project approved in the LTP 24-34 for new indoor courts at QEC and are in the design phase. Squash courts are not included in the core scope approved by the previous Council.</p>
Penfold	Rachel		Oppose	<p>Unlike the qldc council they are part of this community and therefore have an understanding of what we need.</p>	no comment
Piggot	Jan		Oppose	<p>This was covered in my submission above. We are funding our own infrastructure, a must have. Why should Luggate residents be asked to fund what are mostly nice-to-haves in Wanaka?</p>	no comment
Polson	Olle		Neutral	<p>I am in particular in support of improved active shared paths proposal this is a meaningful addition to the local infrastructure that fits with the wider plans of the district for central Otago to be a destination for activity and adventure both for tourism and locals this seems like an easy way to achieve both</p>	<p>A programme of interventions including active travel elements has been formulated and is being put forward into the long list of proposals for the LTP. These are intended to start in 2027 but are subject to both QLDC funding availability and NZTA funding assistance being provided.</p>
Preston	Alexia		Support	<p>Bring forward priority 3, shared paths and active transport. This is critical for our community, above all else.</p>	no comment

RADLEY	Michael		Support	Funding projects need to be balanced with Rates. Its ridiculous to bring forward UV treatment for Luggate that was scheduled in 2028. No Cryptosporidium in Luggate. It has added a huge increase in our rates. The size of the Pipes far exceed Luggates requirements. It maybe 20 years before that capacity is reached. To prove you have read this, take two minutes to acknowledge this submission. mkradley@gmail.com	The acceleration of Luggate's water treatment improvements (incl. the addition of a protozoa barrier) was a legislated requirement. The acceleration of the planned investment provided the most cost effective way to deliver the required upgrades without adding re-work.
Rainsford	Scott		Oppose	90% of these projects should not be a priority in the current economic climate. If a new sports field is truly required then the various clubs can pitch in and raise the funds required or apply for funding outside of rate payers - ie the Wanaka skate park? We have perfectly functioning town entertainment building that is not in use most of the time - rate payers should not need to fund another large art centre to sit idly equally as often. Timsfield?? I bought in the original Timsfield stage one, back then the original plan was for a park to be built by the developer if I remember the selling proposal correctly? Why now - 17 years later and several (6?) profit making extra stages are rate payers paying for this?	Council Officers have developed a Sports Field Plan 2024 which looks at the development of new fields, renewing existing fields and development of new artificial turfs/fields. This forms the basis of the communities need and future investment into new/existing sports field development in the Wānaka/Upper Clutha area. Council officers continue to work with clubs/individuals and funding trusts to provide third party funding towards the cost of these projects where possible. The Lake Wānaka Centre is heavily utilised by the community and the proposed Arts Centre needs to be clearly evaluated against the overall District and Wānaka/Upper Clutha priorities before Council would invest into this.
Robson	Luke		Oppose	Agree with priority projects getting approval faster	no comment
Samson	Greg		Oppose	Yes, it seems like the area is playing catchup to all the new development happening in the area. But in my mind the developers should be contributing a substantial amount toward these necessary projects that the land/property they are selling for decent prophet will rely on. Also, Shouldn't the rates get cheaper, the higher the volume of people moving here and	no comment
Saunders	Christopher		Neutral	Please provide details of the impact on funding for the years 2027 to 20237 by the proposal to bring forward to earlier years some of the funding. Ideally there should be a schedule showing the level of funding for each of the 10 years and propesd expenditure. I would expect to see a schedule witha low level of funding avaiable for the later years , say 2036 and 20237 if the proposals as documented are approved.	no comment
Schurink	Carl		Support	Cut spending, stop coming up with so many new projects. Why was the developers these new or expanding subdivisions not encouraged as part of there consent to put in a fully funded recreation areas. Then council maintained Open your books to what's being spent on projects - traffic light cost on Ballantyne Rd and Ardmore Street near Caltex Also why can some of our bicycle lanes in rural areas not be crusher dust with matting underneath?. Like they've done the North side of Lake Tekapo.	Bicycle lanes in rural areas - this is unclear where it relates to. If it is a cycle lane on a roadway - crusher dust would be inappropriate.
Sinclair	Rae-ann		Support	Some of these priorities are important. In these hard economic times not all this list can be addressed. Clean water and sewage etc are essential. Other factors will require partnerships between public and private funding models.	no comment

Sinclair Irwin	Isabella		Support	Yes but only after rigorous analysis of value, significance and urgency of each project. Maybe sports fields are urgent and significant in terms of how many people (especially young people) use them compared with beautification projects seen as 'nice to have' especially in these uncertain economic times. Are 3 playgrounds necessary for Hawea? What are the expected ratios of playgrounds to children they cater for?	The three playgrounds in Lake Hāwea service a population of over 2,400 people, including approximately 570 children (25% of the population are aged 0-14 years). Two of the playgrounds—located at Peter Fraser Park and Longview—are approximately 2 km apart and serve a growing community with a high proportion of young families, for whom access to outdoor play opportunities is important. A further playground is located at McPhee Park in Hāwea Flat. Council has worked with community associations over a number of years to secure funding for playground provision in Lake Hāwea. The playground at Peter Fraser Park was originally funded and installed by the community association. The community association has since requested the provision of additional playground equipment, either at Sentinel Park or through upgrades to existing facilities
Stenson	Bruce	None	Neutral	I support the proposed funding for Timsfield Park, water quality initiatives, and progress on the parking strategy. However, given the cost pressures currently facing the community, I would welcome consideration of deferring some other projects as a way to help maintain rates at their current levels. I would also welcome the inclusion of an overall ranking or prioritisation of capital projects across the district to help ensure the programme remains focused on what is most important and affordable.	QLDC's capital programme is prioritised during the Long Term Plan process, and it is frequently assessed and reforecasted in response to a range of factors including cost via Annual Plans.
Stephens	Sarah		Support	While I appreciate Wanaka-Upper Clutha need things as well it's frustrating to read of new sports fields and work on the, already beautiful, lakefront when Queenstown children can barely make their swimming lessons with the lack of parking and infrastructure with our one event centre and swimming pool for the entire district.	The draft Wānaka Recreation Centre Masterplan indicated an increase in community facility provision based on population growth, current and future needs of the community. Due to funding reprioritisation this investment has been delayed to date but will be included in the 2027-37 Long Term Plan for prioritisation of funding.
Stoner	Steven		Oppose	I think all major spending in the present climate should be put to the public at large to make informed choices. The willy nilly spending of rate payers money must be stopped . IE two council staff working on a public holiday blowing leaves from a path in autumn is a classic example off a waste of rate payers money (time and a half plus a day in lue when if do the next day would not incur these penalty's) The decision makers are not to be trusted not to advance their wants above the fiscal needs of the community .	no comment
Suggate	Helen		Oppose	See attached	no comment
Tan	Boon Khiang		Oppose	I do not support progressing any of the proposed priority projects in the current Annual Plan. Residents are already facing significant cost-of-living pressures, higher interest rates, and rising essential expenses, and this is not the right time to add further financial burden. While I support the long-term intent of these projects, the priorities and timing are not appropriate in the present economic environment. These costs should only be incurred when the community can reasonably afford them, not during a period of financial strain. Council should focus on essential infrastructure, compliance obligations, and core services, and defer all non-urgent or lower-priority projects until economic conditions improve. Doing so would reduce pressure on ratepayers and demonstrate responsible financial management.	no comment

Thompson	Judy	Luggate Community Association	Support	See written submission	no comment
Thompson	Judy	Luggate Community Association	Support	We do not feel able to support any proposals in the current environment. Our community is unable to sustain any further increases at this time.	no comment
Vlietstra	Paul		Oppose	We enjoy Luggate how it is now.	no comment
Ward	Judy		Oppose	Council needs to focus solely on essential services for a couple of years while we see what the impact of the world fuel crisis does to inflation and rate payers ability to contribute.	no comment
Watkins	Natalia		Neutral	Whilst I am supportive of the Community Board's priorities, in the current cost environment, the timing of all discretionary projects in the region should be reviewed. Whilst the community would be disappointed by delays, I think if the impact on their rates was explained, there would be support, or understanding.	no comment
Welch	Tim		#N/A	I support investment in active transport, including expanding shared paths, completing missing links in the walking and cycling network. These projects are important for improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, and supporting a more connected and accessible community.	A programme of interventions including active travel elements has been formulated and is being put forward into the long list of proposals for the LTP. These are intended to start in 2027 but are subject to both QLDC funding availability and NZTA funding assistance being provided.
Westphal	TG		Support	A clearer case needs to be made for why these initiatives are deemed absolutely necessary and beneficial to ALL residents; for example, upgrades to lakefront and downtown areas disproportionately benefit owners of commercial properties there (via increased values) vs the community as a whole. If a case can be made for how many residents will actually utilise and thus benefit from each project, and rank those projects accordingly, appropriate prioritisations can be made, including deferring or cancelling some that, in reality, are only enjoyed by/benefiting a few. In a time of financial hardship for many residents, tough choices just have to be made vs simply continuing to increase rates at an eye-watering rate.	no comment

Wetherall	Emberly		Support	<p>I fully support all proposals for shared path and active transport projects. I feel it's critical to establish this infrastructure to enhance safe alternative transport options and contribute to our zero carbon goal.</p> <p>I also fully support progressing and funding public transport in the Upper Clutha. The flow on effects of establishing reliable public transport are huge and include: assisting the community with the rising cost of living, reducing traffic congestion = improving quality of living, reducing wear and tear on our roads = decreasing \$ for repair, reducing noise pollution = helping to meet our deafening dawn chorus goal, improves community connection by providing opportunity for people to connect and catch up, and contributing to overall behaviour change to create a more regenerative living culture.</p> <p>Our natural environment underpins our health and wellbeing, and we are currently failing on water quality (sewage discharge into our fresh water should never be an option), noise pollution from (vehicle, boat and aviation), lack of climate resilient development, and lack of food resilience and security. As part of our climate action and biodiversity plan I would like council to map the biophysical limits of our environment and create limits that assure that the health of our environment is included in decision making and long term planning. For instance rain gardens should be apart of every development, roof top rainwater capture encouraged, greywater recycling so people don't have to use fresh drinking water to irrigate their lawn etc.</p>	<p>Council agrees that giving people safe, affordable, and reliable transport choices can reduce emissions, ease congestion, support household costs, and improve community wellbeing. We are continuing to invest in walking and cycling connections, advocate for ORC for better public transport, and support lower-carbon travel options across the district.</p> <p>We also acknowledge your comments on water quality, environmental limits, climate resilient development, and food security. These are important issues. Through the Queenstown Lakes District Council Climate & Biodiversity Plan and wider planning work, Council is progressing actions to improve resilience, protect biodiversity, strengthen freshwater outcomes, and better integrate climate risk into long-term decision-making.</p>
Wheeler	Raymond	Retired	Neutral	Need to have is priority Nice to have back of queue	no comment
Williams	Amy		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment

Williams	Kawhata		Oppose	<p>Yes — but with conditions.</p> <p>I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints.</p> <p>However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.</p> <p>In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects * costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary * funding decisions remain transparent and justified * affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one 	no comment
Young	Ross		Support	Active transport is essential	no comment