

Surname	First Name	Organisation	Response	Contribution	RO Comment
Allen	Sarah	Southern Land Limited and Southern Land Queenstown Limited	Oppose	<p>We formally raise serious concerns regarding the proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure published by QLDC. We do not support the proposed fees in their current form.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed fees may not meet the Local Government Act requirement that charges be reasonable and aligned with actual cost recovery, rather than revenue generation.</p> <p>Our position on the proposed fees and charges is outlined below:</p> <p>1. Scale of Fee Increases</p> <p>We oppose the scale of the proposed TMP and CAR fees. The charges for non-excavation corridor access and TMP-related activities are significantly higher than those charged by other Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs) across New Zealand. Most RCAs charge a fraction of what is being proposed by QLDC. Even when compared to higher-cost authorities such as Wellington, QLDC's proposed fees remain substantially higher (by approximately \$1,500 in comparable cases). This indicates that the proposed fees are not consistent with industry norms and raises concerns about whether they are reasonable.</p> <p>2. Lack of Justification and Transparency</p> <p>We do not support the proposed fees due to a lack of transparency around how they have been calculated. There has been no clear breakdown provided to demonstrate how the fees reflect actual service delivery costs. It has been indicated that fee increases were required to fund additional internal resourcing (FTEs), and there was no clear explanation of how the fees were calculated.</p> <p>Cost recovery must be evidence-based and directly linked to the service provided. Without this, the fees risk being perceived as revenue generation rather than legitimate cost recovery.</p>	<p>SCALE OF FEE INCREASES</p> <p>Council note the Global Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee levels are lawful, risk-based, and designed to recover the total cost of providing corridor access oversight. Financial data shows that the Road Corridor Authority (RCA) Function meeting the Revenue and Finance Policy for an 80/20 user/rate split. Notably the RCA fees and charges were not adjusted for inflation for the period 2016 to 2024. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>LACK OF JUSTIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>Council confirm the RCA fee setting approach complies with the Local Government Act and Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and that no itemised cost breakdown is required or recommended, as fees are designed to recover the total cost of the corridor access service rather than individual activities.</p> <p>DOUBLE CHARGING ACROSS QUEENSTOWN AND WĀNAKA</p> <p>Council note the introduction of the Global CAR fee has resolved previous complexity associated with charging across multiple networks, and that no further change is required as global activities are now charged once under a single, consolidated fee.</p> <p>NON-EXCAVATION CORRIDOR ACCESS REQUESTS (\$2,660 FEE)</p> <p>Council note the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee is compliant with cost-recovery requirements and reflects up to 12 months of authorised access and ongoing assurance responsibilities. In perspective \$2,660 is the equivalent to 8 specific applications over a 12 month period, so regular use of the global permit represents an efficient fee pathway for customers. However, we also note that QLDC sits at the upper end of reviewed non-excavation global fees nationally. To improve proportionality and public confidence, officers recommend a modest reduction to the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee to \$1,890.00, which retains the Global approval model, overall fee structure, and risk-based approach. This adjustment is intended to better align the fee with perceived risk, without compromising Council's ability to recover the total cost of the service or shifting costs onto ratepayers. Due to the lower number of these applications the forecast impact on revenue from this reduction is \$23k. Applicants can also apply for individual CARs should they wish to reduce upfront cost.</p> <p>INCREMENTAL EXCAVATION CAR FEES (BASED ON TRENCH LENGTH)</p> <p>Council continue to use excavation length as a transparent and practical proxy for scale, workload, and risk, and that no change to the existing graduated fee structure is recommended, given it has been stable, understood, and consistently applied for over a decade. We also note that most, if not all, RCAs use similar incremental fees.</p>
					<p>(continued)</p> <p>GLOBAL EXCAVATION CAR FEE (\$3,960)</p> <p>Council retain the Global Excavation CAR fee as an all-inclusive approval reflecting higher asset and safety risk over an extended period, and that no change is recommended while uptake remains low and monitoring indicates fees remain within cost recovery limits. In perspective \$3,960 is the equivalent of 10 or less specific applications over a 12 month period, so regular excavation use of the global permit represents an efficient fee pathway for customers. Applicants can also apply for individual CARs should they wish to reduce upfront cost.</p> <p>RISK TO COMPLIANCE AND SAFETY OUTCOMES</p> <p>Council reaffirm its expectation of full compliance with Corridor Access and TMP requirements, note that standard approval pathways remain available and proportionate for most activities, and endorse continued monitoring and enforcement using existing statutory powers where non-compliance occurs.</p>

Anderson	Kim		Oppose	<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"> 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. Stronger control of operational spending. There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Anderson	Lynnette		Neutral	N/A	no comment
Aotearoa	Protect Our Winters	Protect Our Winters New Zealand incorporated	Support	<p>Costs should align with CPI to avoid a reduction in maintenance or other important work, to keep wages for staff fair, and to minimise larger increases in the future. Many POW members have spent time in similar resort towns in other countries where sometimes there will be a higher charge for visitors to a local climbing wall, gym or pool. This is something the QLDC could investigate as another revenue source that would help keep local recreation facilities affordable for local residents. The prices for the Wanaka airport landing fees have not specifically said if fees were different for private planes but POW would like to suggest that they should be. Private planes are a completely unnecessary source of climate pollution and should be discouraged, or at least used as a source of revenue to go towards public transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Wanaka Airport landing fees are reviewed by an independent consultant to ensure alignment with comparable airports. Aircraft are not differentiated on ownership, but on weight categories, as the weight of a particular aircraft can have a consequential impact on the airports infrastructure.</p>
Bartlett	Catkin		Neutral	<p>The increases to QLDC facility hire rates appear to be too low and below the rate of inflation</p>	<p>Achieving balance for affordable access in some cases minimised the increase for community groups hiring facilities and increased commercial rates, the average increase for the QLDC Community Venues is 2.3% compared to the inflation rate 2.1% (noting this figure was at the time of drafting the Annual Plan draft consultation document) Fuel crisis expected to impact inflation going forward.</p>

bayc	angie		Oppose	<p>Even 11.6% is too high and you frame it that we are getting a good deal as it could have been 19%. After all the previous years' increases this is outrageous and unsustainable. Either cut costs more dramatically, improve efficiencies (we all know alot of the money you get is simply wasted) and/or find alternative sources of income. I pay 25% of my income on rates as it is and simply cannot sustain such high increases year after year. I have been a ratepayer for 28 years - I have paid over and over for the services I receive - how about a cutoff after 15 or 20 years of paying rates where the increase is capped at CPI?</p> <p>Also more services should be user pays What are you doing to increase the low income rebate?</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services. The low income rebate has recently been increased. This rebate is managed and set by Central Government not QLDC.</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. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Beable	Barbara	Aspiring Athletics Club Wanaka	Oppose	<p>I pay my rates, our Club pays significant user charges for use of the grass track yet so many others who dont live here get to use our facilites for free, taking over the car park at 3 Parks Freedom Campers use the public toilets even though porta loos are supplied (paid for by our rates)- where we cannot consider it safe anymore for our athletes.</p>	no comment
Beacham	Jason		Oppose	<p>We just had a large rates increase last year and now another 29%</p> <p>This would mean we pay more than a homeowner in Wanaka for the same value property. And for what? A wastewater scheme that our current village population did not need or ask for. Any infrastructure upgrade like this which is for future growth and future residents, should be paid for by developers and not current ratepayers. The 3 million that was Luggate's piece of the scheme had already been paid for and now we have to pay more? and it's not even hooked up yet. Not until 2027. We didn't need it, and don't want it. our rates will go up roughly another \$1300 this year for our property. This is a massive hit to our small family and will have large consequences to our weekly budget. It will mean trimming our grocery list, diminished heating, and a lower quality of life in general. Between Inflation, cost of living crisis, and fuel costs, we are already stretched extremely thin.</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>
Beacham	Joanne		Oppose	<p>My concern is around the affordability of year on year rates increase for Luggate. Last year plus this proposed increase is nearly 50% increase. This next year i understand is around waste water infrastructure, but only being spread around the existing rate payers and not future rate payers is a tough one to handle financially.</p> <p>Future growth I believe is key and to help this growth is to change Luggate from Rural to residential so those on larger properties can subdivide. Win Win.</p> <p>Concern around total development contributions collected from Luggate growth was approx \$4.1 million. Where has this money been spend. How has this been spent?</p> <p>I believe these needs to be an external audit of all the books for all of QLDC. Everything needs to be transparent.</p>	<p>The rates increases across the district are driven by several factors, including external economic pressures that push cost increases higher than inflation, as well as central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. Additionally, our region's growth requires critical infrastructure investment which carry essential ongoing costs. The Annual Plan expenditure represents 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. Hawea rate increases this year is due to Hawea now paying similar water related rates as the rest of the district.</p>

Bell	Ronald		Support	User pays not rate payers	no comment
BELL	Hamish		Oppose	<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</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>
Bendle	Hannah		Support	<p>Prices seem to be minimal and increases over time are expected. The only thing I would say is planning & development fees will be past onto customers, is there some way we can support low income households so they can have hope in being involved in these types of opportunities..?</p>	<p>Council's fees and charges are set on a cost-recovery basis to ensure that the costs of processing private development applications are met by applicants, rather than being subsidised by ratepayers. Targeted assistance for low-income households is generally addressed through wider housing and social policy initiatives, rather than through subsidising regulatory processing fees. This enables fairness across all rate payers.</p>
Booiman	Arda		Oppose	inevitable	no comment

Boulter	Summer-Lee	Aspiring Traffic	No response	<p>We are writing to provide feedback on the proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure as part of the Annual Plan 2026/2027. We are based in Central Otago and regularly undertake work within the QLDC area. As an operator working frequently within the district, we would like to raise several concerns regarding the proposed fees and their practical impact on industry, compliance, and safety outcomes.</p> <p>1. Proportionality of Fees (Particularly for Low-Risk Activities) We are concerned that the proposed fees do not adequately differentiate between high-risk and low-risk activities. In particular, the application of a \$2,660 fee for non-excavation Corridor Access (Global Permit) appears disproportionate when compared to the standard \$300 non-excavation fee. For many low-risk, short-duration activities such as surveying and inspections, this level of cost does not appear to reflect the complexity or level of council involvement required. We would expect a more clearly defined, risk-based approach that aligns fees with the level of activity and associated effort.</p> <p>2. Combined Cost Impact (CAR and TMP Requirements) While we understand the structure of individual fees, the combined cost impact of CAR and TMP requirements becomes significant. For example, a non-excavation global CAR fee of \$2,660, when combined with TMP processing fees (e.g. \$288 per location), can result in total costs exceeding \$3,000 for low-risk activities. This level of cost for short-duration, low-impact works does not appear proportionate to the level of review or service required and may influence whether works proceed through formal processes.</p> <p>3. Transparency and Cost Recovery We understand that councils are required to recover costs; however, it is not clear how the proposed fees have been</p>	<p>Proportionality of Fees (Particularly for Low-Risk Activities) Council note the Global CAR fee levels are lawful, risk-based, and designed to recover the total cost of providing corridor access oversight. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>Council note the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee is compliant with cost-recovery requirements and reflects up to 12 months of authorised access and ongoing assurance responsibilities. In perspective \$2,660 is the equivalent to 8 specific applications over a 12 month period, so regular use of the global permit represents an efficient fee pathway for customers. However, we also note that QLDC sits at the upper end of reviewed non-excavation global fees nationally. To improve proportionality and public confidence, officers recommend a modest reduction to the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee to \$1,890.00, which retains the Global approval model, overall fee structure, and risk-based approach. This adjustment is intended to better align the fee with perceived risk, without compromising Council's ability to recover the total cost of the service or shifting costs onto ratepayers. Due to the lower number of these applications the forecast impact on revenue from this reduction is \$23k. Applicants can also apply for individual CARs should they wish to reduce upfront cost.</p> <p>Combined Cost Impact (CAR and TMP Requirements) Council note the Global CAR fee levels are lawful, risk-based, and designed to recover the total cost of providing corridor access oversight. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>Transparency and Cost Recovery Council confirm the RCA fee setting approach complies with the Local Government Act and Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and that no itemised cost breakdown is required or recommended, as fees are designed to recover the total cost of the corridor access service rather than individual activities.</p> <p>Financial data shows that the Road Corridor Authority (RCA) Function meeting the Revenue and Finance Policy for an 80/20 user/rate split. Notably the RCA fees and charges were not adjusted for inflation for the period 2016 to 2024. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>Consistency with Other Regions While we acknowledge that Council's across New Zealand perform very similar RCM functions, there is no nationally consistent fee structure for the road corridor service. Benchmarking headline fees alone is also not reliable as local factors will</p>
Brake	Natalie		Oppose	<p>We support the proposed changes to user fees and charges in part. While we support the principle of "user-pays" to reduce the burden on general rates, this cannot be viewed in isolation. As residents of Luggate, we are facing a proposed 29.1% total rates increase. Adding increased user fees on top of a nearly 30% hike is unsustainable for local families and those on fixed incomes. Council must ensure that these fee increases do not become a "double-dip" for residents in smaller townships already hit by massive targeted rates for infrastructure. I support these changes only if the additional revenue is used directly to offset the rate burden for vulnerable households.</p>	<p>QLDC is currently reviewing its Revenue & Financing policy which fees and charges is part of in time for the upcoming Long Term Plan (LTP). Discussions have centered on implementing a tiered fee structure for residents versus visitors. As part of the formal LTP process, any proposed changes would require endorsement from the councillors and consultation.</p>

Brand	Terrence		Oppose	<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. <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>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	----------	--	--------	--	--

britcher	Sam		Oppose	<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.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------	-----	--	--------	---	--

Brown	Sarah		Oppose	<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
-------	-------	--	--------	--	--

Brown	Lynette		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	---------	--	--------	--	--

Brown	Emma		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Brown	Ian		Support	<p>I support increases for those who don't live in the area however those people who do should by form of identification not face further increases in specific user charges. I do however question why specific user charges must increase and can assume that much relates to further commentary I shall make in relation to wasteful spending bureaucratic wastefulness and complete lack of efficiencies as shown by too many specific council staff.</p>	QLDC is currently reviewing its Revenue & Financing policy which fees and charges is part of in time for the upcoming Long Term Plan (LTP). Discussions have centered on implementing a tiered fee structure for residents versus visitors. As part of the formal LTP process, any proposed changes would require endorsement from the councillors and consultation.

Buckley	Francesca		Oppose	<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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	-----------	--	--------	--	--

Burgess	Emma		Oppose	<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> <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
Burke	Val		Oppose	<p>We aren't all independently wealthy in Wanaka. The QLDC rates increases the past few years has been crippling along with the increase in insurance rates, groceries and general cost of living. An additional proposed 11-12% increase in rates 2026-2027 will be another burden that may cause many people who serve the local community to have to sell out because living here is getting unaffordable. A tourist tax needs to be considered to help with the expensive infrastructure and tourist management that continues to increase our rates.</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>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>

Campbell	Megan		Oppose	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed 29% rates increase for Luggate.</p> <p>After already facing a 17% increase last year, this feels like too much, too quickly. Like many in our community, we are already dealing with rising costs across the board, and another increase of this size is simply not something we can easily absorb. It puts real pressure on households and makes it harder to plan and feel financially secure.</p> <p>I am also struggling to understand how this level of increase is being applied to our community. It doesn't feel like a fair or balanced distribution, and it raises concerns about whether Luggate residents are being asked to carry more than their share.</p> <p>I care about our community and understand the need for investment, but increases need to be reasonable and sustainable. At the moment, this proposal does not feel either affordable or fair.</p> <p>I ask that you reconsider both the size of the increase and how it is being allocated.</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>
Carrington	Carl	self	Oppose	<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>	<p>The rates rises across the district are driven by several non-negotiable factors, including external economic pressures that have significantly inflated the costs of materials and labour over the years above CPI, as well as new central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. Additionally, our region's growth requires critical infrastructure investment in projects like Water/Wastewater upgrades.</p>

Cassidy	Simon		Oppose	<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>The rates increases across the district are driven by a complex financial landscape. 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. 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>
---------	-------	--	--------	---	---

Charles	Ashley		Oppose	<p>From: Ash Charles 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><u>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Chave	Michelle		Support	<p>I Support the fact that to keep our public facilities up to standard and to keep maintenance up on them that the fees need to be accounted for somewhere, i do support slight increases in user fees and if i am using a facility that i love i would be more than happy to pay this as long as i could afford to use it.</p>	no comment
Chirnside	Craig		Support	User costs are always justified.	no comment
Clifton	Carolyn & Rowan		Oppose	See attached document	no comment
Clough	Lisa		Oppose	The proposed 29%+ increase to rates to a small handful of Luggate residents is untenable and unaffordable for people in our community. We are not an affluent community.	no comment
Collins	Megan		Support	I believe users should pay directky	no comment
Cotter	Guy	Adventure Consultants Ltd	Support	If this includes developers then yes, of course they should be paying fees appropriate to the addition of their development to the cost of running council.	no comment
Cranfield	Jose		Support	Many of these services council provides are not essential services. Although in many cases these assets provide places for community cohesion, there are often well subsidised activities available in these areas and an increase in fees and user charges will not prohibit use.	no comment
Cro	Hayden		Oppose	29 percent raise in luggate is ridiculous if I had have known it'd be that extreme I would have just brought a water filtration system my self and it would have paid for it self in 1 year	no comment

Cross	Nicola		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally express my opposition to the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Over recent years, rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen at a pace that is increasingly difficult for households to keep up with. These cumulative increases are no longer marginal — they are placing sustained financial pressure on families, and for many, including our own, they are becoming unsustainable.</p> <p>In areas like Lake Hāwea, this pressure feels especially pronounced. Many residents are long-term locals contributing to the fabric of the community, yet the rising cost of rates — on top of mortgages, insurance, food, and fuel — is making it harder to remain here. Rates are a non-negotiable expense, and when they continue to escalate at this level, they directly affect household stability.</p> <p>While I acknowledge the challenges Council faces, particularly around infrastructure demands and growth, the current approach appears to place too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is no longer whether increases can be justified in theory, but whether they are genuinely affordable in practice. Right now, they are not.</p> <p>There are several areas where a more balanced and equitable approach is needed:</p> <p>Affordability must be treated as a firm constraint. Recognition that increases are difficult is not enough — there needs to be a defined limit on what households can realistically</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	--------	--	--------	--	--

Cross	Simon		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea.</p> <p>Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability.</p> <p>In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint.</p> <p>Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly.</p> <p>Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure.</p> <p>Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	-------	--	--------	--	--

Davidson	Bridget		Oppose	<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> <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
Dawson	Harry		Oppose	<p>Far too expensive as it is, nevermind proposed increases. We live in Luggate due to not being as well off as most in the Wanaka Queenstown areas</p>	no comment
Dawson	Masae		Neutral	<p>it's already more expensive user fee than neighbour town (cromwell) I can bare rates to go up need different solution here</p>	no comment

Dempster	Gina	Wastebusters	Support	<p>On behalf of Wastebusters, we would like to thank the Mayor, councillors and council staff for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Annual Plan 2026/2027.</p> <p>As a strategic partner in the delivery of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, Wastebusters deeply appreciates the Council backing for our Resourceful Communities programme of work, focusing on education, community engagement and making resourceful choices.</p> <p>We particularly value the extension to a two-year service level agreement for delivery of our established behaviour change initiatives in repair, low waste living, textile waste reduction, food waste minimisation, and zero waste for business.</p> <p>Transitioning these waste minimisation programmes to a two-year cycle has provided the stability and continuity needed to deepen impact and focus on delivering high-value outcomes for our community.</p> <p>We would like to acknowledge the fantastic work of our delivery partner Sustainable Queenstown, who does the grassroots delivery of Resourceful Communities in the Whakatipu Basin.</p> <p>The Resourceful Communities programme is an integral part of Wastebusters broader community engagement and education workstream, which delivered 72 workshops and events, and supported zero waste education in all schools across the district in 2024/25, connecting to 11,308 people over the year.</p> <p>By developing a strong culture of reduction, reuse and recycling in our district, Resourceful Communities reduces pressure on the waste collection and management infrastructure and</p>	<p>The submission reflects known capacity, health and safety, and operational constraints at the Ballantyne Road facility, particularly during peak periods, and acknowledges ongoing population growth and pressure on waste services in the Upper Clutha. The current Wānaka transfer station is constrained by site size and layout, limiting its ability to safely manage increasing waste volumes and to maximise diversion opportunities or encourage behaviour change. Redevelopment of the Wānaka facility is a priority project intended to address these challenges through improved layout, increased capacity, and enhanced diversion infrastructure, supporting the objectives of the WMMP 2025–2031. The redevelopment project is progressing through investigation and design phases, with site investigations completed and design progressing. Construction is forecast for completion by December 2027.</p>
Devonda	Stevee		Oppose	<p>11.7% increase? Are you having a laugh? What does that make the past years? 30%+ overall?</p> <p>What is the average rate payer getting in services for this increase? Decreased parking? Decreased Quality of life? More traffic, more construction, more angst</p> <p>How is the increase going up another 10%+ when we have more properties, more development contributions being charged and then higher DC's for properties with units - It's a scam.</p> <p>You can add another 500+ properties and their relative DC's and rates to the rate payer base in the past 12 months and increase commercial rates within the CBD to some of the highest in the country.... BUT You still need the average rate payer to pay 10% more to have their bins emptied?</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential services. Growth expands the rating base but also drives significant new demand, and while development contributions help, they do not cover the long-term costs of operating and renewing infrastructure.</p>
Doherty	Patricia		Oppose	<p>No increase to dog registration as this is just dead money to me as I get nothing for this.</p>	

Donovan	Damien		Oppose	<p>I 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.</p> <p>Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Dowling	Fraser		Support	If you use it, fair enough to pay for it	no comment
Dowsett	Adam		Support	<p>In general supportive of the proposed changes; there could be more imagination put into who the increases are most targeted at. For example, at Wanaka Recreation Centre - non-residents (i.e. international tourists) should pay more than residents for using the pool, shower facilities etc. Especially given the recent changes allowing multiple campervans in the carpark there day & night This is opportunity is staring right at QLDC to more appropriately tax freedom campers, rather than that burden be felt more by residents.</p>	QLDC is currently reviewing its Revenue & Financing policy which fees and charges is part of in time for the upcoming Long Term Plan (LTP). Discussions have centered on implementing a tiered fee structure for residents versus visitors. As part of the formal LTP process, any proposed changes would require endorsement from the councillors and consultation.
Drury	Michael		Oppose	<p>What is the capacity of the new water and waste installation, in terms of the number of properties that can connect before it overloads?</p> <p>It is assumed that the current number of properties is only a small percentage of the system's total capacity.</p> <p>On this assumption, then the cost of the upgrade should be divided by the total capacity of the new infrastructure, and then that amount should be levied per property. If the current properties must cover a large slice of the upgrade this coming year, this will allow any future properties a cheaper connection. The area will expand, that is progress, but the properties in Luggate six months ago were okay with the services that they had. Why should they have to pay for progress ?</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
East	Richard		Oppose	<p>Targeting current rate payers instead of future for services.</p> <p>Inflated current charges.</p>	no comment
Edwards	Gareth		Support	Agree that user pay more for projects that the community agree is needed.	no comment

English	Sharon	NA	Oppose	<p>The continual rises of everyday living is crippling enough ..now we have to be objected to paying for poor government planning and allowing of projects going forward without proper for thought.</p> <p>I understand an increase is necessary but this is excessive to the point of forcing lower fixed workers and elderly out of this community.</p> <p>I am concerned that the mentality is if you can't keep up with the increases then you dont deserve to live here which is an elitist and patronizing attitude..combined with last years 18% increase this totals a 40% increase in 2 years. Totally unsustainable. We will be paying \$10,000 in rates in 5 years at this rate</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>
Fernandez	Eva		Support	Sharing among users makes the load easier	no comment
Fernando	Nipun		Oppose	20% increase in rates?. Do i even need a reason to disagree	no comment
FOLEY	Patricia	Patricia Foley	Oppose	<p>The increase in rates for Luggate does not reflect the socio economic population of working class families. This increase is focused on affluent home owners who have no idea of the impact of their use of water to the wider community. Regarding sewage needs, many residents who have lived in Luggate for more than 40 years are not reliant on councils new sewage system. People have lived and survived in Luggate with septic tanks for many years, it is the new wealthier residents who have impacted on the increased costs, perhaps a metered system may be required. This would reduce the impact on families who are struggling to survive with current economic crisis and rise in petrol costs. Should places such as Luggate, Hawea Flat and Kingston become too expensive for working class people to live there will be a shortage of long term trade and blue collar workers in the area.</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>

Forrest	Michelle		Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea because it unfairly shifts the cost of long-standing infrastructure and planning failures onto residents. The Hāwea wastewater system has been under an abatement notice for nitrogen non-compliance, showing the system was already failing environmental standards before the current upgrade programme was proposed. This reflects delayed investment and inadequate long-term planning, not any change in resident behaviour. At the same time, QLDC continued to approve subdivision growth during years when the wastewater system was already under pressure, adding demand to infrastructure that was known to be constrained. Development contributions in Hāwea are among the highest in the district, and these costs are embedded in the price of land and new builds, meaning new investment in the community has already contributed significantly to growth-related infrastructure. Councillors have publicly questioned whether these contributions are being properly ring-fenced and whether growth is genuinely paying for growth. The system was already non-compliant, growth was enabled despite constraints, development contributions have not covered the true cost of growth-driven upgrades, and now residents are being asked to absorb a 22.3% increase, double the district average. A rise of this scale, not signalled in the Long Term Plan, creates an unreasonable financial shock and undermines confidence in the fairness of the rating system. I ask QLDC to reduce the increase for Hāwea to be in line with district average, provide transparent cost allocation, and avoid placing a disproportionate burden on the community.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Froggatt	Katherine		Oppose	<p>Summary of submission I am submitting in support of stronger protection and prioritisation of sport and recreation infrastructure, particularly indoor court capacity, within the Annual Plan 2026-2027 and as QLDC develops the Long Term Plan 2027-2037. Specifically, I am asking Council to:</p> <p>Confirm that the \$46m Queenstown Events Centre expansion (announced May 2025, tripling indoor courts from two to six NBA-sized courts, with doubled gym space) remains fully budgeted and on timeline within the \$205.8M 2026-27 capital programme, and has not been part of the \$8.8M reduction from the original LTP Year 3 figure. Commit that any further reductions to the 2026-27 capital programme will not come from sport, recreation or community wellbeing infrastructure. Include indoor court capacity needs in Wānaka and Upper Clutha explicitly within the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects, including scoping and feasibility funding in 2026-27 so the project is shovel-ready for the LTP 2027-2037. Ensure the updated sport and recreation participation KPI referenced in the draft Annual Plan captures access and capacity, not only participation volumes, because participation is currently constrained by the facilities available, not demand. Frame and communicate investment in court infrastructure explicitly as public health and wellbeing infrastructure in the LTP 2027-2037 development process.</p> <p>Why this matters: the public health case As a health coach working with clients across the district on chronic disease prevention, mental wellbeing and healthy ageing. I see daily evidence that accessible year-round indoor</p>	<p>Council officers continue to advocate strongly for social infrastructure across the District in accordance with both Council approved strategies and national benchmarking and guidelines. Councillors determine the final Capital Programme annually as part of the Long Term Plan and any delays to projects are communicated to Councillors on regular reporting intervals. The QEC Indoor Courts project is currently in Concept design. Council officers are reviewing public KPI's for the 27-37 Long Term Plan which include capacity monitoring of community facilities and will recommend for adoption by Council.</p>

Frommherz	Karl		Oppose	<p>Substantial increase to Hawea is detrimental to our community and unfair when compared to Alberttown.</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 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. Albert town is already paying for the infrastructure at a higher rate than Hawea.</p> <p>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.</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>
Gabbusch	Christine		Oppose	<p>These are nominal increases, people choose to use these facilities therefore they can pay more, rather than keep putting costs onto rate payers.</p> <p>Increase fees and charges and decrease rates.</p>	no comment
Galland	Lucy		Oppose	<p>Significant increases year on year for Luggate, does not reflect the level of investment in our community.</p> <p>Luggate is the only remaining affordable areas in the Wanaka region and this significant increase will further push a key demographic group out of the region. I am a local mortgage broker and a number of my customers choose Luggate because of its affordability. The proposed rate increases will leave few options for a good chunk of the local population wanting to get their own stable housing and stay in the region.</p> <p>We are a young family and recently build in Lake McKay. We paid for our own septic pump, yet the proposed increased appears to be going towards funding this infrastructure for other new houses coming in.</p> <p>We also paid a large developer contribution to the council, as did a number of other houses and it is not clear what this is being utilised for?</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>

Garland	Jessica		Support	29.1% rates increase for luggate is too much for residents to cope with, why is it proposed to increase so much for luggate residents on top of user fees?	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>User fees and charges help to offset rates increases by ensuring the cost to deliver a service is fairly funded by those who use and benefit from it.</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>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
Gasson	Craig		Oppose	The council should charge non NZ residents more for the use of ratepayer funded facilities. Specifically the Swimming Pools	<p>Council Officers have recently modelled locals vs non-locals pricing structures (differential pricing). The data of % of non-locals utilising the facilities was 15% when last measured. Differential pricing is possible to implement to casual admission. Some challenges exist on the definition of "local" and the mechanism to evidence locals compared to non-local. The cost to administer may exceed the extra revenue (modelled at \$73,093 across all Sport & Rec sites for all casual admission).</p> <p>Facility venue hire already has a 3 tier structure (community, standard & commercial) which effectively captures local vs non-local pricing differential.</p>

Ghimire	Kshitiz		Oppose	<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.</p> <p>Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties</p> <p>Could a rate payer discount be available? Bring your rates invoice and get XX% discount for a membership/concession in the name of the listed person.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Gomes	Germano		Neutral		The council is exploring tiered pricing for locals and 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.

Gomez	Josefina		Oppose	<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> <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
Grant	Sue		Oppose	Not improved anything to warrant increase.	no comment
Green	Shane		Oppose	<p>I cannot increase my income by 29% at whim and thus the rates increase is very unfair especially coming after a hefty increase last year.</p> <p>Looking at the forward plan I cannot see an end to these usurious increase either?</p> <p>What seems incredibly unfair is that friends in Wanaka will be paying rates of 2/3 ours and their property is probably 4 times the value!</p> <p>It appears that our bill will be \$6K+</p> <p>These rate increases are way above the CPI.</p> <p>We have a section of 800 sq metres and the council benefits to us amount to water and rubbish removal!</p>	<p>The rates rises across the district are driven by several non-negotiable factors, including external economic pressures that have significantly inflated the costs of materials and labour over the years above CPI, as well as new central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. Additionally, our region's growth requires critical infrastructure investment in projects like Water/Wastewater upgrades. QLDC is responsible for delivering many services in addition to water and waste removal, such as roading, parks & reserves and other community facilities, parking, planning & regulatory functions etc</p>

Hamilton	Daniel		Oppose	<p>Submission: TMP and Corridor Access Request (CAR) Fees We formally raise serious concerns regarding the proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure published by QLDC. We do not support the proposed fees in their current form. We are concerned that the proposed fees may not meet the Local Government Act requirement that charges be reasonable and aligned with actual cost recovery, rather than revenue generation. As an organisation working directly with industry, we previously raised concerns when significant fee increases (in some cases exceeding 800%) were introduced without consultation. At that time, we were advised that engagement with industry stakeholders would occur for the 2026/2027 review. To date, no meaningful consultation has occurred prior to the release of these proposed fees. Our position on the proposed fees and charges is outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale of Fee Increases We oppose the scale of the proposed TMP and CAR fees. The charges for non-excavation corridor access and TMP-related activities are significantly higher than those charged by other Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs) across New Zealand. Based on our knowledge of the sector, most RCAs charge a fraction of what is being proposed by QLDC. Even when compared to higher-cost authorities such as Wellington, QLDC's proposed fees remain substantially higher (by approximately \$1,500 in comparable cases). This indicates that the proposed fees are not consistent with industry norms and raises concerns about whether they are reasonable. 2. Lack of Justification and Transparency We do not support the proposed fees due to a lack of 	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services. The higher rates increase affecting many Lake Hāwea and 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. Complex funding and rating models have made this challenging to explain clearly to affected residents. FAQ documents were published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases. QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year. Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance. Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
----------	--------	--	--------	--	---

Hamilton	Daniel Jordahn		Oppose	<p>The scale and pace of recent rates increases in Lake Hāwea are no longer just concerning — they are becoming unsustainable.</p> <p>In just four years, residents have gone from manageable single-digit increases in 2023 to a relentless climb: 15.8% in 2024, 15.2% in 2025, and now a proposed 22.3% increase for 2026. This is not a one-off spike. This is a pattern — a sustained, compounding burden that is tightening around households year after year.</p> <p>And it is not falling evenly.</p> <p>For many in Hāwea — especially young families, tradespeople, service workers, and small business owners — this is no longer a budgeting challenge. It is a breaking point. These increases aren't numbers on a page; they are real sacrifices. They are putting groceries put back on shelves, heaters left off in winter, and constant stress about whether staying in this community is even viable anymore.</p> <p>These are the very people who built this region. The ones pouring the concrete, wiring the homes, teaching the kids, running the cafés, keeping the place alive. And now, they are the ones being squeezed the hardest — not because they've failed, but because the system meant to support them is failing instead and that's you.</p> <p>What makes this worse is the growing lack of trust. People do not clearly understand where their money is going. They do not see transparency. They do not see restraint. Instead, they see spending on "nice-to-haves" while being told massive increases are unavoidable. Whether every perception is perfectly accurate or not, the outcome is the same: confidence is gone. And that matters — because trust, once lost, is not easily rebuilt.</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 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 was published on the Let's Talk page to help explain what is driving these increases.</p> <p>QLDC is in the process of reviewing its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines where Council gets its money from (rates, fees, charges, borrowing, dividends etc) and who pays for what (residents, businesses, new developments etc). This will form part of the Long Term Plan consultation process next year.</p> <p>Rates rises can be unsettling, especially when household budgets are tight. The simple fact is that the increasing cost of maintaining and upgrading essential infrastructure must be passed on to those who use and benefit from it. This is not taken lightly, and QLDC is committed to investigating new funding levers, finding ways to keep costs as low as possible and supporting ratepayers who need assistance.</p> <p>Final rates increases will be subject to Councillor deliberation following the consultation process.</p>
----------	----------------	--	--------	--	--

Hancock	Georgia		Oppose	<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.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
harding	jennie		Support	seems ok with increased cost of everything	no comment

Harrold	Brett		Oppose	<p>I am in strong objection to the continued rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>In recent years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen beyond anything that could be deemed realistic or reasonable, and certainly are now proposed to be beyond the average income earning household.</p> <p>This is not sustainable, local council has a duty of care to consider the wider implications of imposing compulsory costs on local homeowners – the money has to come from somewhere and likely that ends up being food and optional extras like childrens sport participation etc.</p> <p>This current proposal is a conflict with any equitable approach and does nothing to represent QLDC as a future focused, human centred organisation, with any human forethought at all.</p> <p>Council has enabled significant development across the district, but the infrastructure required to support that growth has not been fully funded by it. Instead, those costs are increasingly being borne by existing residents, whilst developers continue to maximise profits at the expense of locals and the land and resources.</p> <p>This creates an imbalance where the benefits of development are realised, while the long-term costs are socialised.</p> <p>QLDCs own strategic framework speaks of wellbeing and community outcomes as two core facets. These have to take into consideration the impacts of such increases year upon year, and the knock on effects – and for what?</p> <p>I urge Council to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat increases as an equity issue. Can the lowest income houses afford this? If not, then don't do it. • Ensure growth and developers contribute proportionately to the 	<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>
---------	-------	--	--------	---	--

Hoggard	Jacob		Oppose	<p>Submission on Proposed Rates Increase – Annual Plan 2026/27</p> <p>From: Jacob Hoggard Location: Luggate</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>I have three young children, and 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> <p>1. <u>Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.</u></p>	Please see comment to Val Burke
Hopper	Saskia		Oppose	<p>This is insane. Council is meant to be for the people yet there will be no people left with these rates counting to rise! Look at the wider picture, the war happening, cost of living crisis etc. New bike trails can wait, updating playground (while i love this) it can wait or be creative with loose parts.</p> <p>The sewage system in longview was not the community's fault-council and developers should have foreseen this and then look who is suffering? Utterly ridiculous.</p>	no comment
Jackways	Tim		Oppose	<p>I am writing as a Luggate resident to oppose the proposed 29% rates increase.</p> <p>Having already absorbed a 17% increase last year, this feels like a significant jump in a very short space of time. Like many households, we are already managing rising living costs, and another increase of this size puts added pressure on everyday finances. It's becoming increasingly difficult to keep up.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about how this increase is being applied. From where I stand, it doesn't feel like a fair or even distribution, and it's hard to understand why our community is facing such a substantial rise.</p> <p>I understand that investment in our district is important, but increases need to be balanced and realistic for the people who live here. Right now, this proposal feels out of step with what many of us can reasonably afford.</p> <p>I would ask that you reconsider both the scale of the increase and how it is being shared across communities.</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

Joll	Linda	Cardrona Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association	Neutral	Communities need support from Central Government to provide for future growth and infrastructure it cannot be expected to be from existing small communities of ratepayers.	no comment
Jongeneel	Gijsbertus		Oppose	Price increase is too high, it's price gauging. People on a budget can not keep up with this. Increases similar to inflation are OK, but the proposed increase is proof of incapability to use taxes responsibly. Als shows qldc not willing to cut waste in it's own organisation.	The alternative to increasing fees and charges is that the ratepayer pays, this doesn't seem fair if the user receives the individual benefit.
Kambe	Takenobu		Oppose	<p>From: Takenobu Kambe 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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission

Kearns	Brendan		Oppose	<p>Excessive Rates Increase - 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).</p> <p>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</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>
Knight	Jo		Neutral		no comment
Krogh	Marian		Support	<p>You comment that the smaller rural developments are having to get expensive water infrastructure installed. This is yet another reason why these satellite towns should not be allowed to grow, and if so the developers should be paying. If more higher density housing, close to town is prioritised then also the infrastructure will cost less, and be easier to build and maintain. I do feel like people who choose to live in Luggate, Kingston etc should have to pay for their new infrastructure requirements, but also a lot of people are choosing to live in places like Luggate because initially it seems more affordable. But then you live out of town and there's nowhere to work and shop etc so they end up having to drive into town every day which costs a lot (especially now). I'd say many of the people living in these smaller communities have the least resources to pay for these infrastructure upgrades</p>	<p>Growth enabled through the Spatial Plan and District Plan is intended to be supported by development contributions from new development. These contributions are a key mechanism to ensure that the infrastructure required to service growth—such as transport, water, wastewater treatment and community facilities—is funded by those developments that create the additional demand. Rates paid for by existing residents are used to maintain and improve the levels of service for the community as a whole. They are not designed to fund the additional infrastructure to provide for new growth.</p>

laureys	marlene		Oppose	<p>From: Marlene Laureys 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><u>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Ledgerwood	Jim		Support	<p>In general I'm in support of user pays. However, I also think restraint should be required in the amounts involved surely looking at the increase making sure it has to be Rather than simply applying what you think you need and adding it to the current fee , how about , seeing if you could live within the current fee.</p>	The 'live within your means' principle is exactly how we approach the budget. However, the difficulty arises when the cost of materials, utilities, and labor rises faster than the current fee allows. The other option is to increase rates which doesn't seem fair where a user individually benefits from the service.
Lin	Eric		Support	<p>I support modest, CPI-level increases to user fees where appropriate, as this follows a fair user-pays approach and helps reduce pressure on general rates.</p> <p>Where people choose to use specific facilities or services, it makes sense that a portion of the cost is reflected in those fees rather than being passed onto all ratepayers. In the current environment, this is a more balanced way to manage costs. That said, it is important that these increases remain reasonable. Many households are already under financial pressure, and even small increases can add up over time. Overall, I support these changes as long as they are kept at a sensible level and do not go beyond what is necessary.</p>	no comment

Lipinski	Carly		Oppose	<p>I'm writing to oppose the continued level of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past few years, rates in our district have continued to rise year after year, and for families like mine, it's getting to a point where it's no longer manageable. These increases don't sit in isolation, they're on top of everything else that has gone up, and it all adds up quickly.</p> <p>Like many households, we're already juggling a lot. Mortgage costs, groceries, insurance, fuel, and the everyday expenses that come with raising a family. On top of that, childcare and daycare costs are significant and ongoing. For working families, these aren't optional expenses, they are essential, and they take a large portion of income before anything else is even considered.</p> <p>Rates are the same. They are a fixed cost, and when they keep increasing at this pace, something else has to give. For many families, there simply isn't any room left to absorb more.</p> <p>I understand that Council is facing real cost pressures, especially with infrastructure and growth, but the way this is currently being managed is placing too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The question is no longer whether the increases can be explained, it's whether people can actually afford them. Right now, many of us cannot.</p> <p>There are a few areas where I believe Council needs to take a harder look:</p> <p>Affordability needs to be a firm limit At some point, there has to be a line. Households have limits.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------	-------	--	--------	---	--

Long	Dean		Oppose	<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. <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>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
------	------	--	--------	--	--

Lott	Kerri		Oppose	<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. 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Macdonald	Jacqueline		Support	<p>So many of us don't use particular facilities whereas others use them a lot.</p>	no comment
Malaponte	Christina		Oppose	<p>I do not support the proposed increase in user fees and charges, particularly the significant 29.1% rise impacting Luggate residents. This level of increase is excessive and places an unfair burden on households already facing a high cost of living. Many residents are already stretched financially, and such a steep rise is difficult to justify without clear, transparent reasoning.</p> <p>There is also a lack of clarity around how these additional funds will be allocated. It is important that any increase in rates directly benefits the communities contributing them. At present, it is not evident that Luggate will see a proportional return in terms of infrastructure, services, or local investment.</p> <p>I strongly encourage a more balanced and transparent approach, including clearer communication on spending priorities and consideration of the financial pressures currently facing ratepayers.</p>	see comment for Rachel Penfold

Martinez	Pablo		Oppose	<p>From: Pablo Martinez 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><u>In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Masters	Hayden		Oppose	<p>This is ridiculous.. the fees need to be passed on to tourists not to local rate payers, the rate hikes should never be that extreme. Hawea barely gets use of rate money as is so more of our rates need to go towards Hawea infrastructure itself as is..</p>	no comment
Masters	Cole		Oppose	<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. Forging 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>	<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>

Matshall	Hannah		Oppose	<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> <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
McDougall	Tim		Oppose	The hourly rates for Council's technical team is well above market rates. Considering the timeframes we experience for reviews are obscene, I believe there should be some measurable changes before fees can be justified to increase.	Council staff hourly rates are considered to be comparable to other councils in NZ. Other external expert consultants (eg, landscape architects/ecologists/traffic and geotechnical engineering) are charged at their council contracted hourly rate.
McDougall	Jessica		Oppose	The hourly rates charged for council staff involved in consent processing, such as planners and land development engineers, exceed typical market rates. If the council intends to justify these higher charges, it should demonstrate that its staff can deliver a level of efficiency and experience that reflects what is available (at lower rates) in the private sector.	Council staff hourly rates are considered to be comparable to other councils in NZ. Other external expert consultants (eg, landscape architects/ecologists/traffic and geotechnical engineering) are charged at their council contracted hourly rate.
McLeary	Robert	None	Support	Do not want rates increases, would rather pay abit more for the areas that we use	no comment

McMahon	Jane		Oppose	<p>I am a resident in the Luggate community and was shocked to hear that there was to be a rate rise of 29.3% for many.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communication: QLDC's explanations re the 29.3% proposed increase for water and waste rates were difficult to understand. Many questions asked prior to the meeting with the Mayor have still not been answered. The council lumps together water and waste. What if you use council water but have a septic tank for sewerage? 2. Timeframe: The time given to make submissions is too short given that we still don't have many of the answers and there is still ambiguity. 3. Rate of Increases: The scale and speed of rate increases for the Luggate community is unaffordable for many and from what we can see, the highest in the country. This rate increase follows a 17.7% increase last year. 4. Developer Contributions: The council have allowed the development of land in the area, and the developers paid large sums to the council - presumably to contribute towards infrastructure. Where have these contributions gone? 5. Equity: Water isn't a "nice to have". Its essential for life. I don't believe that the council should load the expenditure of such a large project on the small number of houses in Luggate. Do we have any assurances that future large charges won't be imposed when water supply is split off into another entity. This risks becoming another expensive bureaucracy that will do nothing to favour rate payers. 	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
Mcneill	Kirsty		Support	User pays is a fair way to fund the activities etc used by all people, rate payers or not. Rate payers shouldn't be subsidising everyone else.	no comment
Meredith	Dave		Support	Mostly worth it	no comment
Mewhinney	Judith		Oppose	Don't believe these are necessary	no comment
Meyer	Andre		Support	still seem reasonable	no comment
Moser	Claire		Oppose	Please see attached	no comment
Moser	Jill		Oppose	as below	no comment
Mueller	Tim		Support	User fees should be increased even more. Do not subsidise all the luxurious things at the expense of core business (e.g. 3-waters)	Fees & Charges: The council is exploring a more equitable fee structure by investigating targeted surcharges and tiered pricing for locals and tourists to ensure that visitors contribute a greater share toward the maintenance and enhancement of the public facilities they enjoy.
Muir	Madeleine		Support	As a Luggate resident I do not believe our rates should be set at 29% increase.	no comment

Munn	Elizabeth		Oppose	<p>If the Queenstown lakes area supermarkets or big retailers decided that their prices were suddenly going up by 11 to 29% next month, with the highest rises in the lowest income areas:- There would be a media storm, the commerce commission would step in , people would take their business elsewhere they would fail because there business plan is broken. The reasons for this would be transparent.</p> <p>Why does the QLDC (which is essentially a business selling us services) think it can be so rapacious just because we can't easily take our business elsewhere or avoid our rates. Clearly your business plan is broken and it is not transparent to me why Hawea's rates are going up so much. This area of the QLDC has exceptionally poor value from the QLDC (no Community centre, no footpaths, part time library etc and unwanted housing development foisted on us). Pensioners and working families will really struggle with rates increase which seems grossly unfair., especially when our position seems to be similar to that of Kingston, where rises are much less steep. Better explanations changes to reduce the rate rises would be appreciated.</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>
Norrish	Oliver		Oppose	<p>From: Location: Hāwea Flat</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>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Novotny	Michelle		Oppose	<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. <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>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
---------	----------	--	--------	--	--

O'Callaghan	Kate		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------------	------	--	--------	--	--

O'Callaghan	Stu		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Oakes	Karen		Oppose	<p>The Qldc is extracting more money from rate payers in Hawea, without properly improving infrastructure. Qldc are greatly increasing population density, but charging existing residents for the 'privilege' of the new residents sewage to be trucked out & traffic to sit in. Expanding population density without expanding the already under serviced infrastructure is irresponsible and these costs should not be passed onto existing residents who struggle to pay the already outrageous rates. Extremely unfair when I see this to be the qldcs responsibility.</p>	<p>Growth enabled through the Spatial Plan and District Plan is intended to be supported by development contributions from new development. These contributions are a key mechanism to ensure that the infrastructure required to service growth—such as transport, water, wastewater treatment and community facilities—is funded by those developments that create the additional demand. Rates paid for by existing residents are used to maintain and improve the levels of service for the community as a whole. They are not designed to fund the additional infrastructure to provide for new growth. Trucking of waste is entirely paid for by the developer of the sites that require trucking to occur prior to under construction infrastructure being completed.</p>
Overton	Tom		Support	User pays is the fairest allocation of costs	no comment

PAGE	TREVOR	Southern Safety Services Ltd	Oppose	<p>Southern Safety Services Ltd - Industry Feedback on Proposed QLDC TMP & CAR Fee Increases</p> <p>On behalf of Southern Safety Services Ltd, I am writing to provide feedback on the Queenstown Lakes District Council's proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure for the 2026/27 year.</p> <p>While we acknowledge QLDC's need to recover the costs associated with administering these services, we have a number of concerns regarding the scale, structure, and application of the proposed fee increases. We respectfully request further clarification and engagement before the fees are finalised.</p> <p>1. Proposed Fee Increases We are concerned about the overall magnitude of the proposed TMP and CAR fees. Charges for non-excavation corridor access and TMP-related activities appear to be significantly higher than those applied by other Road Controlling Authorities across New Zealand.</p> <p>In particular, the new fees do not appear to reflect the full range of work types undertaken in this region, nor do they adequately distinguish between minor and major works. Based on our experience operating locally for over 25 years and our familiarity with fee structures in other regions, the proposed fees appear out of step with national norms.</p> <p>2. Transparency and Fee Methodology To date, we have received no clear explanation of how the proposed fee structure has been calculated or justified. While the principle of cost recovery is understood, it is important that fees remain proportionate to the services provided.</p> <p>Clarification is also sought regarding the \$288 fee for a revision of an approved TMP. Clear guidance on what constitutes a revision—such as whether minor administrative changes would</p>	<p>Proposed Fee Increases Council note the Global Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee levels are lawful, risk-based, and designed to recover the total cost of providing corridor access oversight. Financial data shows that the Road Corridor Authority (RCA) Function meeting the Revenue and Finance Policy for an 80/20 user/rate split. Notably the RCA fees and charges were not adjusted for inflation for the period 2016 to 2024. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>Transparency and Fee Methodology Council confirm the RCA fee setting approach complies with the Local Government Act and Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and that no itemised cost breakdown is required or recommended, as fees are designed to recover the total cost of the corridor access service rather than individual activities.</p> <p>For clarity, the TMP revision fee does not apply to minor administrative adjustments — such as corrections to contact details, typographical errors, or minimal extensions that do not change the approved layout or risk profile. All other changed to an approved TMP are charged the revision fee.</p> <p>Application of Fees Across Queenstown and Wānaka Council note the introduction of the Global CAR fee has resolved previous complexity associated with charging across multiple networks, and that no further change is required as global activities are now charged once under a single, consolidated fee.</p> <p>Non-Excavation Corridor Access Requests (\$2,660) Council note the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee is compliant with cost-recovery requirements and reflects up to 12 months of authorised access and ongoing assurance responsibilities. In perspective \$2,660 is the equivalent to 8 specific applications over a 12 month period, so regular use of the global permit represents an efficient fee pathway for customers. However, we also note that QLDC sits at the upper end of reviewed non-excavation global fees nationally. To improve proportionality and public confidence, officers recommend a modest reduction to the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee to \$1,890.00, which retains the Global approval model, overall fee structure, and risk-based approach. This adjustment is intended to better align the fee with perceived risk, without compromising Council's ability to recover the total cost of the service or shifting costs onto ratepayers. Due to the lower number of these applications the forecast impact on revenue from this reduction is \$23k. Applicants can also apply for individual CARs should they wish to reduce upfront cost.</p> <p>Global Excavation CAR Fee (\$3,960) no comment</p>
Parker	Pamela	Private	Support	<p>By increasing the user-pays component of services you provide choice to the community as to what they spend their money on rather than forcing people to cover the subsidy in their rates.</p>	
Penfold	Rachel		Oppose	<p>The proposed increase of rates in Luggate by over 29% is frankly preposterous and I cannot believe that any council in this economic climate would believe that this is reasonable. I understand that development is required in Luggate due to increase in residential builds requiring further infrastructure and in this case water supply but I am uncertain as to why this falls on the rate payer. The developer who has profited from increasing the numbers of dwellings in the area should also be responsible for ensuring that the infrastructure can support the number of new homes that they have made massive profits off. House prices are dropping due to world events and interest rates are rising and the council want to hike our rates over a quarter more of what we currently pay? This is incredibly unreasonable particularly when the vast majority of our current rates goes to supporting queenstown infrastructure and projects. I thoroughly oppose this change and would also appreciate a full breakdown of where the projects are that my rates are currently funding, preferably on a map so that my point is clear. If little investment has been completed in Luggate since the last plan I should know where my money has been spent and why when there is finally some new infrastructure going into my community I have to foot the bill.</p>	<p>Rising costs, infrastructure demands, and regulatory requirements mean rates remain the primary funding tool for essential infrastructure and services.</p> <p>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.</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>

Perkins	Graeme & Yvonne		Oppose	<p>We feel that is extremely unfair that a small community like Luggate is shouldering such a huge share of the infrastructure costs. We are not a wealthy town. It seems we are paying for misdirected development costs from the past, and for future proofing for a larger town. This is too hard on our Luggate families - house values have risen through no fault of our own and don't reflect the ability of residents to meet such a staggering rate increase. We personally are concerned for both young families and our older people living here. Please adopt a more caring approach to this issue rather than simply one of facts and figures.</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>
Perriam	Elle		Oppose	<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. 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 	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Piggot	Jan		Oppose	<p>I accept the rates need to be increased to cover increasing costs. The rates rise for Luggate is too high. I feel we are paying for more of the infrastructure than we should be.</p> <p>1) 29% is more than families and some retired folks can afford in the current climate. People being forced to leave will impact the community.</p> <p>2) Private residents should not have to front up to support new developments or the airport. It is not clear what proportion of the water and sewage upgrades is being paid by the present community and what is being paid for by the airport or the developers. It is not clear what the developer contributions have been, whether they are covering the total cost of the infrastructure for the new developments OR whether their contributions are being spent in Luggate or shared throughout QLDC</p> <p>3) Current rate payers should not be paying for the extra infrastructure required for projected increases in the population, for example the size of the pipes and the ultraviolet filters.</p> <p>I applaud the council for listening and acting on our original concerns about the water in Luggate, several years ago, but we had no idea that we would be paying so much personally to fund this. This is about equity. Have we not supported many of the mistakes of the Queenstown community? So why is this burden just falling on us?</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
Polson	Olle		Neutral	<p>Passing on fees via tourism seems like a more logical step. Much of the proposed strains on existing infrastructure is caused by international tourism. Charge those that are responsible for the increases my concern is you will keep driving costs up for locals which ultimately makes it less and less affordable for locals to live. It's a complex issue and I appreciate that but more needs to be put on to tourism rather than locals picking up the burden consistently.</p>	The council is exploring a more equitable fee structure by investigating targeted surcharges and tiered pricing for locals and 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.
Pugsley	Dan		Oppose	<p>Firstly... your off you head!!!</p> <p>The over paid, under educated clown or group of clowns aka circus who came up with this concept should knock on the door of every person, family, and worker who is lucky enough to have made enough money to scrap, borrow and lend their way into a property in the southern lakes and then look them in the eye and tell them..... hey I know money's tight right now with the fuel hikes, the inflation, and international unrest buuut there the thing!!!! I know since the last 5 year property value has doubled therefore councils RV has done the same and also you as the land owner got hit with an 11% rate rise last year but because council underestimated th3 fact that people moving into Longview were human and also needed to go poo poo and then they thought..... I know let's just let the struggling people fit the bill for our own idiocracy.</p> <p>About right??</p>	no comment
RADLEY	Michael		Support	x	no comment

Rainsford	Scott		Oppose	<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"> 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. 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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Robson	Luke		Oppose	<p>Cost of everything is going up, can't afford rates rise of ~20% in Luggate</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>
Samson	Greg		Oppose	<p>To much of a large jump in price increase. Unaffordable, especially at this time.</p> <p>Do we get reimbursed for our previous 'haweia' rates that have gone towards projects in queenstown etc?</p>	Water rates are targeted to the community that benefits. Haweia is not paying for Queenstown's water projects.
Saunders	Christopher		Neutral	<p>For a more considered response, can you please provide details by relevant activity, the level of revenue generated in the 2025/2026 financial year</p>	This information is included in the supplementary income under the Financial Impact Statements.

saupin	anthony		Oppose	<p>I do not agree the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.</p> <p>Over the past several years, rates in the QLDC have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, 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. 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. <u>Not everything can or should be delivered at once.</u></p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	---------	--	--------	--	--

Sawers	Melissa		Oppose	<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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
--------	---------	--	--------	--	--

Scott	Aaron	Elite Safety Limited	Oppose	<p>Submission: TMP and Corridor Access Request (CAR) Fees</p> <p>We formally raise serious concerns regarding the proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee structure published by QLDC. We do not support the proposed fees in their current form.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed fees may not meet the Local Government Act requirement that charges be reasonable and aligned with actual cost recovery, rather than revenue generation.</p> <p>As an organisation working directly with industry, we previously raised concerns when significant fee increases (in some cases exceeding 800%) were introduced without consultation. At that time, we were advised that engagement with industry stakeholders would occur for the 2026/2027 review. To date, no meaningful consultation has occurred prior to the release of these proposed fees.</p> <p>Our position on the proposed fees and charges is outlined below:</p> <p>1. Scale of Fee Increases</p> <p>We oppose the scale of the proposed TMP and CAR fees. The charges for non-excavation corridor access and TMP-related activities are significantly higher than those charged by other Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs) across New Zealand. Based on our knowledge of the sector, most RCAs charge a fraction of what is being proposed by QLDC. Even when compared to higher-cost authorities such as Wellington, QLDC's proposed fees remain substantially higher (by approximately \$1,500 in comparable cases).</p> <p>This indicates that the proposed fees are not consistent with industry norms and raises concerns about whether they are reasonable.</p> <p>2. Lack of Justification and Transparency</p> <p>We do not support the proposed fees due to a lack of</p> <p>QLDC have taken money from the development of Hawea without the necessary infrastructure in place now have realised an upgrade is required..how dumb are these planners??</p>	<p>SCALE OF FEE INCREASES</p> <p>Council note the Global Corridor Access Request (CAR) fee levels are lawful, risk-based, and designed to recover the total cost of providing corridor access oversight. Financial data shows that the Road Corridor Authority (RCA) Function meeting the Revenue and Finance Policy for an 80/20 user/rate split. Notably the RCA fees and charges were not adjusted for inflation for the period 2016 to 2024. We also note that because Global fees were introduced as new consolidated charges, their scale has been more visible to industry than previously.</p> <p>LACK OF JUSTIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>Council confirm the RCA fee setting approach complies with the Local Government Act and Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and that no itemised cost breakdown is required or recommended, as fees are designed to recover the total cost of the corridor access service rather than individual activities.</p> <p>DOUBLE CHARGING ACROSS QUEENSTOWN AND WĀNAKA</p> <p>Council note the introduction of the Global CAR fee has resolved previous complexity associated with charging across multiple networks, and that no further change is required as global activities are now charged once under a single, consolidated fee.</p> <p>NON-EXCAVATION CORRIDOR ACCESS REQUESTS (\$2,660 FEE)</p> <p>Council note the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee is compliant with cost-recovery requirements and reflects up to 12 months of authorised access and ongoing assurance responsibilities. In perspective \$2,660 is the equivalent to 8 specific applications over a 12 month period, so regular use of the global permit represents an efficient fee pathway for customers. However, we also note that QLDC sits at the upper end of reviewed non-excavation global fees nationally. To improve proportionality and public confidence, officers recommend a modest reduction to the Global Non-Excavation CAR fee to \$1,890.00, which retains the Global approval model, overall fee structure, and risk-based approach. This adjustment is intended to better align the fee with perceived risk, without compromising Council's ability to recover the total cost of the service or shifting costs onto ratepayers. Due to the lower number of these applications the forecast impact on revenue from this reduction is \$23k. Applicants can also apply for individual CARs should they wish to reduce upfront cost.</p> <p>INCREMENTAL EXCAVATION CAR FEES (BASED ON TRENCH LENGTH)</p> <p>Council continue to use excavation length as a transparent and practical proxy for scale, workload, and risk, and that no change to the existing graduated fee structure is recommended, given it has been stable, understood, and consistently applied for over a decade. We also note that most, if not all, RCAs use similar incremental fees.</p>
Scrivener	John		Support	<p>QLDC have taken money from the development of Hawea without the necessary infrastructure in place now have realised an upgrade is required..how dumb are these planners??</p>	no comment
Shaw	Samuel		Neutral	I don't mind either option to pay for trail build and maintenance.	no comment
Sinclair Irwin	Isabella		Support	User pays is a fair system and should reflect the inflationary rises as well as covering improvements to facilities.	no comment
Skelton	David		Oppose	Rates increase is too high developers need to pay more	no comment

Smith	Andrew		Oppose	<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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
-------	--------	--	--------	--	--

Snelling	Lani		Oppose	<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. <p><u>There needs to be confidence from the community that all</u> It makes sense to charge the people who use the services.</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Stephens	Sarah		Support	<p>It makes sense to charge the people who use the services.</p>	no comment
Stoner	Steven		Oppose	<p>1: The proposed new Rates in Luggate are far from clear . The proposed Pan element Does not take into consideration that the occupancy of any dwelling. These figures are available from statistics NZ.</p> <p>2: It is still unclear where the developers contributions have been spent . This would have a large impact on the final sum would be.</p> <p>3: We had an up grade to our sewer system Two years ago we are still unclear as to why a further up grade was required as from the meeting with the Mayor this is still unexplained</p> <p>4: We have not had an explanation as to how much of this installation is relevant to The luggate village IE the 184 house holds being held accountable . It Would appear that all this new infrastructure is to support up and coming developments. The pumps and pipes installed have the ability to supply 4000 homes we are only 184 ?</p> <p>5: The spending of this amount of money is supposed to be gazetted before spending giving the public a chance to make informed choices rather than a demand after the fact. Maybe this is a decision best mad by the ombudsman.</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
Suggate	Helen		Oppose	See attached	

Summerville	Zoe		Oppose	<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 	<p>The rates increases across the district are driven by a complex financial landscape. 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. 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>
Tan	Boon Khiang		Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea because it unfairly shifts the cost of long-standing infrastructure and planning failures onto residents. The Hāwea wastewater system has been under an abatement notice for nitrogen non-compliance, showing the system was already failing environmental standards before the current upgrade programme was proposed. This reflects delayed investment and inadequate long-term planning, not any change in resident behaviour. At the same time, QLDC continued to approve subdivision growth during years when the wastewater system was already under pressure, adding demand to infrastructure that was known to be constrained. Development contributions in Hāwea are among the highest in the district, and these costs are embedded in the price of land and new builds, meaning new investment in the community has already contributed significantly to growth-related infrastructure. Councillors have publicly questioned whether these contributions are being properly ring-fenced and whether growth is genuinely paying for growth. The system was already non-compliant, growth was enabled despite constraints, development contributions have not covered the true cost of growth-driven upgrades, and now residents are being asked to absorb a 22.3% increase, double the district average. A rise of this scale, not signalled in the Long Term Plan, creates an unreasonable financial shock and undermines confidence in the fairness of the rating system. I ask QLDC to reduce the increase for Hāwea to be in line with district average, provide transparent cost allocation, and avoid placing a disproportionate burden on the community.</p>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>

Telfer	Rebekah		Oppose	<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.</p> <p>Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties</p> <p>rates hike</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
tetzlaff	david		Oppose		no comment

Thompson	Jazmin		Oppose	<p>From: Jazmin 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>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------	--------	--	--------	---	--

Thompson	Brittany		Oppose	<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 	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Turner	Olivia		Oppose	<p>The proposed variation in rates increase for the Luggate area is well above what is affordable for the average homeowner. We are still navigating high fixed interest rates and with the cost of living at an all time high I'm seriously wondering how is this possible. It is so discouraging and makes us not want to live here. Where is the transparency and where is the consideration from the paper pushing decision makers on council? How about salary decrease to contribute and to compensate for the lack of professionalism in executing such an impactful increase. Community morale is down because of this. What will council be doing to help?</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>
Vlietstra	Paul		Oppose	<p>We are retired and moved to Luggate so we could afford to stay in Otago (lived here all our lives). Our pension is not rising so we won't be able to cope with a huge increase in rates etc, especially with the cost of food petrol and electricity which continues to rise.</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>
Walsh	Lucy		Oppose	We can't afford it	no comment
Ward	Judy		Oppose	Financial strain on people.has got to unsustainable levels.	no comment

Williams	Amy		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
----------	-----	--	--------	--	--

Williams	Kawhata		Oppose	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the ongoing trajectory of rates increases proposed in this Annual Plan, particularly given the growing impact on communities such as Lake Hāwea. Rates across the Queenstown Lakes District have risen significantly in recent years and are now placing sustained and, for many households, unsustainable financial pressure on residents. These increases are no longer marginal adjustments — they are materially affecting household affordability. In communities like Lake Hāwea, this pressure is especially evident. Many long-term locals who contribute significantly to the community are increasingly being priced out by rising rates alongside mortgage, insurance, and living costs. As a non-discretionary expense, rates directly impact whether people can afford to remain living in the district.</p> <p>While I recognise Council faces real challenges around growth and infrastructure, the current approach places too much of the burden on existing ratepayers. The key issue is not whether investment is needed, but whether it is affordable — and at present, it is not.</p> <p>I believe a more balanced and equitable approach is required: Affordability must be a hard constraint. Rates increases must reflect what households can realistically sustain, not simply what funding requirements dictate.</p> <p>Tourism must contribute more directly. Visitors place significant demand on local infrastructure, yet costs are largely borne by residents. Stronger mechanisms such as visitor levies should be prioritised so users contribute fairly to the system they rely on.</p> <p>Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.</p> <p>Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully</p>	see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission
Woodward	Bree		Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed 29% rates increase for our community.</p> <p>Following last year's 17% rise, this level of continued increase is simply not affordable for many households. Cost of living pressures are already significant, and increases of this scale place unnecessary strain on families who are doing their best to keep up.</p> <p>In addition, the distribution of the proposed increase does not appear fair or proportionate. It is unclear why communities like Luggate are facing such substantial rises, and there seems to be an imbalance in how the burden is being shared. And how all our rates are being shared across our district.</p> <p>I urge the council to reconsider the scale of this increase and review how rates are allocated, with a focus on affordability and fairness for all residents.</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

Woolford	Nicola		Oppose	<p>I believe we are being primed for a 22% rate rise. How on earth can households afford this when the cost of living is rising rapidly around us. I believe it has something to do with the 2percent rates cap that will be rolled out in 2027.. Just getting ahead? Yes I know Council does ALOT. I know! and thank you! but this increase will be a tipping point for many who.. A) only have one house.. and live in it/ B) rent a house from someone who owns two or three or more houses and will pass on the rates to their tenants and make the cost of living higher again.. and 3) create a mini crisis of employment for the lower paid but essential services that keep the town running. I believe a review of staff salaries, additional spending and additional tourist charges should be put into action. I am all for good wages and tourism but .. wheres the happy medium? Do you just pass all of this on to households, many who are already struggling, especially families who are trying to just cover costs with inflated housing in areas like Lake Hāwea and Luggate... Please consider this a letter of non support for this excessive rate rise. Thank you.</p>	<p>The rates increases across the distict are driven by several factors, including external economic pressures that push cost increases higher than inflation, as well as central government mandates regarding water reform and resource management. Additionally, our region's growth requires critical infrastructure investment which carry essential ongoing costs. The Annual Plan expenditure represents 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>In respect of additional tourist charges, council is investigating targeted surcharges and tiered pricing for locals and tourists to ensure that visitors contribute a greater share toward the maintenance and enhancement of the public facilities they enjoy thorough the long term plan.</p>
Wrench	Hannah		Oppose	<p>From: Hannah Wrench 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> <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>	<p>see comment for Daniel Hamilton submission</p>
Young	Ross		Support	<p>They seem reasonable</p>	<p>no comment</p>