

# Annual Plan / Mahere ā tau

2026  
2027

/ Submissions Pack 1 /  
/ 13–15 May 2026 /

Achterberg,Anton .....	4
Ackroyd,Toni .....	6
Adams,Tyron .....	7
Adams,Helena .....	8
Allan,Craig .....	9
Allard,David .....	10
Allen,Sarah.....	11
Allen,Erica.....	13
Anderson,Rod .....	14
Anderson,Kim.....	15
Anderson,Lynnette .....	16
Anson,Danielle.....	17
Aotearoa,Protect Our Winters .....	18
Aubrey,Scott.....	19
Aubrey,Louise.....	20
Barker,Chris .....	21
Barratt,Kevin .....	23
Barringer,James.....	24
Barry,Robert .....	25
Bartlett,Catkin .....	26
Barton,Kirsty .....	27
Barton,Kirsty .....	28
bayc,angie.....	29
Beable,Barbara.....	30
Beacham,Jason.....	31
Beacham,Joanne.....	32
Bedggood,Hemi.....	33
Bell,Alexander .....	34
Bell,Ronald .....	35
BELL,Hamish .....	36
Bell,Tracey.....	40
Bendle,Hannah .....	41
Blum,Urs.....	42
Blum,Doris.....	43
Booiman,Arda .....	44
Boulter,Summer-Lee.....	45
Bowden,Sera .....	47
Brake,Natalie.....	48

Brake,Natalie.....	50
Brand,Terrence .....	51
britcher,Sam .....	52
Brockie,Christina.....	53
Brown,Sarah.....	54
Brown,Sarah.....	55
Brown,Lynette .....	56
Brown,Ian.....	58
Brown,Emma .....	59
Buckley,Francesca .....	61
Bulluss,Joanna .....	62
Burgess,Emma .....	63
Burke,Val.....	65
Busst,Nicola .....	66
Campbell,Don.....	67
Campbell,Megan.....	69
Carrington,Carl .....	70
Carroll,Grant .....	71
Cassidy,Simon .....	72
Causa,Connie .....	75
Charles,Ashley .....	76
Chave,Michelle .....	77
Chirnside,Craig.....	78
Clark,Stuart.....	79
Clifton,Carolyn & Rowan.....	81
Clough,Lisa.....	82
Clouston,Charlotte.....	83
Clouston,Charlotte.....	84
Cocks,Lyal .....	85
Collins,Megan .....	86
Collins,Mike .....	87
Colston,Adam .....	88
Cook,Blair .....	89
Cooper,Ben .....	90
Copland,Ross .....	91
Cotter,Guy.....	93
Cowie,Aaron.....	94
Cranfield,Jose .....	95

Creighton, Philip.....	96
Cro, Hayden.....	97
Crombie, Derek.....	98
Cross, Nicola.....	99
Cross, Simon.....	102
Cull, Rebecca.....	104
Cull, Thomas.....	105
Cull, Thomas.....	106
Davidson, Bridget.....	107
Dawson, Harry.....	108
Dawson, Masae.....	109
Dawson, Joanne.....	110
Dempster, Gina.....	112
Deschout, Yoka.....	114
Devereux, Genevieve.....	115
Devonda, Stevee.....	116
Dickens, Kirstin.....	117
Dickson, Kevin and Shirley.....	118
Doherty, Patricia.....	119
Donaldson, Louella.....	120
Donovan, Damien.....	121
Dowling, Fraser.....	122
Dowsett, Adam.....	123

Name	Achterberg, Anton	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.

6. There should be a fee for tourists using the things this area has to offer to help cover the cost.

7. With all these new developments is also more rate money coming in so technically there is no need to increase the rates as the income increases automatically with more new build owners paying rates that haven't been there before.

8. Instead of contracting everything out the council should employ their own people for road works, piping, electric matters, building, maintenance etc. this would significantly reduce the cost long term. This has been done like this in other countries for decades.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before making a decision.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6688703

Responded At: 2026-04-23 15:45:08 +1000

Name	Ackroyd,Toni	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea.

This increase is significantly higher than the district average of 11.6% and places an unfair burden on our community. Lake Hāwea and Luggate already have some of the lowest median property values in the district, yet residents are being asked to absorb one of the highest increases. This disproportionately affects young working families, retirees, and those on fixed incomes.

In particular, many of our neighbours are retirees who are receiving a 3% increase to their superannuation, while expecting to increase their rates payments 22% they will be left worse off.

In the same vein, the average pay increases for working families amounts typically to 4-6% (if I base this on myself - I haven't received a pay increase since 2022), again leaving the working class worse off year by year when calculating the cost of living compared to inflation. While this may not affect QLDC members as much with their 8-15% pay increases each year, this really hurts the average homeowner in lake Hāwea.

A substantial portion of the cost driving this increase appears to be related to growth and infrastructure, particularly the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. Based on Council's own figures, a significant share of these costs should be attributed to growth and therefore recovered from developers, rather than existing ratepayers.

It is also concerning that Lake Hāwea residents are being asked to fund costs now for infrastructure that is not yet operational, while other areas such as Kingston have had cost recovery deferred under similar circumstances. This inconsistency does not appear equitable.

I ask Council to reconsider this proposal and reduce the increase for Lake Hāwea to align more closely with the district average. A fairer distribution of costs, particularly those related to growth, is essential.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6687074

Responded At: 2026-04-22 15:45:10 +1000

Name	Adams,Tyron	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I am a local homeowner in Hawea and have been for 10 years and am not happy about the rates increase planned for Hawea , especially taking into consideration the current economic environment. I think they are ridiculously high and unsustainable.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6688641

Responded At: 2026-04-23 15:45:08 +1000

Name	Adams,Helena	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I am not in support of the changes proposed to rates in the Hawea area. The increase is not comparable to inflation and too high for most home owners to manage.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6680056

Responded At: 2026-04-20 10:16:11 +1000

Name	Allan,Craig	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
se submission

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Maybe sell the land a Ladies' Mile to make up funding shortfall rather than just making ratepayers pay more every year, use the airport dividend.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/091bc527dcf5af315acf4dc7c45bb64afa8b9c46/original/1776643828/eb64579328204e5771ab8585aaf89be1_l%20am%20writing%20to%20formally%20oppose%20the%20continued%20trajectory%20of%20rates%20increases%20proposed%20under%20this%20Annual%20Plan.docx?1776643828">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/091bc527dcf5af315acf4dc7c45bb64afa8b9c46/original/1776643828/eb64579328204e5771ab8585aaf89be1_l%20am%20writing%20to%20formally%20oppose%20the%20continued%20trajectory%20of%20rates%20increases%20proposed%20under%20this%20Annual%20Plan.docx?1776643828</a>

Name	Allard,David	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

I think that it is unsustainable for ratepayers to have to fund the infrastructure required for the seemingly endless stream of property developments. Clearly the funding currently being collected from developers is insufficient to cover the cost burden caused by their project(s). In Australia, Developers must pay the entire cost of the impact of their project on the Community. This has been the case for many years and he's not been an impediment to growth.

In practical terms this can mean providing kilometres of water water piping from the development to a processing station, or the cost of increasing the capability for the system and even roading alterations to cope with increased traffic flows.

The proposed Plan should introduce this funding requirement and by doing so relieve the ratepayers from the current and grossly unfair imposition of rate increases to fund much of the infrastructure development.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Allen,Sarah	Organisation (if any)	Southern Land Limited and Southern Land Queenstown Limited	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

Our position on the proposed fees and charges is outlined below:

#### 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.

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 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.

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.

#### 3. Double Charging Across Queenstown and Wanaka

We oppose the application of separate TMP processing fees for Queenstown and Wanaka where a single TMP is submitted for one activity.

This appears to duplicate charges for a single scope of work and does not reflect a proportional increase in review time or effort. This approach is not reasonable and places an unnecessary financial burden on operators.

#### 4. Non-Excavation Corridor Access Requests (\$2,660 fee)

We strongly oppose the application of a \$2,660 fee for non-excavation Corridor Access Requests.

Low-risk, low-impact activities (such as surveying) are being charged at a level that does not reflect the complexity or effort required to review and approve these activities. This lack of differentiation between low-risk and high-risk activities is not proportionate.

There is no evidence provided to justify this fee, including:

- The actual cost components being recovered
- The level of service delivered
- The number of audits or inspections undertaken for these activities

Without this information, it is difficult to see how this fee can be considered reasonable.

#### 7. Risk to Compliance and Safety Outcomes

We are particularly concerned about the impact these fees will have on compliance and safety outcomes.

Excessive fees are likely to discourage compliance, resulting in works being undertaken without notification or approval. This creates increased risk across the network and undermines the purpose of the TMP system.

#### 8. Alignment with the Local Government Act

It has been indicated that fee increases were linked to the need to increase internal resourcing.

We do not consider this to be consistent with the Local Government Act requirement that fees reflect the cost of providing the service. Increases of up to 800% raise serious concerns as to whether the requirement for fees to be reasonable has been met.

Requested Outcomes

We request that QLDC:

- Provide a detailed breakdown of how all proposed TMP and CAR fees have been calculated
- Demonstrate that fees are based on actual cost recovery, not revenue generation
- Remove duplication of charges across locations (Queenstown and Wanaka)
- Introduce a tiered, risk-based fee structure that reflects activity complexity
- Provide evidence of inspection and audit activity used to justify fees
- Undertake meaningful consultation with industry stakeholders before finalising any changes

Summary

In summary, we do not support the proposed TMP and CAR fees in their current form. The scale of the increases, lack of transparency, and absence of consultation raise significant concerns regarding fairness, proportionality, and compliance with legislative requirements.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

--

<b>Long Term Plan 2027-2037</b>
---------------------------------

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

<b>Other feedback</b>
-----------------------

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?
--

--

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
---	----

Pre-prepared submission link:	
-------------------------------	--

Name	Allen, Erica	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Good Afternoon

Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026 – 2027.

I wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13 – 14 May 2026.

I object to the 22.3% median residential rates increase as proposed for Hawea in the QLDC's Draft Annual Plan 2026 – 2027, when compared to the district average of 11.6%.

In the 2025 – 2026 year our increase was 15.3% so the combined increase on an average house in Hawea over 2 years is around \$1,816 – way more than a middle to lower income village should be expected to deal with.

The explanation for this large increase has been given as necessary to cover the costs incurred or to be incurred for the development of the sewerage system and pipeline to Project Pure near Wanaka Airport but my question is why should those of us who have owned our property in Hawea for many years and previously paid for sewerage and water upgrades have to pay for something that would not be necessary if the recently developed and future large subdivisions had not been forced upon Hawea.

Why should the existing ratepayers be forced to cover the costs that are being incurred to provide services for future residents – surely these charges should be covered by those who are developing new land and stand to profit from these developments.

Wanaka is also benefitting from this waste water project so why is the cost of the development being split 50:50 with Wanaka who have vastly more residential and commercial units to share the costs across, where is the fairness in this approach?

The residents of Hawea, both long-term and recent are not generally wealthy people.

They have chosen to live in Hawea for it's quality of life and affordability but now many say they can no longer afford to live here.

Please reconsider this approach to the setting of our rates for the 2026 – 2027 year and treat all QLDC with fairness.

Please also base deliberations on the fact that Hawea residents generally receive very little in the way of amenities and services.

We have water meters but Wanaka residents do not but we also have massive leaks within our water system evidenced by water pouring out of the ground in many places.

We have very few footpaths, no public transport and we funded and maintain our own community centre.

There are options and one of these is to use the same formula as applied in Kingston and ensure that our rates increase sits within the average range across the QLDC region.

Reading the Kingston rates fact sheet (March 2026) the council says that "it would be unfair to begin full cost recovery now" because the Kingston scheme is "not yet operational" – nor is ours!

Where is the fairness in this approach?

Kind Regards

Erica Allen

submitted via email - entered by Let's Talk team

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6661205

Responded At: 2026-03-27 21:27:45 +1100

Name	Anderson,Rod	Organisation (if any)	Luggate Community Association	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
The proposed increase in Rates in the Luggate area. A proposed increase of 29% is both ridiculous and unfair to many residents. As residents we have contributed to the costs of QLDC over many years including the Leaky homes fiasco in Queenstown so now if Luggate has a project that is beyond the community financing why is the entire community not helping us out? I understand that the Airport required additional water to allow future approval, so this also is a region expense	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Anderson, Kim	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:


I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



**Closing Position**

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
--	-----

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6688316

Responded At: 2026-04-23 11:14:49 +1000

Name	Anderson,Lynnette	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
N/A	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
N/A	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
Please prioritize protecting the Environment which is an important asset for our future enjoyment and economy. Large unsustainable increases-in population and Tourism will heavily impact this. A large open cast mine in the area will also be to our regions detriment. A cap on the amount of tourist coming in also would help.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Proposal to increase rates in Lake Hawea 22%	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hawea has been a more affordable area to live. But now it is becoming too expensive to stay</li> <li>2. Why do we have to pay for the new 3 waters scheme before we have it.</li> <li>3. Why do existing residents have to pay for council approved additional developments which were disputed by the community at the time. Why cant developers contribute more.</li> <li>4. It seems unfair to have to share the 3 waters scheme 50/50 with Wanaka when they have a bigger population than Hawea.</li> <li>5. Due to this area being a big tourist attraction, could there be a tourist levy that would contribute to our infrastructure. During Peak tourist and holiday seasons our existing infrastructure is tested.</li> </ol>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6688737

Responded At: 2026-04-23 15:45:09 +1000

Name	Anson, Danielle	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/a71b383ed3845bd4095e48c644b3bbd9988605b2/original/1776922125/de8165889948d727730024b2d999df81_QLDC%20Rates%20Submission%202026-27.docx?1776922125">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/a71b383ed3845bd4095e48c644b3bbd9988605b2/original/1776922125/de8165889948d727730024b2d999df81_QLDC%20Rates%20Submission%202026-27.docx?1776922125</a>

Name	Aotearoa,Protect Our Winters	Organisation (if any)	Protect Our Winters New Zealand incorporated	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

1. The lakefront and town centre development. This means more recreation, closer to town, and easily accessible by locals and visitors without having to drive. A pedestrian friendly lakefront-downtown connection will be good for everyone, and the climate.

3. Shared paths and active transport. It's essential that an active transport network be planned and implemented now, before significantly more development happens and an active transport network has to be retrofitted. A safe and separated network will provide more choices for how people can get around, and means more people will be able to bike and walk safely and efficiently. POW also specifically supports a Ballentyne rd active transport corridor.

10. Timsfield Park. This is important to provide outdoor recreation for everyone who lives in and visits Hawea.

12. Community communication and engagement. POW would like to see more opportunities for people of all ages and income levels, permanent and seasonal locals to engage with the local leaders on the WUCCB. POW supports the proposal for both participative and deliberative engagement approaches, and also supports wider educational campaigns for civics and sustainability. POW would love to be specifically consulted with, and have our members engaged with. We have many members who have spent a lot of time in other similar mountain towns around the world.

13. Public transport. YES! The current fuel crisis is highlighting how few choices people who live in Wanaka have for how to get around. It is unfortunately a town designed for driving. It is very challenging to live in Wanaka without a car and this shouldn't be the case. Seasonal employees should be able to move to Wanaka for the winter and not have to buy a car. Visitors should be able to come to Wanaka and not have to rent a car. The QLDC and the WUCCB need to be loud and clear with their advocacy to make sure Wanaka has public transport. POW acknowledges that this is technically the role of the ORC but that doesn't means it's not their responsibility to help make public transport in Wanaka a priority.

15. Water quality. POW supports work with water quality groups to create an effective, enduring 'structure' to influence the development of LTPs, 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy, the QLDC code of practice and the next Climate and Biodiversity Plan into the future. Wai Wanaka seems like the obvious group to engage with but also farming groups who have expert knowledge and that have influence over fertilizer use, grazing practices, and herd numbers all of which contribute to water and climate pollution.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

POW supports a local visitors levy. This could be used to help fund public transport, outdoor recreation, and other important services that benefit both visitors and locals, but at this moment only locals pay for. Many POW members have experience visiting similar mountain towns overseas where a visitor levy helps fund critical infrastructure, specifically public transport, but also other outdoor recreation areas.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Wanaka Lakefront development should be a priority and will benefit locals and visitors.

An Active Transport network for Wanaka is essential, and should be designed and built early

Public transport must be prioritised, but smarter urban design would make public transport more efficient too. Both need to be considered together.

General advice: Less urban sprawl, smarter, denser housing with public transport! More natural recreation development such as trails for walking, hiking, biking close to town.

A visitors levy to help fund things such as active transport networks, recreational trails, and public transport.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Respondent No: 6656514

Responded At: 2026-03-26 19:07:19 +1100

Name	Aubrey,Scott	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6690645

Responded At: 2026-04-24 13:21:09 +1000

Name	Aubrey,Louise	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>Afternoon,          Please accept this as my formal submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027.          I do not wish to speak in support of my submission at the hearing on 13-14 May 2026.          I do not support the rates increase proposed for Hawea as a ratepayer in the area.          Lake Hawea and Luggate have the lowest median property values in the district. Working families, tradespeople and retirees bear the burden - not wealthy holiday-home owners. On Councils own figures 47% of the UCCS cost is attributable to growth. that should have been recovered from developers not existing ratepayers, and the UCCS is not yet operational.          Thank you very much,          Louise Aubrey          Submitted via email, entered by Let's Talk team</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Barker,Chris	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I wish to object to the proposed 2026-7 median rate rise of 22.3% for Lake Hawea. Additionally, being a former ratepayer in Luggate, I would also add my opposition to the proposed 29.3% increase for that district. I have been a Wanaka-area ratepayer for approximately 28 years, and am well aware of the expansion history of this District, which has been dynamic to say the least. I do appreciate that QLDC has undergone a rapid expansion during this time in order to keep up with same.

However, in recent years it would seem a disconnect has grown between QLDC and ratepayers on "this side of the hill", particularly with regard to the smaller outlying districts around Wanaka.

An example is the Longview Liquor license application; If locals didn't object, it would go through. Locals did object, in record numbers, but their objections were dismissed as too "generic" and unable to prove specific harm to the community - that's a high bar to clear until it's built, and then it's too late anyway. We were even told that because we didn't object to the supermarket selling booze we had set a precedent (!) So, to be consistent, we should have been outside New World Three Parks with our tambourines and Salvation Army band when that opened....

The KHL application was resubmitted and pushed through without consultation.

Bottom line is now the people of Longview will now enjoy convenient access to RTD's before they have similar access to fresh food; That's a great message to send them.

Here in Hawea we are not all qualified experts in the demographic/geographic effects of isolated alcohol outlet placement, but we are concerned citizens of an engaged local community; our very isolation from other urban areas makes us so - just look at our fight against the fast-track application of Contact Energy.

Now we are asked to pay a 22.3% increase in our rates, before they become capped next year, an increase QLDC can't seem to justify by any specific figures, even when their own elected local councillors have asked for same. This is not transparency. We need to know this information.

This rise "seems" to be in relation to the connection of the UCCS wastewater system to Project Pure via Albert Town, but without the figures how do we know? and wasn't that expected to be covered by additional payments provided by Government for allowance of an HCA placement zone and developers of new subdivisions? Please advise.

On that note, QLDC approved a 2500 section subdivision that had no provision for sewage disposal except trucking it out....visitors from overseas just cannot comprehend that information when I tell them. Not a good look for QLDC.

The UCCS upgrade is to cope with all the new sections being put in, which therefore should be paid for by all those who will benefit from it ( c 5500 sites ) - yet it seems that only the existing ratepayers are being invoiced - ( c 1200 ratepayers) is this fair? Please advise. Were ratepayers even consulted for input before the decision was made to undertake this UCCS upgrade over other options? No. Had we been consulted, we might have accepted a one-off rates rise to cover such an upgrade, yet we were not - just asked to be the (unqualified) cash cow.

Also, this UCCS project is not yet completed, yet we are being asked upfront to pay for it? Is this because QLDC are showing a large increase in cost of interest on borrowings? The only other situation I can think of where you pay upfront for something you might get in the future are luxury sports cars - and this is not a Ferrari. Please advise.

I see Kingston is getting a wastewater upgrade - yet their rates increase is half of Haweas. Council have even stated in the Kingston Rates Fact Sheet (March 2026) that it would be "unfair to begin full cost recovery now" on Kingston because the scheme is " not yet operational". So - no consistency there then. Please advise.

Is there not c23 Million NZD coming from developers as well as a central Govt allocation for this expansion due to the HCA setup? Therefore, if QLDC are asking existing ratepayers to pay upfront for UCCS, should the same ratepayers expect a full refund to this value when it arrives in QLDC coffers? Please advise.

This Rates increase seems to be something thrown out to the hinterlands on the basis we will not complain, and if we do we can be safely ignored, as before. If this is the case QLDC are sorely misinformed. As well as being over twice the regions average increase it lacks transparency, consultation with ratepayers, accountability ( even to council representatives ), and any stress-tested assurance that the project(s) it might cover will future-proof Hawea's infrastructure. It's a mess.

I feel Hawea and its ratepayers are being taken for granted, ignored, and regarded as "hicks", with this unquantified and and unjust rates increase.

250 years ago, a group of isolated and repressed citizens came up with a slogan; it was "no taxation without representation" It didn't work out well for a certain mad King.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6687085

Responded At: 2026-04-22 15:11:13 +1000

Name	Barratt, Kevin	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Priority must be given to minimise any non-essential rate rises in 2026-2027. We are pensioners and struggling to pay these rates	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>1. I request that the council reduce non-essential expenditure where possible to reduce these very steep rate rises</p> <p>2. Ensure that in future any foreseeable development cost that does not benefit existing residents is recovered in the form of development contributions from developers. Existing residents should not be burdened with development costs for things that often do not benefit them.</p> <p>3. Provide clear evidence to show how development contributions from developers are spent</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Barringer,James	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I attended a large meeting at the Lake Hawea Community Centre to try to learn more about the draft annual plan and in particular the very high rates increase proposed for Lake Hawea (22.3%). I understand this is driven by the council deciding that the bulk of the financial burden of the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyancing Scheme should be borne by the local communities directly benefiting from it.

There were a great many valid points raised at the meeting - but the following seemed most relevant in terms of objecting to the proposed rates increase for Lake Hawea.

Lake Hawea (and Luggate) have the lowest median property values in the district reflecting that they are communities of younger working families, trades people and retirees on fixed incomes not as able to afford such increases at any time let alone in the current cost-of-living crisis. There is considerable irony in the fact that the Longview development was pushed through planning in order to provide more affordable housing, despite the knowledge that the existing wastewater system could not support the increased number of homes. So the presence of this affordable housing area has resulted directly in the need for a new wastewater scheme which has lead directly to the proposed rates increase making that very housing considerably less affordable.

In principle, being asked to pay extra for services I benefit from directly is not unreasonable. However, had the Longview Development not gone ahead this cost would have come later and presumably been considerably less. Given Longview is now a reality, I understand ALL of Lake Hawea township will need to operate through the new wastewater system. But it is not acceptable to lump such a high increase on a small community that has already been exposed to a cumulative rates increase of >30% in the last 3 years without at least making a clear and compelling case for why this should happen. Instead, the lack of transparency around how this 22.3% rates increase has been calculated is extremely disappointing.

Note that if approved, the 22.3% proposed increase will mean the cumulative rates increase in the last 4 years will be around 64%.

My understanding is that about 80% of this year's wastewater cost increase is interest on borrowing. This seems a concerning figure that implies something is not right in the way this infrastructure is being financed.

I don't understand why I am being asked to pay for a service which is not even operational yet. I note that in the case of Kingston's new water and wastewater scheme that the council is on record in its Kingston Rates Factsheet as saying that it would be "unfair to begin full cost recovery now" because the Kingston scheme is "not yet operational". Kingston's median proposed rates rise is 11.1% (pretty much the average for the whole QLDC district). What justification is there to treat Kingston differently?

Given the above points - I submit that the Lake Hawea (and Luggate) rates should be set at 11.6% in the 2026-27 Annual Plan.

Thank you for considering this submission

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6688689

Responded At: 2026-04-23 15:45:08 +1000

Name	Barry,Robert	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

In response to the Annual Plan consultation I'd like to let you know that I support the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board's priority projects as part of the Draft Annual Plan 2026/27. In particular, I support investment in active transport, including expanding shared paths, completing missing links in the walking and cycling network. These projects are important for improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, and supporting a more connected and accessible community.

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Bartlett,Catkin	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

The increases to QLDC facility hire rates appear to be too low and below the rate of inflation

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Please retain the level of services currently experienced. The more evidence of pride in our environment the better visitors will treat our beautiful area. Please also invest well for the furpture, we are currently enjoying the benefits of historic investments, e.g. the memorial centre, the events centre, the biking trails, Queenstown gardens and Frankton Beach reserve, libraries etc and I am very grateful that those commitments were made so we can enjoy them today.

While some services could require a payment, e.g. toilets there is a risk that people will not pay and defile the environment instead. The more we invest in looking after the environment and facilities, the more everyone will look after it and also the maintenance is much more cost effective.

For parking could there be a scheme for residents to pay a different (lower) rate or have a number of free parks per year.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Perhaps a fund to respond to urgent community safety needs for roading/ footpaths etc so that changes can be made when they need to be made rather than expect individuals to make submissions on the annual plan making specific requests (meaning they won't bother because it is such an awful process). This would still be subject to a rigorous design process etc but could also yield more community engagement in managing safety and encouraging active transport.

Consider developing a cycling code of conduct. There is increasing tension between those on e-bikes and other non motorised users (bikes/ pedestrians etc).

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Barton, Kirsty	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed increase in rates as outlined in the Annual Plan.

As a resident of Lake Hāwea for the past 6 years, I have seen rates rise consistently over this time, with increases that are significantly outpacing wage growth and the general cost of living. These cumulative increases are placing growing financial pressure on households in our community, and the current proposal continues that unsustainable trajectory.

Lake Hāwea has some of the lowest median property values in the district, yet residents are facing proportionally greater rates burden as higher-value areas. This creates a clear equity issue. A significant proportion of our community is made up of working individuals and families who live here full-time, contribute locally, and do not have the financial flexibility of the wealthier holiday home owners in higher-value parts of the district.

For households like ours, the impact is immediate and tangible. An additional approximate \$900+ per year in rates is simply not sustainable for us as a young, working couple. This is not discretionary spending — it directly affects our ability to meet everyday living costs and plan for the future. The rates increase last year was bad enough - this one would be the icing on the cake.

For many residents, including ourselves, the issue is not a single year's increase, but the compounding effect of repeated rises. What may appear manageable in isolation has, over time, become a substantial and ongoing burden.

While I understand the need for investment in infrastructure and services, I do not believe the current approach sufficiently balances these needs with the ability of residents to pay. Greater consideration should be given to cost control, prioritisation of essential spending, and alternative funding mechanisms before further increasing the burden on ratepayers.

There is also a growing concern that the scale and pace of spending are not aligned with what communities like Lake Hāwea can reasonably sustain. Without a more measured and equitable approach, there is a real risk of undermining affordability and displacing long-term residents.

I strongly urge Council to reconsider the proposed increase and adopt a more moderate, sustainable, and equitable path that better reflects the financial realities facing ratepayers in lower-value areas of the district.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Barton, Kirsty	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed increase in rates as outlined in the Annual Plan.

As a resident of Lake Hāwea for the past 6 years, I have seen rates rise consistently over this time, with increases that are significantly outpacing wage growth and the general cost of living. These cumulative increases are placing growing financial pressure on households in our community, and the current proposal continues that unsustainable trajectory.

Lake Hāwea has some of the lowest median property values in the district, yet residents are facing proportionally greater rates burden as higher-value areas. This creates a clear equity issue. A significant proportion of our community is made up of working individuals and families who live here full-time, contribute locally, and do not have the financial flexibility of the wealthier holiday home owners in higher-value parts of the district.

For households like ours, the impact is immediate and tangible. An additional approximate \$900+ per year in rates is simply not sustainable for us as a young, working couple. This is not discretionary spending — it directly affects our ability to meet everyday living costs and plan for the future. The rates increase last year was bad enough - this one would be the icing on the cake.

For many residents, including ourselves, the issue is not a single year's increase, but the compounding effect of repeated rises. What may appear manageable in isolation has, over time, become a substantial and ongoing burden.

While I understand the need for investment in infrastructure and services, I do not believe the current approach sufficiently balances these needs with the ability of residents to pay. Greater consideration should be given to cost control, prioritisation of essential spending, and alternative funding mechanisms before further increasing the burden on ratepayers.

There is also a growing concern that the scale and pace of spending are not aligned with what communities like Lake Hāwea can reasonably sustain. Without a more measured and equitable approach, there is a real risk of undermining affordability and displacing long-term residents.

I strongly urge Council to reconsider the proposed increase and adopt a more moderate, sustainable, and equitable path that better reflects the financial realities facing ratepayers in lower-value areas of the district.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	bayc,angie	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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?  
Also more services should be user pays  
What are you doing to increase the low income rebate?

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Rates should be kept to basic services- water, rubbish, library etc The community board can be funded by community users.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Community services and facilities should be majority user pays  
"Economy" - could easily be reduced we don't need more local promotion or visitors  
Local democracy sounds like more unnecessary costs

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Reduce council salaries and pay increases should be suspended.  
Minimise outside consultant costs.  
Go back to basic services only and make spending on these more efficient

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Beable, Barbara	Organisation (if any)	Aspiring Athletics Club Wanaka	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

I pay my rates, our Club pays significant user charges for use of the grass track yet so many others who don't live here get to use our facilities 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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

I have concerns that rugby and football are prioritised ahead of other equally important infrastructure requirements that have been ignored and neglected over time - such as an all-weather athletics track. These male dominated sports have not considered the female sporting youth who have chosen not to play a contact sport or feel uncomfortable in the male dominated football environment. Athletics should not be penalised because of this. Has any thought been given to supporting the truly global sport of athletics that caters for all sizes and shapes while developing the basic platform essential to provide safe and rewarding sporting activities whether it be competitive or recreational? As our national sport, Rugby receives support from multiple sponsors and have facilities that are far superior to any other sporting code in the region and yet still get priority treatment in allocation of these community funds.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Priority to lack of sporting facilities in the Upper Clutha basin. What is plan B if 101 Ballantyne Road loses the legal battle currently before the High Court. What land is available close to the 3 Parks recreation Centre that could be used for future development? Does the currently vacant land around 3 Parks have any chance to be purchased by QLDC to safeguard the interest of the sporting /recreational community. One of the benefits of the 3 Parks complex is how easy it is for the youth to get there from MAC –any development further away would compromise this to the extent that it would be too hard to get there! It would be an opportunity lost if this land destined for even more houses planned for the area goes ahead. It is hard to believe that Wanaka finds itself in this situation where houses are developed without due regard for parks and recreational areas adjacent to the 3 Parks Recreation Centre where this legal challenge may well ruin any future community opportunities. 3 Parks was always too small even from the outset – how could QLDC get this so wrong?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Inequality between budgets for the Wakatipu and Upper Clutha regions continues to be an issue. Although the Draft plan is promoted as a draft document and changes can be made this is in fact not what happens. The loss of priorities in the LTP 2023 - 2033 regarding development of Wanaka facilities has never been re-instated inspite of mutiple meetings and promises. It is impersative that Wanaka facilities are prioritised and that a plan B to replace 101 Ballantyne Road is actioned now should the greedy developers win their appeal!.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

Yes

Pre-prepared submission link:

[https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/da1cfa465d1d8d48df8b7926b7f0181ddb62a78a/original/1776124439/2738e90634398fb6c3a8f0ffc2890d7\\_ASPIRING%20ATHLETICS%20SUBMISSION%20%202026.docx?1776124439](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/da1cfa465d1d8d48df8b7926b7f0181ddb62a78a/original/1776124439/2738e90634398fb6c3a8f0ffc2890d7_ASPIRING%20ATHLETICS%20SUBMISSION%20%202026.docx?1776124439)

Name	Beacham, Jason	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

We just had a large rates increase last year and now another 29%

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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Not a single project is benefiting Luggate. Most of the projects are supporting tourists and tourism. Yet we are paying for it. Can them or at least postpone them until a better funding solution is found.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Open the books. show us where the money is actually going. Get funding from the tourist levy. Focus on the people who actually live here. Help them first.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Beacham, Joanne	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

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.

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?

I believe these needs to be an external audit of all the books for all of QLDC. Everything needs to be transparent.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

A lot of this is just to make Wanaka more "beautiful". How about this money go towards what is really needed by upgrading Wanaka, Luggate, Lake Hawea's infrastructure. Everyone who lives and visits here will benefit. Things don't need a facelift.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6694394

Responded At: 2026-04-28 10:28:03 +1000

Name	Bedggood,Hemi	Organisation (if any)	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	---------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Please see attached the submission from Federated Farmers of New Zealand regarding the proposed 2026-27 Annual Plan.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/c6f2dcbcbd36f9d28cec397efbb9a88adb4ad99d/original/1777336074/7d8512c462da9f1e3c07a687e9e738c4_QLDC%202026-27%20Annual%20Plan%20Submission%20-%20by%20Federated%20Farmers%20of%20New%20Zealand.pdf?1777336074">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/c6f2dcbcbd36f9d28cec397efbb9a88adb4ad99d/original/1777336074/7d8512c462da9f1e3c07a687e9e738c4_QLDC%202026-27%20Annual%20Plan%20Submission%20-%20by%20Federated%20Farmers%20of%20New%20Zealand.pdf?1777336074</a>

Respondent No: 6694383

Responded At: 2026-04-28 10:18:54 +1000

Name	Bell,Alexander	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>I wish to express my opposition to the proposed 23.3% rates increase for Hāwea based on the lack of transparency from within the council as to how the amount of the rates increase has been arrived at.</p> <p>Although a 50/50 split between Wanaka and Hāwea has been suggested, Hāwea has a much smaller population and as can easily be found online a lower value of housing of the properties in the area. This seems to be a very unfair bias towards the people owning properties in Wanaka.</p> <p>Also the same consideration has not been given to Hāwea as has been extended to Glenorchy where the cost of their wastewater has been deferred until the project has been finished.</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6675243

Responded At: 2026-04-13 20:11:34 +1000

Name	Bell, Ronald	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
User pays not rate payers	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Lets work on infrastructure first.	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	BELL, Hamish	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027

#### 1. Introduction

I am a Luggate resident/ratepayer and submit in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.

My submission focuses on three core concerns:

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

#### 2. Affordability – Consecutive Year-on-Year Increases

Council's material indicates:

District-wide average increase: approximately 11.7%

Luggate connected properties: increases of up to 29.3%

Previous year increase: approximately 17.8%

Taken together, this represents a very significant cumulative increase over a short period.

For many households this equates to:

Increases of over \$1,000 in a single year

Cumulative increases exceeding 50% over two years in some cases

This level of increase is not sustainable and sits well outside the district average.

In the current environment, where rates affordability is under increasing national scrutiny, increases of this magnitude create both financial stress for residents and reputational risk for Council.

#### 3. Key Driver – Wastewater Charges

Council has confirmed that the primary driver of these increases is wastewater and water supply charging.

For connected properties:

Wastewater charges increase from approximately \$782 to \$1,757

This represents an increase of over 120% in a single year

This is a step change rather than a gradual adjustment.

The impact is amplified because:

Costs are spread across a relatively small number of properties (approximately 184)

Resulting in large variations in outcomes depending on connection status

#### 4. Core Issue – Allocation of Wastewater Costs

The key issue is not whether infrastructure should be funded, but how those costs are allocated.

There is currently insufficient transparency regarding:

Total development contributions collected from recent Luggate growth (reported to be approximately \$4.1 million)

How those contributions have been calculated

Whether those funds are ring-fenced for Luggate or applied more broadly

The balance of cost recovery between growth and existing residents

Council has indicated that approximately 67% of infrastructure costs are attributed to growth. However, the scale of increases experienced by existing residents suggests this allocation may not be working effectively in practice.

#### 5. Historical Funding and Use of Funds

Given the level of recent investment in Luggate water and wastewater infrastructure, it is important that Council provides clarity on:

How past investments have been funded

The proportion funded through:

Development contributions

Debt

Rates

How development contributions already collected have been applied

Without this transparency, residents cannot have confidence that costs are being allocated fairly.

#### 6. Three Waters Transition – Timing and Risk

An additional concern is the timing of these increases in the context of upcoming water services reform.

With water and wastewater services expected to transition into a new entity, there is uncertainty around:

How current charges will translate into future pricing

How associated debt, assets, and revenue will be transferred

Whether ratepayers may face further increases post-transition

Significant increases are being implemented now, without clarity on how these costs will be treated under the new structure.

This creates uncertainty and risk for ratepayers.

#### 7. Local Investment and Geographic Equity

There is a strong concern within Luggate and the wider Upper Clutha (including Wānaka) regarding the distribution of investment across the district.

There is a perception that:

A disproportionate share of investment is directed toward Queenstown  
 Smaller communities contribute through rates and growth but do not see equivalent levels of local reinvestment  
 Whether or not this perception is fully accurate, it reflects a lack of transparency in how funding is allocated geographically.

8. Development Contributions – Local Benefit  
 Development contributions collected from Luggate growth should clearly support infrastructure in Luggate.  
 Key questions include:  
 Are development contributions ring-fenced for Luggate or the Upper Clutha?  
 If not, how are allocation decisions made?  
 What proportion of contributions collected locally is spent locally?  
 Without clarity, there is a risk that:  
 Growth funding is not directly supporting the communities generating that growth  
 Existing residents continue to face high costs despite local development activity

9. Timing and Policy Alignment  
 Council has indicated that the Revenue and Financing Policy will be reviewed as part of the 2027–2037 Long Term Plan.  
 This raises a key concern:  
 Significant increases are being implemented now  
 While the underlying funding model is acknowledged as requiring review  
 This sequencing is problematic.

10. Key Concerns Summary  
 The proposal raises concerns regarding:  
 The scale and speed of rates increases  
 The concentration of costs on a small number of properties  
 Lack of transparency around development contributions and historical funding  
 Uncertainty associated with the transition to new water service delivery  
 Lack of clarity around geographic distribution of investment

11. Recommendations  
 I request that Council:  
 Reassess affordability, particularly where increases significantly exceed district averages  
 Phase wastewater-related increases to avoid large one-year cost shocks  
 Provide full transparency on development contributions, including total amounts collected, methodology, and allocation  
 Clarify historical funding, including how past infrastructure investments have been funded and recovered  
 Ensure fair allocation between growth and existing residents so that growth contributes an appropriate share  
 Clarify treatment under water services reform, including how current costs will translate into the new entity  
 Improve transparency of geographic spending, including reporting on investment in Luggate and the Upper Clutha  
 Consider aligning major changes with policy review and avoid implementing significant increases ahead of the Revenue and Financing Policy review

12. Conclusion  
 Luggate residents support investment in essential infrastructure.  
 However, the current proposal raises serious concerns about affordability, fairness, transparency, and timing.  
 Addressing these issues is essential to maintaining trust and confidence in Council decision-making.

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there’s anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027

1. Introduction  
 I am a Luggate resident/ratepayer and submit in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.  
 My submission focuses on three core concerns:  
 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

2. Affordability – Consecutive Year-on-Year Increases  
 Council’s material indicates:  
 District-wide average increase: approximately 11.7%

Luggate connected properties: increases of up to 29.3%

Previous year increase: approximately 17.8%

Taken together, this represents a very significant cumulative increase over a short period.

For many households this equates to:

Increases of over \$1,000 in a single year

Cumulative increases exceeding 50% over two years in some cases

This level of increase is not sustainable and sits well outside the district average.

In the current environment, where rates affordability is under increasing national scrutiny, increases of this magnitude create both financial stress for residents and reputational risk for Council.

### 3. Key Driver – Wastewater Charges

Council has confirmed that the primary driver of these increases is wastewater and water supply charging.

For connected properties:

Wastewater charges increase from approximately \$782 to \$1,757

This represents an increase of over 120% in a single year

This is a step change rather than a gradual adjustment.

The impact is amplified because:

Costs are spread across a relatively small number of properties (approximately 184)

Resulting in large variations in outcomes depending on connection status

### 4. Core Issue – Allocation of Wastewater Costs

The key issue is not whether infrastructure should be funded, but how those costs are allocated.

There is currently insufficient transparency regarding:

Total development contributions collected from recent Luggate growth (reported to be approximately \$4.1 million)

How those contributions have been calculated

Whether those funds are ring-fenced for Luggate or applied more broadly

The balance of cost recovery between growth and existing residents

Council has indicated that approximately 67% of infrastructure costs are attributed to growth. However, the scale of increases experienced by existing residents suggests this allocation may not be working effectively in practice.

### 5. Historical Funding and Use of Funds

Given the level of recent investment in Luggate water and wastewater infrastructure, it is important that Council provides clarity on:

How past investments have been funded

The proportion funded through:

Development contributions

Debt

Rates

How development contributions already collected have been applied

Without this transparency, residents cannot have confidence that costs are being allocated fairly.

### 6. Three Waters Transition – Timing and Risk

An additional concern is the timing of these increases in the context of upcoming water services reform.

With water and wastewater services expected to transition into a new entity, there is uncertainty around:

How current charges will translate into future pricing

How associated debt, assets, and revenue will be transferred

Whether ratepayers may face further increases post-transition

Significant increases are being implemented now, without clarity on how these costs will be treated under the new structure.

This creates uncertainty and risk for ratepayers.

### 7. Local Investment and Geographic Equity

There is a strong concern within Luggate and the wider Upper Clutha (including Wānaka) regarding the distribution of investment across the district.

There is a perception that:

A disproportionate share of investment is directed toward Queenstown

Smaller communities contribute through rates and growth but do not see equivalent levels of local reinvestment

Whether or not this perception is fully accurate, it reflects a lack of transparency in how funding is allocated geographically.

### 8. Development Contributions – Local Benefit

Development contributions collected from Luggate growth should clearly support infrastructure in Luggate.

Key questions include:

Are development contributions ring-fenced for Luggate or the Upper Clutha?

If not, how are allocation decisions made?

What proportion of contributions collected locally is spent locally?

Without clarity, there is a risk that:

Growth funding is not directly supporting the communities generating that growth

Existing residents continue to face high costs despite local development activity

### 9. Timing and Policy Alignment

Council has indicated that the Revenue and Financing Policy will be reviewed as part of the 2027–2037 Long Term Plan.

This raises a key concern:

Significant increases are being implemented now

While the underlying funding model is acknowledged as requiring review

This sequencing is problematic.

### 10. Key Concerns Summary

The proposal raises concerns regarding:  
 The scale and speed of rates increases  
 The concentration of costs on a small number of properties  
 Lack of transparency around development contributions and historical funding  
 Uncertainty associated with the transition to new water service delivery  
 Lack of clarity around geographic distribution of investment

11. Recommendations

I request that Council:

- Reassess affordability, particularly where increases significantly exceed district averages
- Phase wastewater-related increases to avoid large one-year cost shocks
- Provide full transparency on development contributions, including total amounts collected, methodology, and allocation
- Clarify historical funding, including how past infrastructure investments have been funded and recovered
- Ensure fair allocation between growth and existing residents so that growth contributes an appropriate share
- Clarify treatment under water services reform, including how current costs will translate into the new entity
- Improve transparency of geographic spending, including reporting on investment in Luggate and the Upper Clutha
- Consider aligning major changes with policy review and avoid implementing significant increases ahead of the Revenue and Financing Policy review

12. Conclusion

Luggate residents support investment in essential infrastructure.

However, the current proposal raises serious concerns about affordability, fairness, transparency, and timing.

Addressing these issues is essential to maintaining trust and confidence in Council decision-making.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6694333

Responded At: 2026-04-28 09:50:56 +1000

Name	Bell,Tracey	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

User Fees and Charges	
Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects	
Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

Long Term Plan 2027-2037
Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Other feedback	
Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>I oppose the 22.3% rates increase in Hawea. I understand that one of the major factors that the rates are being increased is due to the installation of the new wastewater system that is currently being installed. The current proposed cost split between Wanaka and Hawea is 50/50. I feel that this is an unfair split of costs. Hawea has a population of 2500, Luggate approximately 1000 and Wanaka 17000 people . Hawea's population is 12.1% of the total number of residents for the greater Wanaka area and Luggate is 4.8% Wanaka makes up 82.9%. I feel that this is the way the cost of the wastewater upgrade should be split with the majority of users paying the majority of the cost. It seems as if Hawea and Luggate are subsidising the people in Wanaka whose rates are proposed to only increase by 13.2%</p> <p>Finally I feel that there is little to no transparency around how the figures for the rates increase that are currently proposed have been reached. I feel that the council should provide us with this information</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Bendle,Hannah	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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 someway we can support low income households so they can have hope in being involved in these types of opportunities..?

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Some -Some projects I just don't think are priority enough to be shifting funds away from our future selves..

1a. Roys Bay Jetty/ pier - in favour. The wharf needs an upgrade, it looks shabby as heck and used to be more of an icon than that tree... I agree that it needs to be done and the earlier it happens the cheaper it'll be. Something cool but not OTT expensive. The floating stairs are pretty cool and would become a pretty cool photo op for tourists.

1b. Wanaka Lakefront dev - unsure, stage 4 in favour as a stand alone. A quick win potentially. Stage 6 hard to talk to without any costs. DON't think it needs to be a priority to move forward? Helwick street dev - can some budget be pulled forward to keep this moving... been spoken about for years... use some budget for detailed design and then have construction in the next budget?

2a. Artificial sports fields - opposed - not a priority to bring funds forward. I would be interested in seeing who wants a rugby field made of turf.. can we extend the current hockey to a full size? What is the expected return on this? So over seeing 'not suitable for full sized games' man either we are doing it once and doing it right or we are not doing it...

2b.. I think opposed - great idea for the future, how can we relocate rec centre and make it bigger and better.. any traffic we can take out of three parks the better. We are hosting more and more tournaments in lots of sports and having a space that supports large numbers will be a fantastic selling point and bringing people into town. The rec centre is screaming out for new floors and a new roof now, can we just get this fixed before thinking of bringing budget forward for a massive project?

3. Shared paths and Active Transport - In favour - wanaka is such a fantastic town for active modes

9. . Wānaka Performing Arts Centre - in favour

10. Timisfield Park - opposed (opposed to bring funds forward as a priority, in favour of the project)

12. Community Communication and Engagement - in favour

13. Public transport – in favour

14. Wānaka Asset Sales Reserve - neutral

15. Water Quality- improving our impact on water bodies - in favour

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I don't know where the rates feedback is meant to go I can't see it mentioned in any of the docs.. I don't have a house here, I have one in Wellington where our rates are pretty much the same. We don't have public transport, we don't host major events, political events, have as many residents to count for in our rates, we're not the capital city with museums, native and historic restoration projects, but somehow we are paying somewhat the same? I get the wanaka tax, I've grown up here and recently moved back, but it's so clear and obvious that there is a huge gap between people that live here and people that are investing/ holidaying here. The council is approving subdivisions for the investors & holidayers and then getting the people that live here to cover the upgrades needed. You say it's for first home buyers but it's only for first home buyers because the holidayers and investors are buying everything else. Stop approving developments and subdivisions without infrastructure to support it. Any cost of development & subdivisions should be past on to the owner, not past onto everyone else via rates. It really just seems like the council support wealthy people & bend over for them when they want anything. We need appropriate planning for slow growth that matches infrastructure growth.. we will be like Queenstown at a complete stop if the growth isn't planned accordingly (and it's not..) Look at what Mamdani just did in NY, anyone with a house sitting empty in QLDC over 5 mil should have their rates reflect that - this money can then go toward community projects and bringing forward projects. I don't feel comfortable talking at a hearing but I would love to get involved another way and understand more about how decisions are made knowing that its not as easy as i'm making it out to be...

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Blum,Urs	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

From:

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Blum, Doris	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

From:

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6686871

Responded At: 2026-04-22 12:46:06 +1000

Name	Booiman,Arda	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
inevitable	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
we can't stand still	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
infrastructure expanding urban cycle ways

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I'm very uneasy about the proposed rates increase affecting the smaller villages like Luggate, Hawea, Kingston and Cardrona etc. What specific options did the Council consider to reduce the immediate impact on the these residents? Id like to request that the Council reconsider the scale and structure of these increases. I'm concerned about how costs are being allocated between existing residents and new development. (Proof of where the development levies went/go? Overall I'd like to see greater transparency and more expeditious reactions to any information requests made by our community.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Boulter,Summer-Lee	Organisation (if any)	Aspiring Traffic	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------------	-----------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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 calculated or how they directly relate to service delivery.

We respectfully request further transparency around:

- The cost components included in these fees
- The level of review, auditing, and inspection activity being funded
- How these costs align with actual staff time and resources

Providing this information would give greater confidence that the fees are consistent with cost recovery principles. Without this clarity, it is difficult to understand how the current structure reflects a reasonable and proportionate cost recovery model.

#### 4. Consistency with Other Regions

Based on our experience working across multiple regions, the proposed fees appear significantly higher than those applied by other Road Controlling Authorities.

This creates challenges when working with clients across different districts and may impact the viability of works within the QLDC area.

We are already seeing situations where clients question whether to proceed with works due to these costs, particularly for low-risk activities.

#### 5. Potential Impact on Compliance and Safety

We are concerned that the scale of these fees may discourage some operators or clients from submitting TMPs, particularly for low-risk works.

Any reduction in compliance would be counterproductive and could increase safety risks across the network.

#### 6. Duplication of Charges

We seek clarification on the application of separate TMP processing fees across locations (e.g. Queenstown and Wānaka) where a single activity is undertaken.

It would be helpful to understand how this reflects additional review effort or cost.

Summary

We support a fair and sustainable fee structure; however, we consider that the current proposal would benefit from:

- Greater transparency around cost recovery
- A clearly defined risk-based approach
- Consideration of alignment with other regions
- Further engagement with industry prior to finalisation

We would welcome the opportunity for industry engagement prior to finalising these changes to ensure the fee structure is practical and proportionate. We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and would welcome any further discussion on this matter.

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Bowden,Sera	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to oppose the rates increases proposed under the Draft Annual Plan.

My partner and I live in Hāwea, where we own our first home. Like many in our community, getting into the housing market here took everything we had, and we have worked hard to build a life in this area.

Over the past two years, we have experienced a 20% rates increase last year, followed by a proposed 22.3% increase this year. This amounts to nearly a 50% increase in a very short period of time.

This level of increase feels overwhelming and ultimately unsustainable for households like ours.

Hāwea is not a community of high-income earners. It is made up of young families, first-home buyers, and retirees on fixed incomes.

Many of us are already carefully managing rising costs, including groceries, fuel, and mortgage repayments.

At the moment, those pressures are being significantly amplified by global and local cost increases that are flowing through into everyday life. The result is that essential living costs are rising sharply across the board, and households are feeling this acutely. In that context, asking residents to absorb an additional \$952 per year in rates feels disconnected from the reality many of us are currently navigating.

What concerns me most is the cumulative impact. These increases are not happening in isolation, and for some in our community, this could be the tipping point that forces them to leave the area altogether. That is a devastating prospect for individuals, families, and the fabric of our community.

I understand that much of the increase is linked to the Upper Clutha Wastewater Conveyance Scheme. However, I am struggling to reconcile the approach being taken in Hāwea with that applied to Kingston.

The Council has stated that it would be unfair for Kingston residents to begin paying the full cost of their water and wastewater schemes before they are operational. Yet Hāwea residents are being asked to do exactly that. From a resident's perspective, this feels inconsistent and inequitable. It is difficult to understand why one community is afforded this consideration while another is not.

I urge the Council to reconsider the timing and distribution of these costs so that they are applied more fairly across communities.

More broadly, I also question whether the full scope of the proposed plan is appropriate in the current economic climate. Many households are under financial strain, and there is a strong case for focusing on essential infrastructure while deferring non-essential spending. A more measured approach would help reduce the burden being placed on communities like ours.

We chose to live in Hāwea because of its sense of community and the opportunity to build a stable future here. Rapid and significant increases in rates put that stability at risk.

In its current form, I do not believe the Draft Annual Plan is equitable or financially sustainable for our community. I respectfully ask the Council to revise the plan to better reflect the realities faced by residents and to ensure a fairer approach for all.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Brake, Natalie	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing as a resident/ratepayer of Luggate regarding the recent and projected rates increases under the Annual Plan and Long-Term Plan.

While we acknowledge the need for investment in essential infrastructure, the scale and pace of increases being experienced in Luggate raise serious concerns about affordability, fairness, and transparency.

#### 1. Disproportionate impact on Luggate

Luggate residents appear to be experiencing significantly higher effective increases than district averages. This is largely driven by:

- The accelerated delivery of the Luggate water supply upgrade
- Targeted rates applied to a small local user base
- Property valuation shifts

This creates a situation where a small rural community is absorbing a large and immediate financial burden.

#### 2. Timing of infrastructure investment

We understand that the Luggate water upgrade was brought forward from a later date. However, this decision has had a direct and substantial impact on current ratepayers.

We request clarification on:

- The justification for accelerating this project
- Whether alternative staging or deferral options were fully considered
- Why current residents are required to fund infrastructure designed for future growth

#### 3. Growth vs. existing community burden

A key concern is that infrastructure sized for future population growth is being funded primarily by existing residents.

We ask Council to:

- Increase the proportion of costs recovered through development contributions
- Ensure that growth pays a fairer share of growth-related infrastructure
- Avoid front-loading costs onto current households

#### 4. Affordability and social impact

Increases of this magnitude (approaching 25–30% over a short period) are not sustainable for many households.

We request that Council:

- Explicitly assess affordability impacts on smaller communities like Luggate
- Consider the cumulative effect of multiple consecutive increases
- Recognise that rural and lower-density communities have fewer income offsets than urban centres

#### 5. Request for phased implementation

We strongly urge Council to adopt a phased approach to cost recovery for the Luggate water scheme and other major infrastructure.

Spreading costs over a longer period would:

- Reduce immediate financial pressure
- Improve community acceptance
- Maintain progress on essential infrastructure while balancing affordability

#### 6. Transparency and accountability

We request clearer, publicly accessible breakdowns of:

- Total cost of the Luggate water upgrade
- Funding sources (rates, debt, development contributions)
- Long-term cost projections for Luggate ratepayers

This information is critical for informed community engagement.

Conclusion

Luggate residents are not opposed to necessary infrastructure investment. However, the current approach places a disproportionate and immediate burden on a small community.

We urge Council to reconsider the timing, funding structure, and phasing of these costs to ensure a fairer and more sustainable outcome.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Brake, Natalie	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

We support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board in part.

We support the Community Board's role in identifying local needs, but we strongly object to "bringing forward" funding for discretionary projects while the district faces an affordability crisis.

Council must prioritize essential infrastructure and maintenance (like the water upgrades) over "nice-to-have" projects. Until the financial discrepancies mentioned in community meetings (such as the unaccounted \$4 million and the use of the \$8 million surplus) are resolved, and until the 29.1% increase is significantly lowered, we cannot support the allocation of resources to new priority projects that aren't critical for safety or basic service.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

- Fiscal Accountability & Transparency:** We need a full, public audit of Development Contributions. There is significant community concern regarding approximately \$4 million in contributions from Luggate that appear unaccounted for. The LTP must include a transparent "open-book" policy for township-specific funds.
- Rate Capping:** The Council should proactively align with central government signals to cap annual rates increases at 2-4%. A 29.1% increase is a failure of long-term planning.
- Infrastructure Funding Models:** We must move away from forcing a small number of current residents (e.g., the 187 connected households in Luggate) to pay for massive capacity upgrades designed for future growth. Developers should bear a higher proportion of these costs through increased Development Contributions.
- Social Impact Resilience:** The LTP must include protections for long-term residents and retirees to prevent "population displacement." We cannot allow Luggate to become a "ghost town" of empty holiday homes because year-round families are priced out.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

We formally object to the 29.1% increase. It is disproportionate and reflects a lack of internal restraint, evidenced by the reported 33% increase in QLDC salary costs.

Specific points the Council must address:

- **Alternative Revenue:** Why has a South Island tourist levy not been implemented locally to shift the burden from residents to visitors who utilize the infrastructure?
- **Enforcement Revenue:** There is a significant loss of potential revenue due to the lack of enforcement of freedom camping bylaws at the Luggate Red Bridge Reserve. Recovering these fines should be a priority over raising rates for residents.
- **Rejected Funding:** I request an explanation as to why the Council declined a third-party offer to fully fund a community walkway. Turning down external funding while asking residents for a 29.1% increase is fiscally irresponsible.
- **Valuation vs. Income:** Rating based on paper wealth (QV) is pushing residents into "asset rich, cash poor" hardship. My property value increased 65%, but my income did not. Rates must reflect the community's ability to pay, not just theoretical land value.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

Yes

Pre-prepared submission link:

[https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/1c3b8ef36122a1e031bae71dffddb65db3c86a01/original/1777001626/6a849ffe6652b62b2cf337cb8bc6a298\\_Formal%20Submission%20-%20Proposed%20Rates%20Increase.pdf?1777001626](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/1c3b8ef36122a1e031bae71dffddb65db3c86a01/original/1777001626/6a849ffe6652b62b2cf337cb8bc6a298_Formal%20Submission%20-%20Proposed%20Rates%20Increase.pdf?1777001626)

Name	Brand, Terrence	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

From:  
Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
--	-------------

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available? No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	britcher,Sam	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:


I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



**Closing Position**

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
--	-----

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6694327

Responded At: 2026-04-28 09:48:56 +1000

Name	Brockie,Christina	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Submission: I am not in support of the changes proposed to rates in the Hawea area. The increase is not comparable to inflation and too high for most home owners to manage.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Brown,Sarah	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:


I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



**Closing Position**  
The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.  
Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available? No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6685241

Responded At: 2026-04-21 15:32:08 +1000

Name	Brown,Sarah	Organisation (if any)	Nil	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	-----	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
Better and well connected bike paths that are separate from the road to keep our children safe when they ride to school

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Brown, Lynette	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

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.

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.

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.

Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.

Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully assessed at the planning stage. Where existing systems cannot support growth — such as in the case of Longview — required infrastructure upgrades must be funded, planned, and delivered by developers, not shifted onto existing ratepayers.

Stronger prioritisation of essential services. Non-essential or discretionary projects should be deferred until affordability improves.

Greater transparency and discipline in Council spending. A full review of discretionary expenditure should be undertaken to identify savings before further increases are imposed.

Fairer allocation of growth costs. Existing residents, including those in Lake Hāwea, should not be expected to carry a disproportionate share of infrastructure costs driven by new development and population growth.

Clearer communication of trade-offs. Consultation documents must clearly show what has been deferred or reduced, not just what is being proposed.

In its current form, the scale of rates increases is not sustainable for many residents and risks undermining the long-term stability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

I support necessary investment, but it must be delivered within genuine affordability limits. I strongly urge Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential expenditure, review spending rigorously, and adopt a more equitable funding model before finalising this plan.

Affordability must be treated as a binding constraint, not an afterthought.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Yes — but with conditions.

I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints. However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.

In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:

- \* essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects
- \* costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary
- \* funding decisions remain transparent and justified
- \* affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Council must prioritise affordability in the LTP 2027–2037, ensuring rates increases remain within what households can realistically sustain. Essential infrastructure should be prioritised over discretionary spending, with stronger discipline and transparency around Council expenditure.

Growth must pay for growth, with subdivision and development required to fully fund the infrastructure they create demand for, rather than shifting costs onto existing ratepayers. Tourism should also contribute more directly to local infrastructure costs.

Without these changes, continued rates increases risk undermining the long-term sustainability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers. Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.

Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6690674

Responded At: 2026-04-24 13:32:53 +1000

Name	Brown, Ian	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Local council members should be in touch with their community and have far more idea of what it is the specific community wants as opposed to Queenstown counsellor's who focus on their own specific area and have for too long fed off the rates paid by the local Wanaka community.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

I would like to hear about a complete audit and review of QLDC it's employees and it's functions to ensure we have an efficient effective council and council employees, making plans for the future of one of the fastest growing areas in New Zealand.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I would just like to reiterate that before putting the hand out for more money from the rate payers reconsider the effectiveness of the council as a whole especially in relation to employees salaries use of council facilities and vehicles etc. Too often we hear stories from the building trade as an example of total inefficiencies, bolshiness and relationship breakdowns between ratepayers and QLDC employees. This is an area that needs total address.

The overriding factor in many areas I believe is that employees of QLDC must remember who they work for and that it is not their position to work against rate payers not withstanding the fact that there are legal positions and policies that must be adhered to.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Brown, Emma	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

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.

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.

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.

Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure. Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.

Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded. Subdivision and land development must be fully assessed at the planning stage. Where existing systems cannot support growth — such as in the case of Longview — required infrastructure upgrades must be funded, planned, and delivered by developers, not shifted onto existing ratepayers.

Stronger prioritisation of essential services. Non-essential or discretionary projects should be deferred until affordability improves.

Greater transparency and discipline in Council spending. A full review of discretionary expenditure should be undertaken to identify savings before further increases are imposed.

Fairer allocation of growth costs. Existing residents, including those in Lake Hāwea, should not be expected to carry a disproportionate share of infrastructure costs driven by new development and population growth.

Clearer communication of trade-offs. Consultation documents must clearly show what has been deferred or reduced, not just what is being proposed.

In its current form, the scale of rates increases is not sustainable for many residents and risks undermining the long-term stability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

I support necessary investment, but it must be delivered within genuine affordability limits. I strongly urge Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential expenditure, review spending rigorously, and adopt a more equitable funding model before finalising this plan.

Affordability must be treated as a binding constraint, not an afterthought.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
--	-----

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Yes — but with conditions.

I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints. However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.

In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:

- \* essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects
- \* costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary
- \* funding decisions remain transparent and justified
- \* affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Council must prioritise affordability in the LTP 2027–2037, ensuring rates increases remain within what households can realistically sustain. Essential infrastructure should be prioritised over discretionary spending, with stronger discipline and transparency around Council expenditure.

Growth must pay for growth, with subdivision and development required to fully fund the infrastructure they create demand for, rather than shifting costs onto existing ratepayers. Tourism should also contribute more directly to local infrastructure costs.

Without these changes, continued rates increases risk undermining the long-term sustainability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Yes. I do not support the level of rates increases proposed in the draft Annual Plan. The current trajectory is not affordable for many households and risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

There is a clear need for stronger financial discipline, with a sharper focus on essential infrastructure and the deferral of non-critical projects. Council must demonstrate greater effort to reduce costs and improve efficiency before increasing the burden on ratepayers. Growth must pay for growth. Developers should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure required to support new developments, and tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.

Without a more balanced and affordability-focused approach, the Plan risks undermining the long-term sustainability of communities such as Lake Hāwea.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Buckley,Francesca	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6690411

Responded At: 2026-04-24 11:30:21 +1000

Name	Bulluss,Joanna	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/6c10cc13edb31575caedd34a8bb0de48efecb6c2/original/1776994107/b1c5068891befc025b5fc3b67c4abd62_inbound5911379874403449567.docx?1776994107">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/6c10cc13edb31575caedd34a8bb0de48efecb6c2/original/1776994107/b1c5068891befc025b5fc3b67c4abd62_inbound5911379874403449567.docx?1776994107</a>

Name	Burgess, Emma	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

From:

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

It is difficult to justify supporting a higher rates burden when a portion of that increase is tied to “priority projects” that are not relevant or accessible to my local area. At the same time, there are clear opportunities within Hāwea—such as improvements to the Main Street, including safer and more accessible walkways—that would have a direct and meaningful impact on residents here, yet do not appear to be prioritised.

I would strongly encourage a more equitable approach to planning and funding, where “priority” reflects the needs of all communities contributing to the rates pool. Ensuring that Hāwea also receives visible and practical investment would make any proposed increases feel more balanced and justifiable.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there’s anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6655362

Responded At: 2026-03-25 19:41:00 +1100

Name	Burke,Val	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6670201

Responded At: 2026-04-08 12:42:42 +1000

Name	Busst, Nicola	Organisation (if any)	Arrowtown Promotion & Business Association (APBA)	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	---------------	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Consideration for a hyper local Arrowtown masterplan

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

Yes

Pre-prepared submission link:

[https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/22041c8e1b2b0fff339239459f634b07134688c9/original/1775616113/67bc7c8807f2669eb76405fefe681eb6\\_0309%20APBA%20Annual%20Plan%2026-27%20Final%20A4%20Low%20Res%20email.pdf?1775616113](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/22041c8e1b2b0fff339239459f634b07134688c9/original/1775616113/67bc7c8807f2669eb76405fefe681eb6_0309%20APBA%20Annual%20Plan%2026-27%20Final%20A4%20Low%20Res%20email.pdf?1775616113)

Name	Campbell, Don	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I wish to implore the council and those involved in the decision making of the proposed rate increase at Lake Hawea, to reconsider their 22.3% increase.

This suggested increase of about an extra \$950 pa. came as a shock. Folks on fixed incomes, of which there are many in the community, do not have the flexibility to cope with massive increases like this. Likewise, those working are already having to make sacrifices, re-prioritising spending currently in the economic climate. This is terrible timing.

Some homeowners have already done away with their house and contents insurance (optional) to ensure they can pay the rates (compulsory). A sacrifice for the council in effect.

One has to wonder how much in touch the council is with their community.

We bought our property in Lake Hawea about 35 years ago. It came with a loan to pay for the sewerage and water schemes (additional to the rates) from the previous owners (previously on septic tanks). We had to actually convince the council to allow us to pay that loan off in a lump sum! The alternative was to take on long term payments along with a non-competitive interest rate. Please see attached documents. That upgrade was initially instigated by the old Vincent council (late 1980's) and continued by QLDC (early 1990's). There will still be many living in the Lake Hawea community who contributed to that upgrade. However, it is worth remembering many of those folk may now be 80 to 100 years old and they may not be able to easily submit about the rate increase, but it will likely affect them significantly.

The lack of empathy with ratepayers continues, it would appear. Since then, there have been numerous upgrades with the water and sewerage with the promise of future proofing incorporated. Along with the corresponding rate increases of course. Enough is enough. I feel there is a social responsibility here that the council is ignoring with this rate proposal.

Council allowing the rapid development along with small sections contributing to even more loading, without the associated infrastructure, has clearly blundered. This is extremely disappointing. The cart before the horse! There should be no surprises or unforeseen issues if homework had been done (re Longview). Trucking sewerage and a sudden rate grab to pay for the pipes to the Wanaka scheme lacks professionalism.

I can recall attending a local ratepayers meeting a few years ago regarding the future growth of Lake Hawea. I believe the council was looking for feedback on future growth. The southern boundary was set at Cemetery Road.

Whatever the reasons for this development now, it is clearly a QLDC mistake and asking ratepayers to bail the council out with an exorbitant rate increase is quite unethical. Zone changes have consequences.

So-called 'affordable housing' needs affordable rates.

I would ask the council to fund this shambles some other way. Developers' contributions need to have a serious look at in the future. If they believe a contribution is too much, the development should not take place. Simple.

The folks at Luggate are equally concerned. Rates are a topical issue currently and for good reason. Burdening ratepayers for council mismanagement is clearly the issue here. I hope the council and those involved with the rating would have a serious consideration of what is going on and how it affects people.

I wish to oppose this rate increase.

Attached for your interest/edification are some documents from Vincent county regarding sewerage scheme funding etc.

Yours faithfully,  
Don Campbell

\*\*Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6690527

Responded At: 2026-04-24 12:29:32 +1000

Name	Campbell, Megan	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed 29% rates increase for Luggate. 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>	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6675578

Responded At: 2026-04-14 12:27:51 +1000

Name	Carrington, Carl	Organisation (if any)	self	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	------------------	-----------------------	------	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
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.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Carroll, Grant	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I'm writing to oppose the direction of the proposed rates increases in this Annual Plan.

As a single working professional in the IT industry, I don't have the buffer of a dual income household to absorb rising costs. Over the past few years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have increased to a point where they're becoming increasingly difficult to manage on a single income.

Like many others, I'm already carrying the full weight of the current cost of living — mortgage, insurance, food, fuel, and everything that comes with day-to-day life. Rates are a fixed cost, and when they continue to rise year after year at this pace, it puts real strain on financial stability and long-term planning.

I understand that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly around infrastructure and growth. But the current approach feels like too much of that burden is falling on existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether the increases can be justified — it's whether they are realistically affordable. From where I sit, they are not.

There are a few areas where I think Council needs to reassess:

Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

There needs to be a clear ceiling on what people can reasonably sustain, especially for those of us managing costs on a single income.

Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be visible discipline around costs, with clear evidence that efficiencies have been found before further increases are passed on.

Prioritisation of essential infrastructure.

In the current environment, the focus should be on critical infrastructure only. Non-essential projects should be deferred until there is more capacity to absorb them.

Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is clearly a major driver of costs, but existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of that burden. For those of us already established here, it's becoming harder to justify staying long-term.

Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that transparency, it feels like affordability isn't being seriously considered.

Closing

The current trajectory of rates increases is not sustainable for people in my position, and it risks pushing working professionals out of the district.

I'm not opposed to investment or progress, but it needs to be balanced with what individuals can actually afford on a day-to-day basis.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is acknowledged.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Cassidy,Simon	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	---------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027 Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC)

Position: Opposed to proposed rates increases (including cumulative impacts up to ~29.1%)

I strongly oppose the proposed rates increases in the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.

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.

1. The scale of spending does not reflect a constrained organisation

QLDC is proposing:

\$205.8 million in capital expenditure, and

\$291 million in operating expenditure

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.

Despite claiming “savings,” the reality is:

Minimal reductions have been made relative to total expenditure

No meaningful structural reform has occurred

Spending remains historically elevated

A genuinely constrained organisation would demonstrate:

Significant reprioritisation

Deferral of non-essential capital projects

Transparent cost-cutting across departments

That has not occurred here.

2. Rates increases are being used as a default lever, not a last resort

Council highlights that the proposed increase has been reduced from 19% to 11.7%. However, this framing is misleading:

The reduction is achieved through financial engineering, not true savings (e.g. extending loan repayment periods, using transport fund income)

These measures defer costs, they do not reduce them

Ratepayers will ultimately pay more over time

This raises a critical concern: Rates increases appear to be the default solution, rather than the last resort after genuine efficiency improvements.

3. Evidence of inefficient spending and poor value for money

There is growing public concern that QLDC does not consistently deliver value for money. Key indicators include:

Continued reliance on external consultants and professional services

Large capital programmes with limited transparency on cost control

Ongoing increases in operational expenditure without proportional service improvements

Even within this plan, “reducing professional services” is presented as a saving—which implicitly confirms that spending in this area has been excessive.

4. Governance concerns raised in recent reporting

Recent reporting by Crux has raised serious concerns about QLDC governance, transparency, and accountability.

These reports have highlighted issues including:

Allegations of poor financial oversight

Concerns about conflicts of interest and decision-making processes

A perceived lack of transparency in how major projects and expenditures are approved

While these matters are publicly debated, they reinforce a key point:

Ratepayers are being asked to fund increases without sufficient confidence that funds are being managed efficiently or transparently.

Until these concerns are credibly addressed, it is unreasonable to expect continued above-inflation rates increases.

5. Capital programme scale suggests prioritisation failure

Over 54% of capital expenditure is allocated to Three Waters, which is acknowledged as essential.

However:

This does not justify the remaining capital programme continuing at current levels

Non-essential or deferrable projects should be paused

Core infrastructure should be prioritised without expanding overall spend unnecessarily

A disciplined council would:

Focus on essentials only

Stage or defer discretionary projects

Reduce total borrowing and long-term liabilities

6. Cost burden is becoming unsustainable for ratepayers

The cumulative effect of repeated large increases (including prior years and projected forward increases approaching ~29.1%) is:

Financial strain on households

Reduced affordability for families and retirees

Disproportionate impact on smaller communities already facing targeted increases

This is occurring in a broader economic environment where:

Interest rates remain elevated

Cost of living pressures are significant

Wage growth is not keeping pace with rates increases

7. Conclusion

QLDC does not have a funding crisis. It has a spending discipline and governance problem.

Before any further significant rates increases are imposed, Council must:

Conduct a genuine, independent efficiency review

Significantly reduce non-essential capital expenditure

Demonstrate measurable improvements in financial discipline

Address public concerns about transparency and governance

8. Recommendation

I recommend that Council:

Reject the current rates increase proposal

Rework the Annual Plan with a focus on:

Reduced total expenditure

Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only

Demonstrable operational efficiencies

Commission an independent review of spending and governance practices

I would like to speak to this submission at the hearing.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Submission on Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027 Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC)

Position: Opposed to proposed rates increases (including cumulative impacts up to ~29.1%)

I strongly oppose the proposed rates increases in the Draft Annual Plan 2026–2027.

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.

1. The scale of spending does not reflect a constrained organisation

QLDC is proposing:

\$205.8 million in capital expenditure, and

\$291 million in operating expenditure

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.

Despite claiming “savings,” the reality is:

Minimal reductions have been made relative to total expenditure

No meaningful structural reform has occurred

Spending remains historically elevated

A genuinely constrained organisation would demonstrate:

Significant reprioritisation

Deferral of non-essential capital projects

Transparent cost-cutting across departments

That has not occurred here.

2. Rates increases are being used as a default lever, not a last resort

Council highlights that the proposed increase has been reduced from 19% to 11.7%. However, this framing is misleading:

The reduction is achieved through financial engineering, not true savings (e.g. extending loan repayment periods, using transport fund income)

These measures defer costs, they do not reduce them

Ratepayers will ultimately pay more over time

This raises a critical concern: Rates increases appear to be the default solution, rather than the last resort after genuine efficiency improvements.

3. Evidence of inefficient spending and poor value for money

There is growing public concern that QLDC does not consistently deliver value for money. Key indicators include:

Continued reliance on external consultants and professional services

Large capital programmes with limited transparency on cost control  
 Ongoing increases in operational expenditure without proportional service improvements  
 Even within this plan, “reducing professional services” is presented as a saving—which implicitly confirms that spending in this area has been excessive.

4. Governance concerns raised in recent reporting

Recent reporting by Crux has raised serious concerns about QLDC governance, transparency, and accountability.

These reports have highlighted issues including:

Allegations of poor financial oversight

Concerns about conflicts of interest and decision-making processes

A perceived lack of transparency in how major projects and expenditures are approved

While these matters are publicly debated, they reinforce a key point:

Ratepayers are being asked to fund increases without sufficient confidence that funds are being managed efficiently or transparently.

Until these concerns are credibly addressed, it is unreasonable to expect continued above-inflation rates increases.

5. Capital programme scale suggests prioritisation failure

Over 54% of capital expenditure is allocated to Three Waters, which is acknowledged as essential.

However:

This does not justify the remaining capital programme continuing at current levels

Non-essential or deferrable projects should be paused

Core infrastructure should be prioritised without expanding overall spend unnecessarily

A disciplined council would:

Focus on essentials only

Stage or defer discretionary projects

Reduce total borrowing and long-term liabilities

6. Cost burden is becoming unsustainable for ratepayers

The cumulative effect of repeated large increases (including prior years and projected forward increases approaching ~29.1%) is:

Financial strain on households

Reduced affordability for families and retirees

Disproportionate impact on smaller communities already facing targeted increases

This is occurring in a broader economic environment where:

Interest rates remain elevated

Cost of living pressures are significant

Wage growth is not keeping pace with rates increases

7. Conclusion

QLDC does not have a funding crisis. It has a spending discipline and governance problem.

Before any further significant rates increases are imposed, Council must:

Conduct a genuine, independent efficiency review

Significantly reduce non-essential capital expenditure

Demonstrate measurable improvements in financial discipline

Address public concerns about transparency and governance

8. Recommendation

I recommend that Council:

Reject the current rates increase proposal

Rework the Annual Plan with a focus on:

Reduced total expenditure

Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only

Demonstrable operational efficiencies

Commission an independent review of spending and governance practices

I would like to speak to this submission at the hearing.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
---	----

Pre-prepared submission link:	
-------------------------------	--

Respondent No: 6690213

Responded At: 2026-04-24 09:39:29 +1000

Name	Causa,Connie	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/d577476e76ec3026e8ade1c61ff9bd09960babdc/original/1776987546/7198f0fd6138ec9e87a298520edeec19_Submission%20on%20Draft%20Annual%20Plan%202026.pdf?1776987546">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/d577476e76ec3026e8ade1c61ff9bd09960babdc/original/1776987546/7198f0fd6138ec9e87a298520edeec19_Submission%20on%20Draft%20Annual%20Plan%202026.pdf?1776987546</a>

Name	Charles,Ashley	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

From: Ash Charles

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available? No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6680199

Responded At: 2026-04-20 12:15:42 +1000

Name	Chave,Michelle	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
The Rate increase for Hawea, I believe this needs to be reassessed. You can't keep throwing the increases as high as this every year. People are already struggling to make the payment to live here, and a 22.3% rate increase is well outside the norm. If infrastructure needs to be increased for new developments then why are the developers not getting increases in this when starting subdivisions? If you keep increasing rates you will be forcing people out of there homes and out of the area. I love Wanaka i have lived here for 35 years, i am excited to be a first home owner and reach my dream to stay here, however I feel the increase is passing on the increase fully to the owners and not be consumed in other areas. Put a visitor levy in for Tourists, and put that towards the future upgrades of the area, it can't all be put on people trying to make a living here and get ahead. I do NOT support the rates increase at 22.3%.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Chirnside,Craig	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

User costs are always justified.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Boating facilities.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Clark, Stuart	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over recent years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have increased at a pace that far exceeds what most households can realistically absorb. These compounding increases are no longer a matter of concern — they are becoming unsustainable for many families, including my own.

I also want to emphasise a fundamental issue of fairness. As ratepayers, we are being asked to carry a disproportionate share of the costs associated with rapid growth — growth that I did not vote for, and from which I receive little to no direct benefit. In fact, the scale and speed of this growth has had a consistent negative impact on my quality of life. It is increasingly difficult to accept that existing residents are expected to fund outcomes that primarily enable further expansion.

Like many in our community, we are already managing significant cost-of-living pressures — mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and other essentials. Rates are not discretionary; they are a fixed and unavoidable expense. Continued increases at this level place real strain on household budgets and reduce our ability to absorb other financial shocks.

While I recognise that Council is facing genuine cost pressures, particularly in relation to infrastructure and growth, the current approach places too much of that burden onto existing ratepayers. The issue is no longer whether increases can be justified in principle — it is whether they are affordable in practice. At present, they are not.

There are several areas where I believe Council must reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard constraint.

It is not sufficient to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There must be a clear upper limit on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

The community needs confidence that all possible efficiencies have been rigorously pursued before additional costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently evident.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be deferred. Not everything can or should be delivered at once, and non-essential initiatives should be placed on hold.

4. A fairer balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a key driver of cost in this district, yet existing ratepayers are being asked to shoulder a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support it. The majority of ratepayers are local residents — tradespeople, builders, teachers, and families — and current settings are making it increasingly untenable for them to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should clearly outline not only what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed in order to manage costs. Without this transparency, it gives the impression that outcomes are predetermined.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for local residents and risks forcing long-term members of the community out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, any such investment must be balanced against what people can realistically afford to pay.

I strongly urge Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential expenditure, and adopt a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan. Affordability must be treated as a real and binding constraint — not simply an unavoidable consequence of growth.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6682012

Responded At: 2026-04-20 18:16:36 +1000

Name	Clifton, Carolyn & Rowan	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
See attached document	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/64d585b50ff1af67e972a692ca908fcf8395cf74/original/1776672935/a7e65cc8c0609b1994e5d0ddcfb2a2bc_Annual%20Plan%20Sub%2026%2027%20Clifton.pdf?1776672935">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/64d585b50ff1af67e972a692ca908fcf8395cf74/original/1776672935/a7e65cc8c0609b1994e5d0ddcfb2a2bc_Annual%20Plan%20Sub%2026%2027%20Clifton.pdf?1776672935</a>

Respondent No: 6684192

Responded At: 2026-04-21 13:13:52 +1000

Name	Clough, Lisa	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Clouston,Charlotte	Organisation (if any)	on behalf of 812 Developments Limited	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Kia ora QLDC Annual Plan team

This is a submission on behalf of 812 Developments Limited on the Annual Plan.

The submission requests funding be allocated in the Whakatipu transport programme budget for upgrades to Anderson Heights.

Anderson Heights is an existing no-exit road that serves residential and visitor accommodation activities. The top section of road adjoins Queenstown Hill reserve.

The land either side is zoned High Density Residential – A in the District Plan, encouraging the highest levels of residential intensification. The District Plan permits a residential density of three houses and associated flats on each site, and there is no upper density limit.

Through a recent resource consent process, Council land development engineers and consultant transport engineers have raised concerns with the compliance of the existing road formation with QLDC's Code of Practice, and safety of vehicle and pedestrian movements.

These are matters outside of the resource consent process for an individual landowner's vehicle access.

Fire and Emergency NZ have indicated that they are unlikely to be able to operate efficiently in an emergency given the manner the street has been designed, and likely could not get a fire appliance to the hydrant in winter conditions. This is the existing scenario and puts the houses on this street and access to the lower part of the reserve at increased risk in an emergency.

Anderson Heights landowners are included in the mapped CBD zone for targeted rates including the Queenstown CBD transport rate.

The submission seeks that Anderson Heights road improvements should be included in QLDC's funding and works programme to improve resilience.

Suggest that QLDC roading team should also be engaging with FENZ to discuss their concerns further.

We would like to speak to this submission.

Ngā mihi | Kind Regards  
Charlotte

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6694730

Responded At: 2026-04-28 13:36:54 +1000

Name	Clouston,Charlotte	Organisation (if any)	on behalf of JE&A.	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------	-----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/3b2d4d4fea6d53fab828ec0bacdbdfefb1991e46/original/1777347400/d0a33646d5f79f944996b2e82f21a58b_Charlotte%20Clouston%20on%20behalf%20of%20JE%20A.docx?1777347400">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/3b2d4d4fea6d53fab828ec0bacdbdfefb1991e46/original/1777347400/d0a33646d5f79f944996b2e82f21a58b_Charlotte%20Clouston%20on%20behalf%20of%20JE%20A.docx?1777347400</a>

Respondent No: 6689957

Responded At: 2026-04-24 06:44:55 +1000

Name	Cocks, Lyal	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Collins, Megan	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

I believe users should pay directky

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

From:

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6694632

Responded At: 2026-04-28 12:48:14 +1000

Name	Collins, Mike	Organisation (if any)	Business South	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	----------------	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	Yes
Pre-prepared submission link:	<a href="https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/fc726dc9a31c0606b9767387bd5bdc287650cbe5/original/1777344482/8038068714a4fad202c97366cc12829_Business%20South%20submission_QLDC%20AnnualPlan%202026-27%20-%20FINAL.pdf?1777344482">https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/fc726dc9a31c0606b9767387bd5bdc287650cbe5/original/1777344482/8038068714a4fad202c97366cc12829_Business%20South%20submission_QLDC%20AnnualPlan%202026-27%20-%20FINAL.pdf?1777344482</a>

Name	Colston,Adam	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Location: Lake Hawea

Rate Type: Residential 20.5% increase

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6679639

Responded At: 2026-04-19 16:52:32 +1000

Name	Cook, Blair	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6655580

Responded At: 2026-03-26 08:03:33 +1100

Name	Cooper, Ben	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Some of these projects are nice to haves and can be cancelled while proposed rates increases in Hawea and Luggate are 22% and 29% respectively	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
The 22% proposed increase in residential rates in Lake Hawea is absolutely disgusting. As is the proposed 29% increase in Luggate. Council cannot control its spending and developers such as Lane Hocking (who will make hundreds of millions from Longview) get a free ride at the expense of Hawea ratepayers. it is sickening. If either Cllr Cody and Cllr Gladding who both live in Hawea support this increase both need to go at the next election. How do they think people on fixed incomes/superannuation can suddenly find another \$1000 per year. The anger in the community about these proposed increases is palpable.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Copland, Ross	Organisation (if any)	Southern Infrastructure Ltd	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Submission on the Queenstown Lakes District Council Draft Annual Plan 2026-27  
 Submitter: Ross Copland, Chief Executive, Southern Infrastructure Limited (SIL)  
 Date: 23 April 2026

I make this submission on behalf of Southern Infrastructure Limited (SIL), a purpose-driven infrastructure company progressing the Queenstown Cable Car (QCC) project. This privately led initiative responds directly to long-standing transport challenges in the Queenstown area.

The draft Annual Plan 2026-27 does not appear to make any specific provision for QLDC's Transport, Property, and Infrastructure teams to engage with or contribute to the development of the proposed Queenstown Cable Car project despite the QT Public Transport Business case indicating that Local Government would need to progress consideration of offline mass-transit infrastructure from 2027. I request that Council address this gap by making appropriate budget provision for external consulting support. The significant workload of current staff is occupied primarily on day to day Council business which is understandable, but leaves little capacity to engage on a project of this magnitude - likely Queenstown's biggest ever transport investment.

The "offline mass rapid transit" option has been signalled for years in transport business cases involving QLDC, the Otago Regional Council (ORC), and NZTA. These studies, including the Queenstown Public Transport Business Case, have identified the need for high-capacity, reliable public transport solutions beyond traditional on-road bus services to address severe congestion on key arterials such as Frankton Road. An offline system like a cable car has been specifically referenced as warranting further investigation due to its potential to provide resilient, high-frequency service with minimal disruption to the existing road network.

SIL has responded to this strategic direction by investing significant private risk capital to advance the QCC project from concept into execution. This includes technical studies, route and station assessments, environmental and planning work, commercial modelling, supplier procurement, and preparation of the Fast-track Approvals referral application (lodged in 2025 and now progressing into substantive application stage). The project has received conditional endorsement from the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission as a national infrastructure priority and is moving through the Fast-track Approvals process.

As a city-shaping mass rapid transit project, the QCC will have wide-ranging implications for urban form, land use, property, roading, parking, spatial planning, and supporting infrastructure in Queenstown and Frankton. These matters fall squarely within QLDC's responsibilities as the territorial authority. Effective collaboration between Council officers and the project team will be essential to ensure the design optimises integration with the existing and planned transport network, aligns with the Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan and District Plan, manages property interfaces, and delivers positive outcomes for residents, visitors, and the local economy.

There is a lot that SIL's project team can do, but we certain aspects of a generational project like this can only be delivered by Council. Without dedicated resourcing, QLDC's ability to provide timely, informed input on design, effects assessment, funding considerations, and integration issues may be constrained or Councils voice may not be adequately reflected in the design and development of the project leading to a missed opportunity for the community. Inadequate resourcing could also delay or complicate what is otherwise a high-value opportunity to deliver transformative transport capacity in a geographically constrained environment.

I therefore recommend that the Council include a specific budget provision in the 2026-27 Annual Plan for external consulting support to its Transport, Property, and Infrastructure teams. This would allow officers to engage constructively with the QCC project team during the next phase of the project, ensuring Council can meet its statutory and strategic obligations while maximising public benefit. SIL remains committed to open engagement with QLDC and other partners. We have already shared referral application documents with Council and welcome further dialogue to support integrated planning.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit. I am available to speak to this submission at the hearings if required.

Ross Copland  
 Chief Executive

Southern Infrastructure Limited	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6678331

Responded At: 2026-04-17 11:18:39 +1000

Name	Cotter,Guy	Organisation (if any)	Adventure Consultants Ltd	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Would rather funds were used to cover infrastructure costs so we can avoid ongoing rate rises for projects that developers should have paid for. Do we really need to spend more on Wanaka lakefront while areas like Hawea are neglected (while being lumped with 11+% rates rises?	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?	
Public transport between Wanaka and Hawea please.	

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6676680

Responded At: 2026-04-15 12:35:09 +1000

Name	Cowie,Aaron	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I would like to submit that if rates increase at greater than inflation then the mayor has to publish a statement as to why this is happening and whether the mayor supports it. Rates should never increase above inflation unless there is an extraordinary reason and it is for the mayor to say why it has been allowed.	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Cranfield,Jose	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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.	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Although I would argue that a Stage 4 pathway only project should not be a priority as access already exists in this area and it could inhibit innovative design of the full stage 4 lakefront development. Development of a Stage 6 to the lakefront development and the design of the jetty should both draw from Manawa Kai Tahu as a starting point. And I am in favour of point 15 being further developed with a strong focus on nature-based Infrastructure projects that align with climate adaptation (we need to start building with the research already available).	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
I'd like to think that economic diversification and prioritising communities and the environment are almost one in the same. Ensuring communities and resilience is at the heart of economic decision making.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6690384

Responded At: 2026-04-24 11:19:13 +1000

Name	Creighton, Philip	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

As Lake Hawea residents for the past 35 years, we object to the proposed rate increase of 22.3%. We have in the past 35 years paid for sewerage disposal residential water connection, rubbish collection, etc and feel we have paid our part in Lake Hawea development of facilities.

It is our view that this major increase in rates should fall squarely on the QLDC and the Developers of the new subdivisions. For QLDC Council to give these projects approval to go ahead without having the infrastructure in place is shockingly bad management. It is the Developer's responsibility to provide this infrastructure before completing the project.

As long term residents, we have paid our way and are not prepared to subsidise these developments. The Developers have made considerable profits from these subdivisions, and as stated above, the cost of this Upper Clutha Water and Sewerage Scheme falls solely on QLDC Council's poor judgement and Developers' failure to provide these facilities.

This is not the first time Lake Hawea residents have been penalised with higher rates. I.e. Queenstown Leaky Home Syndrome for which we will still be charged for many years to come.

Our Rates in 2026 were \$2,940. The new proposed Rates would be approximately \$7,500. This is totally unfair and completely unacceptable.

We would strongly suggest a fairer proposal needs to be found similar to the Kingston Scheme.

Nga mihi

Philip & Margaret Creighton

\*\*Received via Lets Talk inbox, submitted by QLDC.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6657890

Responded At: 2026-03-27 04:37:54 +1100

Name	Cro, Hayden	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Were already in a extremely pricey area you gota give the average worker a chance to catch up just do projects slowmey	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?	
The council is very top heavy needs lots shaved off so the standard worker can live here	

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Crombie,Derek	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I write as a Trustee owner of the properties at 228 Lakeview Terrace and 46 Lichen Lane.

My submission is that the proposed rate increase is unjustified, unreasonable, and unaffordable. It is premised on the need to pay for a very expensive upgrade to the water and wastewater services to meet future needs of the township.

My reasons for this are:

Justification-

I have been a property owner in Hawea since 1975. I paid a lump sum full contribution for the construction of the water supply and wastewater reticulation and treatment as those services were installed- about \$6000 I recall. At the time the payments were substantial and almost 50% of the actual value of our land.

We are being asked to pay again for no added benefit.

Unreasonable

The need for greatly increased rates is stated as being upgrading of the wastewater system. This upgrade is required as a result of the QLDC decision to allow further development of the residential area without the necessary services being available.

Submissions made to QLDC by myself and other residents at the time pointed this situation out and we were overruled and ignored.

The present outcome was obvious and results from negligent actions by Council staff.

These costs should be paid for over the whole district as that was the intention of a Special Housing Area - to provide low cost housing for Wanaka and the District- not Hawea.

Many residents of Hawea only use the township as a residence and they work in Wanaka, shop in Wanaka and use Wanaka for all other services. Hawea should be treated as a suburb of Wanaka not a stand alone entity,

Unaffordable

Hawea is populated by many elderly long term residents and very young newer residents. There are very limited services for the community, and everyone has to go to Wanaka for support. Increases above the rate of inflation are not sustainable and impose severe hardship on residents.

Our rates for the exactly same house in 2019 were \$3105.62. and the proposed rate will be \$7484.00 an increase of 240%

Upgrading the services to accommodate new subdivisions should be entirely at the cost of developers, not existing ratepayers, who receive no added value from the upgrade. Council has been negligent to allow these subdivisions to occur without requiring the necessary service upgrades.

Developers are making a huge profit at the expense of ratepayers.

I submit that the Hawea rates should be set on the same basis as Wanaka rates and limited to the rate of inflation.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Cross,Nicola	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

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.

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.

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.

There are several areas where a more balanced and equitable approach is needed:

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 sustain, regardless of future planning ambitions.

Tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it relies on.

Tourism is a major driver of demand on local infrastructure, yet the funding burden sits largely with ratepayers. There needs to be stronger mechanisms for visitors to contribute more directly — for example through targeted visitor levies or similar tools — so that those using the region’s infrastructure help fund it, rather than relying predominantly on residents.

A fairer contribution model across all residents.

It is not only property owners who benefit from and place demand on local infrastructure. A significant portion of people living and working in the district contribute little directly toward these costs. Consideration should be given to more equitable contribution models — for example, mechanisms linked to residency or visa conditions — so that the cost of maintaining infrastructure is shared more fairly across everyone living here, not just those who own property.

Stronger prioritisation of essential infrastructure.

In the current environment, it is critical to distinguish between what is necessary now and what can reasonably be deferred. Non-essential projects and “nice-to-have” initiatives should be placed on hold until affordability improves.

Greater discipline and transparency in Council spending.

There is a growing perception within the community that Council-funded activities and projects are not being sufficiently scrutinised. A thorough and transparent review — including a full audit of discretionary spending — should be undertaken to identify efficiencies and reduce unnecessary costs before further increases are passed on to ratepayers.

A fairer distribution of growth-related costs.

Growth continues to drive a significant portion of expenditure. However, existing residents — including those in Lake Hāwea — should not be expected to shoulder a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. Many of the district’s core workforce are already under pressure, and current settings risk pushing them out of the region.

Clearer communication around trade-offs.

Consultation materials should transparently outline not only what is proposed, but also what has been scaled back, delayed, or removed in order to manage costs. Without this, it is difficult to see how affordability is being meaningfully considered.

“Better subdivision and land development infrastructure needs to be fully considered at the planning phase. If existing local systems cannot support the proposed development—such as in the case of Longview—then the required infrastructure must be clearly funded, planned, and delivered by the developer. These costs and responsibilities should not be shifted onto existing community members if the core infrastructure is not already in place.

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for many local residents and risks undermining the long-term viability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

I support necessary investment and future planning, but it must be grounded in what people can realistically afford. I strongly urge Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential expenditure, undertake a thorough review of spending, and adopt a more equitable funding model before finalising this plan.

Affordability must be treated as a genuine constraint — not simply an unavoidable outcome.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

I would like to acknowledge and express support for the priority projects identified by the Wānaka–Upper Clutha Community Board. The Board is uniquely positioned to understand the needs of the Upper Clutha community. As local residents themselves, members of the Board live and work within the district and experience firsthand the pressures, growth, and infrastructure challenges facing Wānaka and surrounding areas such as Lake Hāwea.

Importantly, the Board maintains a direct and ongoing connection with the community. Through regular engagement with local residents, businesses, sports groups, and community organisations, they have a clear and grounded understanding of what is genuinely needed versus what can wait.

For this reason, their prioritisation of projects reflects:

Real, on-the-ground community need, rather than top-down planning

Direct feedback from local groups and stakeholders who actively use these facilities

An understanding of how growth is impacting daily life in Wānaka and the Upper Clutha

Practical insight into what infrastructure will deliver the most value to the community

There is strong value in trusting this locally informed perspective. The Board provides a critical link between Council and the community, ensuring that decision-making is informed by those who are directly affected.

Supporting the Community Board's priorities also reinforces the importance of locally driven decision-making, where investment is guided by people who are embedded in the community and understand its evolving needs.

## Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### 1. Clear definition of "core services"

There needs to be a much clearer distinction between essential infrastructure (water, wastewater, roading, resilience) and discretionary or amenity projects. This should guide all prioritisation and spending decisions.

### 2. Staged delivery of major projects

Large capital projects should be broken into stages and only progressed when funding is available without placing excessive pressure on ratepayers. Not everything needs to be delivered at once.

### 3. Independent review of Council spending

A formal, independent audit of operational and discretionary spending should be undertaken to identify efficiencies and ensure value for money before further rates increases are considered.

### 4. Stronger "user pays" approach

Where appropriate, those who directly benefit from services or infrastructure (e.g. visitors, tourism operators, event users) should contribute more directly, reducing reliance on general rates.

### 5. Infrastructure-first approach to growth

Growth should not outpace infrastructure. New development must be aligned with the ability to fund and deliver the required infrastructure without placing undue burden on existing residents.

### 6. Long-term affordability benchmarks

Introduce clear affordability metrics (e.g. rates as a % of household income) and use these as a hard constraint in planning decisions.

### 7. Better use of alternative funding tools

Explore and expand funding options beyond rates, including:

Development contributions

Targeted rates for specific beneficiaries

Public-private partnerships where appropriate

### 8. Climate resilience with cost discipline

While environmental protection and resilience are critical, there must be transparency around costs and prioritisation to ensure initiatives are practical and affordable.

### 9. Transparent trade-offs in consultation

Future consultation should clearly show:

What is being proposed

What is being deferred or removed

The direct impact on rates

This will build greater trust and allow the community to engage meaningfully.

### 10. Protection of local communities

Ensure that long-term planning supports the retention of local, working communities (including places like Lake Hāwea), rather than unintentionally pricing them out through rising costs.

Simple closing line you could add:

Overall, the Long Term Plan must strike a better balance between ambition and affordability, ensuring that investment decisions are grounded in what the community can realistically sustain over the long term.

## Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Overall, the draft Annual Plan does not yet strike the right balance between necessary investment and what is realistically affordable for the community.

While the direction of travel is understood — particularly the need to respond to growth, infrastructure demands, and environmental pressures — there is a clear gap between planning ambition and the financial reality facing households.

A few key areas require further consideration:

Affordability needs to be a primary decision-making constraint.

Current proposed increases suggest affordability is being acknowledged, but not actively limiting decision-making. There needs to be a clearer framework that ensures rates remain within what households can sustainably absorb over time.

Stronger cost control and transparency are needed.

There is limited visibility for the community around what has been reduced, deferred, or removed to offset rising costs. A more transparent approach to trade-offs would build trust and demonstrate that all options have been explored before increasing rates. Greater scrutiny of operational and discretionary spending.

There is a perception that not all Council spending is being sufficiently challenged. A more disciplined approach — including a thorough review of non-essential expenditure — should be prioritised before further financial pressure is placed on ratepayers. A more equitable funding model is required.

The current system relies heavily on property owners, despite a broader population (including renters and visitors) placing demand on infrastructure and services. More balanced contribution mechanisms should be explored to ensure fairness across all users of the district.

Tourism and growth-related costs need better alignment with funding.

Tourism and population growth are key drivers of infrastructure demand, yet the cost burden sits disproportionately with residents. Stronger user-pays mechanisms and targeted funding tools should be progressed as a priority.

Project prioritisation should reflect current economic conditions.

While many proposed projects have merit, not all are essential in the current environment. Greater emphasis should be placed on deferring non-critical projects and focusing on core infrastructure and services.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Cross, Simon	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

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.

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.

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.

Fairer contribution across all who use local infrastructure.

Cost recovery should better reflect actual usage and benefit, not rely disproportionately on property owners alone.

Infrastructure must be developer-funded where capacity is exceeded.

Subdivision and land development must be fully assessed at the planning stage. Where existing systems cannot support growth — such as in the case of Longview — required infrastructure upgrades must be funded, planned, and delivered by developers, not shifted onto existing ratepayers.

Stronger prioritisation of essential services.

Non-essential or discretionary projects should be deferred until affordability improves.

Greater transparency and discipline in Council spending.

A full review of discretionary expenditure should be undertaken to identify savings before further increases are imposed.

Fairer allocation of growth costs.

Existing residents, including those in Lake Hāwea, should not be expected to carry a disproportionate share of infrastructure costs driven by new development and population growth.

Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation documents must clearly show what has been deferred or reduced, not just what is being proposed.

In its current form, the scale of rates increases is not sustainable for many residents and risks undermining the long-term stability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

I support necessary investment, but it must be delivered within genuine affordability limits. I strongly urge Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential expenditure, review spending rigorously, and adopt a more equitable funding model before finalising this plan.

Affordability must be treated as a binding constraint, not an afterthought.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Yes — but with conditions.

I support Council allocating funding or resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board where those projects are genuinely essential, evidence-based, and clearly aligned with community need and affordability constraints. However, I would not support bringing forward funding in a blanket way or accelerating projects without clear prioritisation, robust cost-benefit assessment, and transparency around trade-offs. Given the current pressure on rates, any early funding decisions should be carefully weighed against overall affordability and the impact on existing ratepayers.

In principle, local prioritisation through the Community Board is positive, but it must still sit within a disciplined, district-wide framework that ensures:

essential infrastructure is prioritised over discretionary projects

costs are not simply accelerated onto ratepayers sooner than necessary

funding decisions remain transparent and justified

affordability remains a binding constraint, not a flexible one

If you want, I can turn this into a strong “yes/no submission statement” or a more critical response depending on the stance you want to take.

## Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

Council must prioritise affordability in the LTP 2027–2037, ensuring rates increases remain within what households can realistically sustain. Essential infrastructure should be prioritised over discretionary spending, with stronger discipline and transparency around Council expenditure.

Growth must pay for growth, with subdivision and development required to fully fund the infrastructure they create demand for, rather than shifting costs onto existing ratepayers. Tourism should also contribute more directly to local infrastructure costs.

Without these changes, continued rates increases risk undermining the long-term sustainability of communities like Lake Hāwea.

## Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Yes. While I acknowledge the intent behind the draft Annual Plan, I have significant concerns about the level of proposed rates increases and the ongoing affordability challenges this places on households, particularly in communities such as Lake Hāwea. There needs to be a much stronger focus on affordability as a binding constraint, with clearer prioritisation of essential infrastructure over discretionary spending. The Plan should also demonstrate greater effort to identify efficiencies and reduce costs within Council operations before passing further increases onto ratepayers.

In addition, there is insufficient emphasis on ensuring that growth-related costs are borne by those driving that growth. Subdivision and development should be fully responsible for funding the infrastructure they require, rather than relying on existing residents to subsidise expansion. Similarly, tourism should contribute more directly to the infrastructure it impacts.

Finally, the Plan would benefit from greater transparency around trade-offs, including what projects have been deferred or removed to help manage affordability. Without this clarity, it is difficult for the community to understand how spending decisions have been balanced.

Overall, I do not support the current level of rates increase and encourage Council to take a more disciplined, transparent, and affordability-focused approach.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6688806

Responded At: 2026-04-23 18:45:07 +1000

Name	Cull, Rebecca	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I oppose the 22.3% rise of rates for Hawea. It is very unfair for the residents of Hawea as it is one of the least wealthy towns in the district. Also I believe it is paying for something that is not yet operational. Why have the residents of Kingston got a reduced rate rise?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6689956

Responded At: 2026-04-24 06:44:33 +1000

Name	Cull,Thomas	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed rates increase for the following reasons.</p> <p>As a teacher soon to retire from over thirty years of teaching, the majority of this service in New Zealand in high and low decile schools, I am appalled that this proposed rates increase of 22.3% would be onto a significant number of families in our locality. I know from my experience of teaching at the local secondary school and driving a school bus from Hawea to Wanaka, to teach our students, that the majority of their families are not well off and that this extra average rates cost of nearly \$1000 a year will drive many into financial hardship.</p> <p>Living costs are already higher than average to other towns in New Zealand and as my wife is retired with a small pension from 30 years as a midwife and my own teacher pension, we will soon also find our modest life style to be comprised. Fortunately our grandchildren here do not rely on us financially, but there are families where pensioners do support their mokapuna.</p> <p>So please could you revise this proposal. It is not fair when compared to Kingston. It has been caused by poor decisions about wastewater service provision by developers and council, namely that the infrastructure will not be complete for at least another year.</p> <p>There is very little in the way of supporting expenditure data from the council and details of how this project is funded. So far the developers for the Longview site have been funding at cost of approx \$400K a year I understand, for the sewage waste disposal by tankers.</p> <p>With the new pipeline system the developers will not have such a financial burden but now the Hawea and Luggate residents will! How was this arranged in the first place?</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6689956

Responded At: 2026-04-24 09:45:13 +1000

Name	Cull,Thomas	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	-------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed rates increase for the following reasons.</p> <p>As a teacher soon to retire from over thirty years of teaching, the majority of this service in New Zealand in high and low decile schools, I am appalled that this proposed rates increase of 22.3% would be onto a significant number of families in our locality. I know from my experience of teaching at the local secondary school and driving a school bus from Hawea to Wanaka, to teach our students, that the majority of their families are not well off and that this extra average rates cost of nearly \$1000 a year will drive many into financial hardship.</p> <p>Living costs are already higher than average to other towns in New Zealand and as my wife is retired with a small pension from 30 years as a midwife and my own teacher pension, we will soon also find our modest life style to be comprised. Fortunately our grandchildren here do not rely on us financially, but there are families where pensioners do support their mokapuna.</p> <p>So please could you revise this proposal. It is not fair when compared to Kingston. It has been caused by poor decisions about wastewater service provision by developers and council, namely that the infrastructure will not be complete for at least another year.</p> <p>There is very little in the way of supporting expenditure data from the council and details of how this project is funded. So far the developers for the Longview site have been funding at cost of approx \$400K a year I understand, for the sewage waste disposal by tankers.</p> <p>With the new pipeline system the developers will not have such a financial burden but now the Hawea and Luggate residents will! How was this arranged in the first place?</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Davidson, Bridget	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

From:  
Location: Hawea


I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
--	---------

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
---	----

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6664085

Responded At: 2026-03-31 13:00:45 +1100

Name	Dawson, Harry	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
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	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6668622

Responded At: 2026-04-06 18:18:35 +1000

Name	Dawson,Masae	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

it's already more expensive user fee than neighbour town (cromwell) I can bare rates to go up need different solution here

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

I have lives in the area for more than 15years now it was quiet now very busy and more and more people want to live here. What about QLDC become the first region individuals need to pay 'living tax' which is calculated based on income. Low income earners pay the base rate while which is anyone who is over 18. It is linked to IRD and employers need to notify to IRD the region the employees working/living. I feel this is only way to make enough money.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Continuing to the answer to the above, we have been living here since the population was 7 or 8000 in wanaka luckily built a house in Luggate well settled in after 15years. Now because of more people wanting to live here we are asked to pay more rates especially the VILLEGE with such population we are trying and live in quiet area away from Wānaka or even Hāwea. we live here mostly pensioners or pre school kids I dont see many single workers in their 20s or 30s as they want to live closer to where everything is we just want to quite affordable even that means little inconvenient without a shop but what we get is high rates I can only see as bullying or if not it must be a mistake. water system isn't enough excuses. we really need some explanations WHY only Luggate residents need to pay high rates

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Dawson, Joanne	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many, including me, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

Like many in our community, we are dealing with the full weight of the current cost of living pressures like mortgages, food, insurance, fuel, and day-to-day expenses. Rates are not optional; they are a fixed cost. When they continue to rise at this pace, it places real and ongoing pressure on our ability to manage as a household.

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.

Key Concerns and Requests:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

The community needs confidence that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible. Deferring planned staff hires is a start, but it is not a strategy.

3. Prioritise essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed.

Approximately 20% of this year's \$233m budget is attributed to infrastructure spend needed to accommodate tourism peaks, yet without a visitor levy, this cost falls entirely on ratepayers. Non-essential projects, including the proposed Queenstown gondola, should be postponed. Divesting assets should also be seriously explored.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. Existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth — particularly when a large portion of the community, including the Hāwea Community Association, actively opposed it. The majority of ratepayers in our region are the local community: tradespeople, teachers, builders. Council's current trajectory is making it untenable for them to continue living here.

5. Retain Developer Contributions locally.

If Hāwea residents are expected to pay for upgrading local infrastructure, it is only fair that the developer contributions, understood to be over \$40,000 per site, and likely more now, paid by developers in Cardrona, Luggate, and Hāwea are directed back into infrastructure for those communities. Historically, these contributions have gone into the QLDC general pool and have not been specifically allocated to projects on this side of the Crown Range. This must change.

6. Review the Uniform Annual General Charge.

QLDC already has one of the highest Uniform Annual General Charges (UAGC) in New Zealand. More than half of the \$287 UAGC currently goes toward servicing interest on a leaky homes loan from a lawsuit involving a Queenstown building constructed over 20 years ago. The fact that Hāwea ratepayers are contributing to this cost, with no benefit and no connection to that building, is simply inequitable.

7. Use the Queenstown Airport dividend to offset rates.

For the first time, Council has the option to apply the Queenstown Airport dividend, approximately \$10 million per year, directly to offset rates rather than to pay down debt. I strongly encourage this approach. Ratepayers across the district should benefit from the income generated by shared public assets.

8. Implement a visitor levy.

A significant portion of the district's infrastructure costs exist to service tourism peaks. Without a local or shared international visitor levy, the full burden of this continues to fall on permanent residents. This is not fair and should be addressed urgently.

9. Commit to rating system reform in the Long Term Plan.

I understand there is now appetite within Council to reform the rating system as part of the upcoming Long Term Plan. I welcome this, but I am concerned that the current year's spending is being accepted as a fait accompli. The conversation must start now, not next cycle.

Lake Hāwea Has Been Overlooked

Lake Hāwea has long felt underserved when it comes to the provision of local services, and it is time this is properly acknowledged in Council's decision-making. We have consistently paid our rates, yet the level of service has not reflected this, especially when compared to neighbouring Wānaka.

It does not seem reasonable that existing residents are now expected to bear the cost of growth, particularly when a large portion of the community, including the Hāwea Community Association, was opposed to it. Developers and incoming residents should be contributing meaningfully, not those who have already been here, paying rates for years without a commensurate level of service. Going forward, we need to see a clear plan that ensures investment in Hāwea is proportionate to the contributions being made by its residents. The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for residents like us, and it risks pushing long-term locals out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress, but it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, redirect Developer Contributions to the communities where they are generated, apply the airport dividend to rates relief, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability must be treated as a real constraint, not an unavoidable outcome.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Dempster,Gina	Organisation (if any)	Wastebusters	Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	Yes
------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------	------------------------------------	-----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
<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. 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 services.</p> <p>This is especially valuable at a time when population growth is putting significant pressure on aging waste infrastructure such as the MFR (recycling sort plant) and transfer station.</p> <p>We strongly support the Zero Waste District Programme's contribution to creating less waste and a more resourceful, connected and resilient community.</p> <p>Relocating Wānaka transfer station</p> <p>As next door neighbours, Wastebusters has witnessed the increasing volume going to the Wānaka transfer station, especially in peak periods.</p> <p>While Wastebusters is committed to the transition to zero waste, we are also realistic about the timescale that systems change takes, from design through to production and consumption choices.</p> <p>It is undeniable that the current transfer station site is too small to deal with the volumes of waste to landfill, and the resources diverted onsite (e.g whiteware, scrap metal, batteries).</p> <p>It has no capacity to cope with the ongoing waste increases due to the rapid population growth in our community. With Wastebusters also at peak capacity, the pressures on Wānaka transfer station will only increase from here.</p> <p>It is therefore critical that the transfer station for Wānaka be relocated to a larger site on 189 Ballantyne Rd, to ensure they can safely deal with the volumes of waste and diversion for the community.</p> <p>For this reason, we support the proposed capital investment into Wānaka waste facilities.</p>	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
<p>Lease for an expanded Wastebusters site</p> <p>We have much appreciated the formalising of Council support for the expansion of Wastebusters during the past year. We look forward to completing this process with the signing of the lease in the near future.</p> <p>The support of the Wānaka Community Board has been a highly valued part of this journey.</p> <p>Receiving a Letter of Intent in October 2025 to expand Wastebusters site enabled the team to progress relationship-building with funders and applications for external funding to build Wastebusters 2.0, with the goal of raising around \$15 million to build the new facility.</p> <p>Wastebusters 2.0 will be a flagship zero waste hub encompassing resource recovery (reuse, recycling, repair, upcycling), a construction and demolition hub, and education centre and remakery (workshops, school groups, tours, skill-sharing etc). The new facility will future-proof Wastebusters delivery for the next 25 years, and divert significantly greater amounts of waste, increasing to over 5,000 tonnes from landfill per annum from 2034.</p> <p>Support of active travel</p> <p>We support the expansion of shared path networks, increase safety and support active travel in the Upper Clutha.</p> <p>Wastebusters employs a team of 55, and welcomes 130,000 visitors to our site every year. We encourage our team (and visitors) to choose active travel options where possible, and many of our staff bike to work regularly.</p> <p>Prioritising the Ballantyne Road and SH84/SH6 projects and creating connected, fit for purpose and safe active travel networks would greatly increase the safety and connectivity to our site for staff and visitors.</p> <p>We strongly support the active travel projects, especially those which connect Wastebusters with the CBD, Albert Town and Hāwea with safe cycle routes.</p>	

## Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Strategic Partnership Development

It is clear that meeting the infrastructure and service needs of our fast-growing community will require innovation and partnership, as recognised in the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy, Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Climate and Biodiversity Plan. We are also seeing the impact of supply shocks, cost of living pressures and wilder weather on communities, which will continue to test the resilience and resourcefulness of our community.

As a strategic delivery partner in the district's transition to a zero waste community built on circular economy principles, Wastebusters values the collaborative approach which Council is taking to respond to the challenges and opportunities facing our district.

We are pleased to support the Council's progress towards delivering the Long Term Plan 2024-34, through our work delivering services including resource recovery, community engagement and education.

We appreciate the commitment from Council as outlined on P11 Annual Plan 2026-27 to enhance "resource recovery and waste diversions options (action 18), by formalising our support for the expansion of Wastebusters Ballantyne Road facilities."

We believe there is an exciting opportunity here to develop the current strategic delivery partnership between Wastebusters and Council into a deeper and more holistic partnership which can deliver even more impact for waste reduction and our community. There is natural synergy between public and not-for-profit social enterprise as purpose-driven organisations with shared goals.

In addition, Wastebusters and Council already have a high-trust relationship with multiple touchpoints:

- service delivery agreement for the Resourceful Communities programme
- sub-contractor to Waste Management for waste services contract (providing communication to support waste services, education in schools and Dr Compost)
- independent partner delivering resource recovery infrastructure and services, which extends social infrastructure and takes pressure off Council aging infrastructure
- holder of a peppercorn lease for the existing site
- grant recipient (e.g. Compost collect)
- participant in pre-engagement sessions e.g. Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
- nationally recognised centre of expertise in waste minimisation behaviour change attracting out-of-district funding e.g. foundation hub designing and implementing the Everybite food waste prevention programme

Wastebusters would be very keen to explore the development of a deeper and more holistic strategic delivery partnership with Council as part of the LTP 27-37 process.

This could also provide a model for the development of other service delivery partnerships with other large-scale social enterprises and not-for-profits.

We strongly support focusing on the development of partnership models as a focus for the LTP.

### Contribution to Wastebusters 2.0

We encourage Council to recognise as part of the LTP process that the goals of the WMMP will not be met without infrastructure in place to support diversion of targeted streams.

The most cost effective way for Council to ensure the district has access to the infrastructure required to achieve WMMP objectives 1 and 3 (preventing and reducing construction waste, and enhancing waste management and minimisation infrastructure) is by supporting Wastebusters 2.0 to be built.

We very much appreciate Council's intention to provide the expanded site we need, and appreciate the contribution of the current peppercorn lease.

As part of the LTP, we would ask that Council expand their formal support to a capital contribution of 10-20% of the cost of extending Wastebusters facilities.

This would be a responsible allocation of ratepayers funds to ensure the ongoing provision of resource recovery infrastructure in Wānaka and the addition of a construction and demolition reuse hub into Wastebusters.

It would also demonstrate commitment by Council to achieving the objectives of WMMP, including achieving significant diversion of Construction and Demolition waste, the district's largest waste stream.

## Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Deschout,Yoka	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

From:

Location: Hawea

I am writing to formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan.

Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.

It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.

2. Stronger control of operational spending.

There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.

3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.

In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.

4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.

Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.

5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.

Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable.

Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



Closing Position

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district.

I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay.

I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6688659

Responded At: 2026-04-23 15:45:08 +1000

Name	Devereux, Genevieve	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	---------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>We are local Luggate residents and ratepayers and are writing in response to the proposed rates increase in the Draft Annual Plan 2026-2027.</p> <p>Our main concern is with the affordability in the rates increases year after year. In our view this is unsustainable. We are first home buyers and are also parents to two small children. I am currently on maternity leave and the thought of our rates again increasing is very concerning. The cost of living is increasing at a shocking rate and wages are not keeping up. We are on a fixed income and there is no room in the budget for these proposed increases.</p> <p>An increase of up to 29.3% is a miles above the district wide average of 11.7%. We will be subject to an increase of well over \$1000. This is not sustainable.</p> <p>Firstly there needs to be transparency around the Water and Wastewater infrastructure funding, including allocation between existing residents and future growth. Also have the Luggate development contributions been allocated for our area or spread further afield? How have previous investment in Luggate Water and Wastewater infrastructure been funded? Can the council please clarify on what proportions were funded through Development contributions, debt and rates. We as a community deserve to see this breakdown so that we can confidently see that the costs are being spread fairly.</p> <p>we are not alone in our view that it feels as though a disproportionate share of investment is directed towards Queenstown. Our community may be small but we contribute through rates and growth and do not see equivalent levels of local reinvestment. This may be true or may just be a perception which reflects the lack of transparency in council spending and how funding is allocated across the area as a whole.</p> <p>This then leads on to Development contributions collected from Luggate growth. This should clearly support local infrastructure. So where are these contributions ending up? Do they stay within the local community of Luggate? If not, how are they allocated and is this fair on the local community?</p> <p>we do understand and support the investment in essential infrastructure but there has to be a better way for the council to address this without passing on such huge increases to the rate payers.</p> <p>Is it truly fair to put such a huge burden on only a few households (approximately 184 that are being connected)?</p> <p>Addressing these issues is essential to maintaining trust and confidence in the Councils decision making.</p> <p>we hope that our submission is seriously taken into consideration.</p> <p>From a hardworking family in Luggate. Genevieve Devereux &amp; James Tisdall.</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Devonda, Stevee	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
<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>	

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
Doesn't affect me	

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
<p>Pull everything back</p> <p>Stop being wasteful with your spending</p> <p>Cap staff wage increases for two years until you sort your balance sheet out</p>

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Yeah - it's bloated and unnecessary	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Name	Dickens, Kirstin	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board? Neutral

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

I am writing on behalf of myself and our small family. The rates increase proposed for Lake Hawea is an exceptional miscalculation. Myself and my small family are working class middle income residents of Lake Hawea. We live on a strict budget and within our means and this rates increase is so out of touch with normal everyday NZ'ers. We simply cannot understand how you have come to these figures, where the transparency is, who does your budgeting, who does your forecasting and how you can honestly sit and roll out potential rates increases year on year of double digits and then an astronomical 22% increase and not think to yourselves that something is not right.

Where is the common sense?

Why are we paying for something that we don't even have yet?

Why are the costings so out of whack and why are you putting such a heavy burden on a small community made up of predominantly middle income working families and retired people.

Are you trying to actively push people like us out of the region? How can you keep asking for more and more and more when we have such little say about what you do with the money you already do get.

Please take yourselves back to the drawing board.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available? No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Respondent No: 6689379

Responded At: 2026-04-23 19:10:16 +1000

Name	Dickson, Kevin and Shirley	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Neutral
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No response
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
<p>We live on a metal road, Kennels Lane, similar to a road in a third world country. We need this road to be sealed in the near future.</p> <p>The dust clouds and corrugation from cars travelling the road create three main issues :</p> <p>1/ Visibility can be reduced very quickly to the point that it is a genuine safety issue</p> <p>2/ The dust clouds travel according to the existing wind conditions. The dust travels great distances and enters houses several hundred metres away. It coats the interiors of houses and makes a real mess meaning householders are unable to leave their windows open at times.</p> <p>3/ The dust can cause respiratory issues to humans and animals especially the elderly.</p> <p>The population that is fed by Kennels Lane has increased markedly in the last five years and is now home to over 50 people with provision for another eight sections.</p> <p>Everybody on Kennels Lane provides their own water supply and sewage system so we believe we are entitled to a decent standard of roading.</p> <p>We feel that the increase of rates collected from the properties down this road, isn't reflected in the services we receive</p> <p>We are disgruntled ratepayers</p>	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6678912

Responded At: 2026-04-18 08:24:43 +1000

Name	Doherty, Patricia	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
No increase to dog registration as this is just dead money to me as I get nothing for this.	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	No
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	
As I live in Lake Hawea we are part of the wanaka ward so I am paying for things in an area i dont live in.	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?
Over spending in other areas of the district has resulted in unsustainable rate increases for others

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
I am saying no to a 22% increase on my rates in Lake Hawea	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6694309

Responded At: 2026-04-28 09:33:10 +1000

Name	Donaldson, Louella	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

No response

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed 22.3% rates increase for Lake Hāwea for the 2026–2027 year. This increase is significantly higher than the district average of 11.6% and sits well above the range proposed for most other communities in the district, which are between approximately 9.9% and 13%. While I understand Lake Hāwea is not the only area facing a large increase, it is one of the communities most heavily impacted by the proposed rate changes. This places a significant additional burden on local ratepayers at a time when household costs are already under pressure. Many young professionals and young families have already been pushed out of Wānaka and the surrounding areas due to extreme housing and living costs. A rate increase of this scale makes it even harder for those who want to stay, contribute to the community, and raise families here. I ask that Council reconsider the proposed increase and work toward a fairer, more balanced approach that acknowledges both the need for investment and the financial reality facing local households.

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link:

Name	Donovan, Damien	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	No
---	----

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:


I formally oppose the continued trajectory of rates increases proposed under this Annual Plan. Over the past several years, rates in the Queenstown Lakes District have risen well beyond what most households can realistically absorb. These increases have compounded year after year, and for many families, including mine, they are now reaching a point that is simply not sustainable.

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.

There are several areas where I believe Council needs to reassess its approach:

1. Affordability must be treated as a hard limit.  
It is not enough to acknowledge that increases are difficult. There needs to be a clear ceiling on what ratepayers can reasonably sustain, regardless of future plans or ambitions.
2. Stronger control of operational spending.  
There needs to be confidence from the community that all possible efficiencies have been identified and implemented before further costs are passed on. That level of discipline is not currently visible.
3. Prioritisation of essential infrastructure only.  
In the current environment, there must be a clear distinction between critical infrastructure and projects that can be delayed. Not everything can or should be delivered at once. And niceties out on the back burner.
4. Fair balance between growth and existing residents.  
Growth is a major driver of cost in this district. However, existing ratepayers should not be carrying a disproportionate share of the infrastructure required to support that growth. The majority of rate payers in our region are the local community, the tradies, the builders, the teachers and the council is making it untenable to continue living here.
5. Clearer communication of trade-offs.  
Consultation should show not just what is proposed, but what has been reduced, delayed, or removed to keep increases manageable. Without that, it feels like the outcome is already set.



**Closing Position**

The current pattern of rates increases is not sustainable for locals like us, and it risks pushing long-term residents out of the district. I am not opposed to investment or progress. However, it must be balanced with what people can actually afford to pay. I strongly encourage Council to reduce the proposed increase, defer non-essential spending, and take a more disciplined approach to costs before finalising this plan.

Affordability needs to be treated as a real constraint — not just something that is unavoidable.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Neutral
--	---------

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6685828

Responded At: 2026-04-21 17:18:20 +1000

Name	Dowling, Fraser	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

**User Fees and Charges**

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:	
If you use it, fair enough to pay for it	

**Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects**

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?	Yes
Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:	

**Long Term Plan 2027-2037**

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

**Other feedback**

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?	
Is a pre-prepared submission available?	No
Pre-prepared submission link:	

Respondent No: 6690415

Responded At: 2026-04-24 11:33:39 +1000

Name	Dowsett,Adam	Organisation (if any)		Do you wish to speak at a hearing?	No
------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	----

### User Fees and Charges

Do you support the proposed changes to user fees and charges?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on proposed changes to user fees and charges:

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.

### Wānaka Community Board Priority Projects

Do you support the proposal for Council to bring forward funding or allocate resourcing to priority projects recommended by the Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board?

Yes

Please outline the reason for your position on Wānaka-Upper Clutha Community Board priority projects:

Fully supportive to realise funded community projects where the need is now.

### Long Term Plan 2027-2037

Let us know if there's anything else you think we need to consider when developing the LTP 2027-2037?

The opportunity to increase targeted charges to international tourism needs more attention within the LTP; such an approach would be very warmly welcomed by the region's residents that are incurring multiple year above-inflation rate increases from the QLDC. These rate increases are indirectly subsidising the holidays of tourists; there are multiple use cases in other global tourist hotspots to learn from - such as localised city taxes and/or hotel taxes for non-residents. The international folks will still come to our beautiful region, as is proven elsewhere.

### Other feedback

Do you have any other feedback on the draft Annual Plan?

Is a pre-prepared submission available?

No

Pre-prepared submission link: