

19th April 2021

On behalf of - Hāwea Community Association Inc

By Cherilyn Walthew – Chair

Chairperson@Haweadistrict.co.nz / 021 665 013

Submission to QLDC - 2021 – Ten Year Plan

We would like to speak at the hearing regarding:

- Ten Year Plan
 - Significance and Engagement Policy
 - Draft Policy on Development Contributions
-

Overview of the Hāwea Community Association Inc. (HCA)

- The Hāwea Community Association represents the residents of the Hāwea District including the Lake Hāwea town settlement, residents through to The Neck (Manuhaea), John Creek, Hāwea Flat and Maungawera.
- The population is the second largest settlement in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au.
- The HCA holds regular Public Meetings to consult with the residents three times a year in January, May, and October.
- Executive committee meetings are consistently held on the third Tuesday of the Month and QLDC are well represented at these meetings with delegates including a QLDC elected member (Niamh Shaw), a WCB elected member (Jude Battson) and a Council Corporate representative (Jess Garrett).

1. Introduction

1.1. From the QLDC website; <https://www.qldc.govt.nz/your-council/our-vision-mission/climate-action-plan>

1.1.1. *“According to the 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report, we have less than a decade to act until the effects of climate change are irreversible. Now is the time to stop talking about climate change and to start taking climate action.”*

1.1.2. *“As a Council, we’ve embarked on a journey towards a major organisational behaviour shift which will lead the way for residents and business communities. Part of this means ensuring climate change considerations are reflected in decision making, policy setting, projects and service delivery.”*

1.2. From the Mayor’s introduction to the Ten-Year Plan: (Consultation Doc p3)

- 1.2.1.** *“It would be short sighted and indeed irresponsible not to continue to plan for and invest in growing well in our district but we can and must begin to think about and do things differently...”*
- 1.3.** The Hāwea Community Association would like to start by acknowledging the challenges experienced right across the globe over the last 12+ months and recognise some of the limitations this has placed on Council’s ability to proceed, or not, with plans already set out in previous reviews. However, as a community we feel this current proposal is unambitious and insufficient for the needs of our people.
- 1.4.** With the change in trading conditions foisted upon us, we can now see alternative opportunities as both a district and a community to re-invent the way in which we sell and utilise our precious resources as a world-famous destination.
- 1.5.** What is outlined in this proposal appears to be “business as usual” and feels at odds with our communities’ desires to re-invent ourselves in a more sustainable manner, in line with the objectives of climate change aspirations.
- 1.6.** Changing to a “green economy” could provide visitor opportunities that work in tandem with our way of life and provide much needed respect for our district.
- 1.7.** It is noted that infrastructure projects around the three waters are essential to the healthy and ecological development of our settlements however, we would question some aspects of the roading infrastructure projects outlined in the current proposal. These appear to be in direct conflict with the aspirations set out on the Council’s own website, in relation to the Climate Action Plan.
- 1.8.** We thank the QLDC for addressing the long outstanding issue around a second drinking water reservoir and acknowledge the investment to find a temporary solution for the Hāwea wastewater treatment which has been non-compliant since 2012. We note however that on page 18 of Vol 2 of the TYP, there is reference to \$13 million being planned for the Hāwea wastewater treatment plant upgrade, but in a number of other references the total budget is \$26.1 million. See for example the table on TYP Vol 2 page 57. We suggest that this difference on page 18 be corrected.
- 1.9.** Landfill - Vol 2, pg. 156 mentions that the Council is required to monitor and rehabilitate its disused landfill sites at Hāwea. Where are these and should they not be mapped in the document?
- 1.10.** The news that a water bore will be installed at the Hāwea Domain is fantastic and will make this space a more usable area for the Community which was showcased during the 2019 Goldfields Cavalcade. Unfortunately, due to bureaucracy around the submission and obtaining of resource consents for the planning of such an event, we are unlikely to see this particular organisation back in the QLDC district. The feedback from the Goldfields committee was that planning events with Councils had proved a much easier task than with QLDC. This is something the Council should investigate if it is wanting our communities outside of Queenstown to also benefit from large events. Especially community driven events. This particular event was not consented by QLDC until hours before it needed to be in place and this was despite the consent application being driven by a competent and at the time, member of the Wanaka

Community Board. It generated over \$50,000 in funds which was shared between our local community groups but very nearly didn't happen!

- 1.11. The HCA has continued to benefit from the Community Grants and thank the Council for the funds that help support volunteer initiatives and beautification projects in our community. We intend to continue to apply for this annual \$5,000 grant however, we also note the value of this grant has not increased since it was introduced.
- 1.12. In addition to the lack of aspiration shown by our Council in this LTP, we would question the distribution of funds that have been allocated to the Upper Clutha region when reviewed against the actual population numbers. The breakdown of population for the region is 67%/33% in favour of Whakatipu whereas, funding appears to have an 87%/13% breakdown in favour of Whakatipu.
- 1.13. We believe that the justification for some of the larger projects in this proposal would do nothing to either further our aspiration of climate change reduction or indeed help drive change in the way we manage our tourism industry and way of life, which is imperative, if we wish to meet our climate action targets.
- 1.14. In short, the proposal presented to the public for comment has little that would support the reduction of the carbon footprint in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au region or, insure we promote 'thriving people'.

2. TYP Proposal

- 2.1. Vol 1 of the draft Plan states:
 - 2.1.1. *"The communities' Vision Beyond 2050, including the vision statements of Zero Carbon Communities | Parakore Hapori and Deafening Dawn Chorus | Waraki, has never been more relevant nor more essential. Planning for our generations to come is one of the most productive and critical things we can do."* (p6)
- 2.2. It is felt that the draft LTP appears to retrospectively apply the "vision" to our existing activities with the result of continuing with the "business as usual" theme. This is out of kilter with our own Community's aspirations let alone those of the wider district with the obvious exception being those people and businesses (predominantly but not exclusively based in Whakatipu) who would directly benefit from the "business as usual" policy. This adherence to "business as usual" policies will ultimately fail to produce any positive, tangible results for our wider communities as per the two examples below.
 - 2.2.1. **Deafening Dawn Chorus** (Our ecosystems flourish and are predator free under Kaitiakitanga)
 - 2.2.2. The issues of concern are evident in "Deafening dawn chorus". This vision is clearly retrofitted. For example, stormwater management, resource consents, water supply. While in theory there may be alignments with these activities they are at best tenuous.
 - 2.2.3. We do not believe most of the District has a "deafening dawn chorus". Many residents do not hear a dawn chorus at all, let alone a deafening one.

2.2.4. For example, mechanisms via resource consent to maintain existing vegetation will not be sufficient to maintain existing birds in the absence of predator control.

2.2.5. In the absence of a plan to enhance our biodiversity the District will never have deafening dawn chorus.

2.2.1. Budgetary provision needs to be made in the LTP for developing a plan to achieve a “deafening dawn chorus” and its roll out in following years. This should be a reasonable budgetary item, given the challenges facing existing, highly interested voluntary groups in our community working at enhancing biodiversity. Planting natives, removing pest plants, and increasing predator control is very important but we must not forget the hugely important organisms at the small end of the size spectrum.

2.2.2. It is noted that there are existing activities that Council supports (e.g., revegetation of the Lake Hāwea township foreshore). It is also noted that partnering with community groups is not mentioned under Partnering Opportunities (Vol 2 page 69)

2.3. Thriving People

2.3.1. Another example of the policy being applied retrospectively is in the points made about “thriving people”.

2.3.2. It is difficult to understand, except for providing for the disabled, how the provision of car parks facilities is ensuring people thrive (Vol 2 p159).

2.3.3. The link to Cemeteries (Vol 2 p148) would suggest that maybe we missed the boat with “thriving” people at that point.

2.3.4. In further delaying plans for active transport in the Upper Clutha, the TYPP fails to deliver in a timely many to this vision.

2.3.5. Hāwea, as the fastest growing settlement in NZ according to the last NZ census in 2018 and, widely sold by estate agents everywhere as a family friendly community, finds it incredibly disappointing that no provision has been earmarked for local projects such as Playgrounds in the Hāwea District, despite a massive deficit of facilities and family friendly infrastructure.

2.3.5.1. This has been caused by the sudden expansion of residential properties in Lake Hāwea, and Hāwea Flat because of Developer led development and, a lack of effective Council oversight on the matter. This is not in line with the “thriving people” aspirations.

3. Zero Carbon Communities

3.1. There is nothing of substance in this proposal that the Climate Action Plan is providing any real guidance in relation to Zero Carbon Communities

3.1.1. To add insult to injury and in total disregard of the Climate Action Plan, a huge expenditure has been outlined for the Whakatipu vehicle transportation plan in what is being called “Stage 1” of a what appears to be a significant roading project, underpinned with public money via the Government.

- 3.1.2.** Stage “1” clearly indicates further “Stages” to come and so far, we can see at least 3 Stages however, Stage 3 is not included in this proposal and no clear funding plan appears evident apart from the fact that it is a costly project that will require us to be locked into a non-climate friendly project for at least 10 years and beyond. This could require the ratepayer to continue funding a project that may well be irrelevant to our way of life in 2028 in accordance with the statement made by the IPCC and, as quoted in clause 1.1.1. above. (The irony of the clause number 111 is not lost on us!)
- 3.1.3.** Our understanding is that Stage 1 will include the new downtown Queenstown public transport hub and that is not the issue however, if the transport hub is successful, surely that negates the need for a flash new road given we are trying to reduce the traffic, not increase it? There are numerous studies worldwide that show that more roads will equate to more and worse traffic. This is a very clear example of QLDC paying mere lip service to their own Climate Action Plan.
- 3.1.4.** We need to understand the point of this project. It is mentioned in conjunction with the revitalisation of the Queenstown CBD which we believe is suffering as a direct result of Council’s green-light to move the majority of the town services and retail outlets to Frankton. The shift in services has resulted in less people requiring the need to go to the original CBD however, begs the question as to who are we regenerating the old CBD area for and, who will benefit financially from this regeneration? The answer seems to be, “for the visitors” and this is the very crux of our financial infrastructure woes. As a population, we simply do not have the money to prop up failed Council planning initiatives and provide infrastructure for such vast number of visitors, when we cannot afford to properly maintain our own residential infrastructure.
- 3.1.5.** There is no doubt that Commercial Queenstown could do with a makeover having been sorely used by businesses to cater for millions of visitors and vehicles. This regeneration should be driven by the commercial interests who will and have benefited from the financial gains of this location, not by the global ratepayer base. We have far more important infrastructure issues as communities to focus on due to policies that have enabled large settlements to develop in our district with inadequate infrastructure and, are more of an environmental threat.
- 3.1.6.** Despite the staggering growth in Hāwea, a rural location and a 15–20-minute drive to Wānaka to access essential services, Council has failed to address the growing issue around transportation that we are already starting to see with hundreds more houses already consented to be built (more cars) and further plans to expand the SHA area, as identified in their Spatial Plan consultation maps, despite consistent public and community opposition to these Developer driven proposals.

- 3.1.7.** Regardless of the looming climate catastrophe, the Council has made no provision for public transport in the Upper Clutha area for the next ten years, despite the IPCC statement.
- 3.1.8.** Neither is there any provision for the Central Government mandate for Council's to remove parking requirements in the District Plan by 2022. With many people needing to travel from Hāwea to Wanaka or, further afield and no public transport, this is not in line with the Council's "thriving people" aspirations.
- 3.1.9.** One might argue that a central carpark building would be of benefit to the community however, if this is privately owned it is simply a license to print money and if it is Council owned, would the required funding to build a building not be better used, and cheaper, to subsidise a public transport system and drive a permanent change in personal habits?
- 3.1.10.** We can clearly see the impact of bad transport planning in the Whakatipu and have little desire to see the same mistakes made in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au. Yet, this is what we see rapidly developing on the Hāwea to Wānaka corridor, through Albert Town.
- 3.1.11.** If Council is unable to deliver on the Mayor's 2019 election promise to provide public transport in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au, in the interest of the climate emergency, we believe QLDC should consider expressions of interest from the Commercial sector who could potentially operate a viable business with the support of Council. This would provide much needed services to the Hāwea district in the absence of Council funding being available and actively reduce the carbon footprint of potentially hundreds of residents and visitors.
- 3.1.12.** The lack of any solution to transport that is "outside of the box" is concerning given the Mayor himself encourages us all to "...think about doing things differently" and yet the recent opportunity to partner with an Electric Bike operator in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au, and to normalise this mode of transport in the township, was flatly turned down by QLDC.
- 3.1.13.** Transportation is the largest contributor to CO2 emissions (Vol2 Page 62) however, the LTP is lacking in any substance to address this planning error, in line with thriving people or Carbon Zero emissions.
- 3.1.14.** Given the urgency of the situation, we are concerned that the Adaptation Plan due to be developed this year, should be an absolute priority.

4. Big Issues Consultation Document

4.1. Three Waters

- 4.1.1.** Due to the change in economic conditions for the district and the uncertainty around finances for many of our residents, the HCA will be advocating for Option 2 which will spread out the costs of the upgrades for residents and hopefully coincide with an increase in economic fortunes for the rest of the world, as well as locally.

4.1.2. We note that much of the harm to receiving waters from stormwater happens from the nutrients, toxins, bacteria, protozoans etc that get into our waterways from runoff. We understood from the QLDC consideration of the Three Waters Bylaw that the Council would begin a baseline receiving water monitoring programme of all areas that were vulnerable to sewage spillage and/or exposed to stormwater drains or direct run-off. We would like to confirm that this is included in the plan.

4.1.3. On Page 17 of the TYP Consultation document we note *“The projects that aren’t planned within this draft Ten Year Plan include the connection of Hāwea Flat (\$5.1M)to Council-operated wastewater infrastructure.”* From the ORC meeting papers of the 10th March 2021, they state that the Hāwea Basin is considered at high risk of septic tank leachate. This concern does not feature in the QLDC TYP except to say that nothing is being done about Hāwea Flat sewage management, however we believe it should. Given the risk of public health and safety concerns outlined around water supplies, in the wake of the Havelock North disaster, the HCA believe Council have a moral and legal obligation to review this therefore, we are surprised that this seems to be of no concern to the Council for the next 10 years.

4.1.4. The Sum of Capital Works TYP Vol 1 Pg 90 (e.g., Hāwea Reservoir Capacity item) shows future cash flow tables but does not indicate whether the values are net present values and, if so, what discount rate has been used for the ten-year time frame. We also find in Vol 2 pg 126 that the future cash flows are discounted “at the original effective interest rate (i.e., the effective interest rate computed at initial recognition of these financial instruments) and adjusted for expected credit loss”. Again, there is no indication of the actual discount rate. The effect of this vagueness makes it quite difficult for ratepayers to look at the future cash flow tables and understand exactly what is going on. We recommend each cash flow table caption to state whether or not the values are net present values and what annual discount rate is used if they are. As it is currently presented we find the cashflow tables opaque and misleading and therefore fail to deliver any information useful for users of this TYP.

4.2. Transport

4.2.1. The HCA is advocating for Option 2 in lieu of the issues outlined above under point 3, Zero Carbon Communities of this submission. We cannot afford “business as usual” and we encourage Council to find more tangible solutions to the issues at hand. This fits more snugly with aspirations for “thriving people” and the Climate Action Plan. This would also loosen up funding to provide specific answers for the Upper Clutha / Mata-au region which is lagging far behind when compared to options available in Queenstown.

4.3. Targeted Rate on Queenstown CBD

4.3.1. The projects in Queenstown CBD are reaching astonishing levels of vanity given the restructure of the town and the frequency with which

the Queenstown beautification projects occur. Such level of expenditure needs to be paid for by Whakatipu ratepayers and how that is collected and distributed should be down to the residents of the Whakatipu to decide. One thing we are clear about in Hāwea, given the lack of footpaths, curbing, channelling, and stormwater investment in our own town, is that Whakatipu needs to pay for itself and not rely on wider ratepayer funds given it is no longer operating as the primary CBD of Queenstown and is merely a tourist destination with QLDC offices still there.

4.4. Increasing User Fees and Charges

4.4.1. The HCA supports Option 2 given that many of our residents have cited inefficiencies in Council processes and would strongly urge Council to review their own practices and processes to establish efficiencies and drive down costs, rather than pushing the cost of these inefficiencies directly back to the ratepayer. If QLDC would like to investigate some of these costly administrative issues and errors, we would be happy to provide some specific examples from our residents where QLDC processes have been convoluted and protracted. Point 1.10 above, which mentions the Goldfields Cavalcade, is one such example where the QLDC consenting process was completely dysfunctional.

5. Other Projects

5.1. District Wide rating on Water Supply and Wastewater

5.1.1. The HCA supports a district wide rating on essential water services to ensure minimum standards on water quality and safe, ecological disposal/treatment of our wastewater. This provides an opportunity to ensure we have oversight that protects our waterways from pollution.

5.2. Queenstown Event Centre land sale or lease

5.2.1. The HCA does not support the sale of any QLDC or publicly owned property at this time. The district is still experiencing growth and may need access to public land at a later date to provide public services that support the growth of the district. Purchasing land or property at a later date will only prove to be a costly exercise. The HCA would support a lease agreement that guarantees the potential for the land to be transferred back for public use, in the event it is needed.

5.3. Cardrona Village Water Supply Scheme

5.3.1. The HCA notes the growth in the Cardrona village and the need for services, however, also notes that it is similar to Hāwea in that it is a fast-growing township, with no services. Currently there are over 600 houses planned and consented for below the ski-field and existing residents will be charged for the water connection, whether they choose to opt for the council chlorinated supply or, continue with their already established supply. This sets a precedent to force costs on residents, that the HCA is not comfortable supporting.

5.3.2. In addition to this, it is our understanding that Cardrona is also due to be connected to the Project Pure sewage system as QLDC seem to prefer to pursue an option that would see the Upper Clutha/Mata-au developing sewage infrastructure worthy of a large city, however, expect this to be funded by a population 12,000 people. These continued large-scale and expansive developments outside of our existing urban centres do nothing to address the large carbon footprint of the infrastructure required, to centralise services. We would argue that it raises the risk of ecological disasters on both land and anywhere where the pipes run close to our waterways.

5.4. Consultation on Elderly and Residential Housing

5.4.1. The HCA supports genuine initiatives that allow members of our community to remain in local, affordable, and suitable housing, especially as they age. Many of our older residents are local treasures who we would be loath to lose as a result of insufficient and unaffordable housing options. We note that these should be located in communities that are well supported with essential services such as doctors, pharmacies, libraries, and public transport. i.e., the Hāwea SHA will not be suitable in the short-term for those needing access to essential services although we understand there up to 40 properties to be included in the QLCHT allocation.

6. Draft Policy – Development Contributions

- 6.1. Amendment 1 – Updated format of the DC policy** - The HCA applauds any move to make documents more user friendly. We would recommend making a short online video-guide available, explaining how to use the information as this is more likely to connect with the younger millennials and generation Z.
- 6.2. Amendment 2 – Name change** – The HCA supports the name change from “Community facilities” to “Community infrastructure” as it more accurately reflects the requirements of the community.
- 6.3. Amendment 3 – Amend the average unit size** - The HCA neither supports or opposes this change as there is no context in the proposal for the definition of a “180 or 140m² unit” or, the need for the change or, indication of what this would achieve. Unfortunately, we have not had time to fully review either of the 64 or 95-page documents available online to establish more detail.
- 6.4. Amendment 4 – Reclassification of land use categories** – The HCA can see no issue with this and applauds any attempt to simplify the classifications based on fair use and, social license.
- 6.5. Amendment 5 – Change to DC assessments** - Appears to redress the issues of unfairness created by the current system of “one size fits all”. In the pursuit of fairness, the HCA supports this amendment.
- 6.6. Amendment 6 – Updated policy differentials** - This is not clear regarding the information included in the table. It is unclear what we are looking at.

- 6.7. Amendment 7 – Special Assessment Parameters** - The HCA supports any move by the Council to provide clear, consistent guidelines and parameters, when dealing with the public.
- 6.8. Amendment 8 – Change to the reserve land calculation** – The HCA supports any moves to clearly define Developer’s obligations around the provision of reserve land. However, given the excessive speed of land price increases within the QLDC District, the HCA would strenuously object to any cash alternative being offered instead of land, except in very exceptional circumstances, given the increase of land prices will ensure that any cash sum will not be sufficient for purchase or investment in new land, within months (if not hours) of agreeing the sum.
- 6.9. Amendment 9 – Changes to reserve land values** – The wording on this amendment does not make any sense. *“Within current policy, the following categories of land are use with their respective values:”* I have read it several times and the corresponding information underneath and....., I am still not sure what your telling/asking us.
- 6.10. Amendment 10 – Updated capital costs** – We will have to take your word for it because, I cannot critique information that I am not privy to the source. It is noted that there is \$16,942 per Hāwea dwelling for wastewater identified however, it is the HCA’s understanding that this project had yet to identify a solution so, what is this number based on?
- 6.11. Amendment 11 – Updated contributing area maps** – I have looked for the supporting document to the proposal, however, have been unable to find anything beyond an online version of the “detailed supporting documents” for the Development Contributions policy dated October 2018. (Effective 1 December 2018) It would be a lot easier if a link had been included.
- 6.11.1.** It is noted that the wastewater for Hāwea is currently under discussion and QLDC should note that parties outside of the zoned area on page 76 of the Development Contributions policy supporting documents file available on the QLDC website, would be interested in being part of the discussion.

7. Significance and engagement policy

- 7.1.** This policy outlines the Council obligations to provide certainty to the community about when it can expect to be informed of proposed Council action or to be asked for a view when Council is looking to make a decision.
- 7.2.** This policy is currently failing and from looking at the new policy online, will continue to do so. We are happy to provide multiple examples of this and have alluded to many throughout this submission, however, will limit to one in this instance and will even avoid the obvious Martin Jenkins debacle.
- 7.2.1. Example** - The documents for the TYP and Spatial Plan was approved for Consultation by the Council on the 18th of March 2021, (two days after the normal HCA scheduled meeting) and released for submissions from the public until the 19th of April (1 day before our next HCA scheduled meeting). The 19th of April is less than three weeks before the next public meeting on the 8th of May which both the Mayor and QLDC CEO have

been invited and alerted to back in February, however, have subsequently declined to attend due to availability issues.

- 7.2.2.** QLDC did extend the courtesy of providing representatives to come out and specifically talk with the Executive Committee on the 31st of March (two days before Easter weekend) with a view to answering any questions and details of the TYP however, declined to open this opportunity up to the public so that we could obtain a wider view regarding specific issues detailed in this plan, rather than just that of the Executive Committee.
- 7.2.3.** This meeting was well represented for the TYP however, the person who was to speak to the Spatial Plan was not in attendance and neither was a substitute representative. Apart from the Executive Committee, all other attendees at this meeting were on company time. The Committee is voluntary.
- 7.2.4.** It was pointed out by the HCA to QLDC representatives at this meeting that the consultation period for both plans was “not fit for purpose” if the Council was genuine about wanting Community Associations to accurately represent and discuss the current proposal of the Plans directly with the Community. Fortunately, due to our regular contact with our Community, we feel we are in a position to accurately represent the Community despite the inability to review the specific proposal, with public input.
- 7.2.5.** In response to our question about QLDC providing an extended deadline to Community Associations of a week or, even a few extra days to allow for the time lost at Easter, we were advised that whilst there was nothing to stop us submitting after the closing date of the 19th of April, whether the submission was actually considered would be at the subjective discretion of the QLDC staff. Too risky an answer for the HCA to consider delaying our submission.
- 7.2.6.** We have been informed that the QLDC process for consultation is mandated by Central Government however, whilst we can establish that QLDC is indeed mandated to have a process for consultation, the law does not appear to mandate a specific process and we believe the current process is not fit for purpose, to genuinely provide an opportunity for voluntary run Community Associations and similar groups, to provide detailed submissions on the reports and documents provided by QLDC, that at times, run into hundreds of pages.
- 7.2.7.** We would ask the Commissioners to acknowledge that the process undertaken by the Council for consultation on this proposal does not provide adequate time for the average layman, let alone a Community Association that needs to coordinate with members, to review in any detail the vast documents (death by PowerPoint) that are supplied with this proposal.
- 7.2.8.** Therefore, we find this process is complicit and deliberate in limiting the amount of push-back from the Community regarding this proposal and others, thereby allowing the Council to pursue a programme of work that

is contrary to the very statements the Council has made to the public, about the welfare and priorities of our communities.

7.2.9. This is a classic example of where this policy is unfit for purpose.

8. Summary

- 8.1.** The HCA is disappointed that QLDC has not taken the opportunity to be truly aspirational in this latest review of the ten-year plan. We are not seeing any move to *“stop talking about climate change and to start taking climate action”*.
- 8.2.** It is time that QLDC realised that the district does not stop at the entrance to the Cardrona ski-field and that under-investment in the Upper Clutha/Mata-au combined with a continuous litany of vanity projects in the Whakatipu that typically benefit businesses who focus on tourism, has left a massive infrastructure deficit across the whole district that is impacting on our residents’ quality of life.
- 8.3.** In addition to the infrastructure deficit, the solutions that are being crafted by QLDC and their many consultants, appear well outside of our budgets as a relatively small ratepayer base. The current TYP proposal is indicating rate increases over the next 10 years that are worthy of annual cigarette price increases, way above any inflation and, have been a constant feature in our rating notices for the last 10 years alone. The purpose of the smoking price increases is to price people out of the market. One has to wonder if the QLDC is trying a similar tactic to get residents to quit the area?
- 8.4.** In short, this Ten-Year Plan proposal is woefully inadequate and fails to address any of the issues that we face as a community. It is a fast-track proposal to “business as usual” and anyone who approved this for public review, should be heartily ashamed.