

FALCONER Patricia

Queenstown/Wakatipu area

Q. 1A: Do you support the preferred option to complete the programme outlined in the draft plan?

Neutral

Q. 1B: Do you agree with the preferred funding model including targeted rates recovery focused on CBD ratepayers?

Agree

Q. 1C: If the funding assumptions are not supported (NZTA) do you agree that Council re-prioritise some projects?

Agree

Q. 2A: Do you support the funding for a Council Office?

Support

Q. 2B: Do you agree that this should include an interim dedicated Queenstown library space?

Disagree

Q. 3A: Do you support the development of a Wanaka Masterplan in 2018 to enable a strategic and well connected approach to Wanaka planning?

Support

Q. 4A: Do you agree with the water supply project programme and timing to meet the Drinking Water Standard (2008) by 2027/28?

Agree

Q. 5A: Do you agree that Council should introduce a general subsidy in order to protect the environment by supplementing the cost of smaller community schemes?

Disagree

Q. 5B: Do you support the application of a two-tier charge to the Arthurs Point Scheme to enable a fairer apportionment of cost to the user?

Support

Q. 6A: Do you agree with the proposed investment in community projects?

Agree

Q. 6B: Do you support inclusion of funding to support the early harvest of Coronet Forest?

Support

Q. 6C: Do you agree that Council should enter into a lease for an interim Frankton Library?

Agree

Q. 7A: Do you support the proposal to revise the rating differentials based on the new rating valuations?

Support

Q.

2018 QLDC submission.pdf - 867 KB



SUBMISSION FORM

All submissions will be made public.

NAME: Patricia Falconer

ORGANISATION (IF ANY): _____

CONTACT EMAIL OR POSTAL ADDRESS:
[Redacted]

LOCATION: Arrowtown Glenorchy Hawea Kingston
 Luggate Makarora Queenstown/Wakatipu area Wanaka/Upper Clutha area

DO YOU WISH TO SPEAK AT A HEARING? Yes No

If yes, please provide a contact phone number:

Please have your say on the big issues identified within the draft Ten Year Plan.

QUEENSTOWN TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN (FUNDING OPTIONS AND DELIVERY)

1A Do you support the preferred option to complete the programme outlined in the draft plan?
 Support Neutral Oppose Page 16

1B Do you agree with the preferred funding model?
 Agree Neutral Disagree Page 19

1C If the funding assumptions are not supported (NZTA) do you agree that Council re-prioritise some projects?
 Agree Neutral Disagree Page 18

PROJECT CONNECT AND LIBRARIES

2A Do you support the funding for a Council Office?
 Support Neutral Oppose Page 21

2B Do you agree that this should include an interim dedicated Queenstown library space?
 Agree Neutral Disagree Page 22

WANAKA MASTERPLAN

3A

Do you support the development of a Wanaka Masterplan in 2018 to enable a strategic and well connected approach to Wanaka planning?

Support

Neutral

Oppose

Page 22

WATER (SUPPLY AND QUALITY)

4A

Do you agree with the water supply project programme and timing to meet the Drinking Water Standard (2008) by 2027/28?

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Page 24

FUNDING SMALL COMMUNITIES' WATER NEEDS (FUNDING OPTIONS)

5A

Do you agree that Council should introduce a general subsidy in order to protect the environment by supplementing the cost of smaller community schemes?

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Page 26

5B

Do you support the application of a tier two charge to the Arthurs Point Scheme to enable a fairer apportionment of cost to the user?

Support

Neutral

Oppose

Page 27

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT

6A

Do you agree with the investment in community projects?

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Page 33

6B

Do you support inclusion of funding to support the early harvest of Coronet Forest?

Support

Neutral

Oppose

Page 29

6C

Do you agree that Council should enter into a lease for an interim Frankton Library?

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Page 33

RATES (REVALUATION, AFFORDABILITY)

7A

Do you support the proposal to revise the rating differentials based on the new rating valuations?

Support

Neutral

Oppose

Page 13

PLEASE USE THIS SPACE TO COMMENT ON THE BIG ISSUES OR ANY ASPECT OF THE DRAFT PLAN

8A

~~Water~~
Refer attached.

Please attach additional sheets if you run out of space



Question 2B – Do you agree that this should include an interim dedicated Queenstown library space?

Oppose. While Council consultation has led to the decision to have a library in the CBD, I oppose this for the following reasons:

- The population of the Wakatipu Ward (including projected future growth) does not justify two library buildings. Duplication of services leads to cost inefficiencies.
- The long-term plan clearly identifies a need for library services to be provided in Frankton.
- The long-term plan also seeks to reduce congestion in the CBD.
- Frankton is the logical place for a dedicated library based on current and projected population distribution.
- Frankton will be the recreational facility centre for residential families (swimming, sports centre, library).
- The primary reason for a library should be for the life-long learning of the residential community. It is not to *“offer domestic and international travellers a safe and inviting space”*. Travellers do not choose to come to Queenstown for the library.

Question 5A – Do you agree that Council should introduce a general subsidy in order to protect the environment by supplementing the cost of smaller community schemes?

Oppose for the following reasons:

- The long-term plan puts forward the view that it is difficult to quantify the environmental protection benefit as compared with the private benefit to be gained from provision of small scheme infrastructure. The plan suggests that the wider general benefit is unlikely to be greater than 10-20%. I do not support a 20% general subsidy.
- At 20% the loan repayment figure is an annual subsidy from the general district-wide rate over a period of 30 years. This is too long.
- I would support a maximum of 10% general subsidy for CAPEX - to be recovered by way of Development Contributions applied to future growth in these small communities. No subsidy for OPEX.

Comment 8A

- Congratulations on being bold and having such an ambitious plan. Things happen and we all have to make adjustments to our budget from time to time. **Council's priority must be the 3 waters with a particular focus on wastewater and stormwater.** We must ensure that infrastructure is installed and maintained in such a way that we can avoid the problems experienced on the beaches of Auckland this last summer.
- No urgency is evident in the plan for the metering of water. This should be on Council's agenda.

FARRIER Michael

Arrowtown

Q. 1A: Do you support the preferred option to complete the programme outlined in the draft plan?

Neutral

Q. 1B: Do you agree with the preferred funding model including targeted rates recovery focused on CBD ratepayers?

Neutral

Q. 1C: If the funding assumptions are not supported (NZTA) do you agree that Council re-prioritise some projects?

Agree

Q. 2A: Do you support the funding for a Council Office?

Oppose

Q. 2B: Do you agree that this should include an interim dedicated Queenstown library space?

Disagree

Q. 3A: Do you support the development of a Wanaka Masterplan in 2018 to enable a strategic and well connected approach to Wanaka planning?

Support

Q. 4A: Do you agree with the water supply project programme and timing to meet the Drinking Water Standard (2008) by 2027/28?

Agree

Q. 5A: Do you agree that Council should introduce a general subsidy in order to protect the environment by supplementing the cost of smaller community schemes?

Neutral

Q. 5B: Do you support the application of a two-tier charge to the Arthurs Point Scheme to enable a fairer apportionment of cost to the user?

Neutral

Q. 6A: Do you agree with the proposed investment in community projects?

Neutral

Q. 6B: Do you support inclusion of funding to support the early harvest of Coronet Forest?

Support

Q. 6C: Do you agree that Council should enter into a lease for an interim Frankton Library?

Agree

Q. 7A: Do you support the proposal to revise the rating differentials based on the new rating valuations?

Neutral

Q. 8A: Comment here.

Attached

Q.

Ten Year Plan 2018 .pdf - 43 KB

Ten Year Plan 2018 -2028 Submission

Michael Farrier



Arrowtown 9302



I would like to be heard.

Arrowtown

In regard to the proposed 10 year plan documents there is little specific reference to Arrowtown in any of them other than water supply, the camping ground and “other projects”.

Some of the issues under “other projects” (Consultation Document) should already be occurring as a matter of regular maintenance. For example, the maintenance of footpaths to ensure that they have a smooth surface and are free from trip hazards (tree roots, uneven surface, etc.). Historical protected trees (not mentioned) also need routine maintenance at regular intervals. In my opinion several of the trees are in poor conditions with large branches often falling in windy conditions. Perhaps the 10 year plan should address a replacement programme.

I note that a “policy to protect the night sky” from light pollution is mentioned. I do not have an issue with this as long as adequate footpath lighting is provided for pedestrians during hours of darkness. I note that lighting has been provided in the newly sealed visitor carpark but nothing has been done to address footpath lighting — despite uneven surfaces!

I also believe that the 10 year plan should consider atmospheric visibility (closely related to the visibility of night sky) in regard to wood burning, etc., during periods of cold temperatures. The Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Air Quality) Regulations 2004 gives the responsibility of this to the Regional Councils, however, the QLDC could be proactive in regard to promoting the use of other forms of energy and considering banning the installation of wood burners in new builds in the areas affected by high respirable particle concentrations (PM10, PM2.5). It is well

accepted that high levels of atmospheric particulate materials shortens the lifespan of people in regard to heart and respiratory diseases.

I also note that I cannot find any provision in the plan to repair the “historic retaining wall” (originally built by miners) that supports the road leading down to the historic Chinese village in Arrowtown. This seems to fall into the same category as footpaths.

Drinking Water Supply:

The Arrowtown water supply is currently drawn from shallow aquifers associated with Bush Creek and the Arrow River. I would like to suggest that to ensure minimum treatment of the water extracted in the longer term action should be taken to protect the water “sources” from contamination due to human activity in the area. The aquifers are not confined and I do not consider that wellhead protection is all that is needed to protect from potential spills of hazardous liquids from vehicles and human (activity diesel, petrol, pesticides, etc.). Currently the public and vehicles have access to the surface waters above the water sources and storm water is discharged into Bush Creek from the Arrowtown Industrial area.

I suggest that with the increasing activity in the area that the water sources are fenced off to protect the water supply from contamination. I understand that it is the responsibility of the Otago Regional Council to ensure that this occurs. If this does not occur there may be a time in the future when a completely new water source is needed or additional water treatment is necessary. For example, flocculation and filtration. It is crucial that all drinking water sources are adequately protected.

I am supportive of chlorination of the Arrowtown water supply based on the condition of the distribution network and the fact that chlorine is currently the only suitable disinfectant that has a residual affect throughout the network.

In regard to the need to make additional contributions through rates for providing an additional bore and reservoir I have some difficulty. I wrote to the Council in August 1993 about this matter when a lump sum was requested to permit supplying Millbrook and additional properties in Arrowtown. I was lead to understand by the Council at that time that in the future the Council would ensure that development contributions would meet capital requirements in the future. Obviously this has not occurred and any fees have been spent elsewhere.

The proposed increase in water rates in Arrowtown needs to be explained more transparently in terms of where the drinking water is distributed. There should be an indication of the proportion of water that is used by the township, the camping ground,

visitors, Millbrook, and surrounding areas, etc.. I do not agree with the current method of raising capital since I consider that as a ratepayer I am paying for the service provided to me and its maintenance. I should not be required to pay for an expansion of the service due to increased demand caused by development.

In regard to Arthurs Point I would expect that expansion of the water supply would have been provided for by development contributions. There may be a case for an increase in charge due to the necessity to chlorinate.

Perhaps the 10 year Plan needs a section to explain how the Council is going to manage and provide capital for growth in the future. Ratepayers should not be continuously faced with charges that increase at a rate greater than that of inflation

Community Investment:

The Council has a legal mandate to service and support existing communities. The existence of healthy safe communities is far more important than investment to attract increased numbers of visitors. It is the communities that support tourist operations in regard to providing employees and volunteers for events. However, community members should not be asked to support business operations and associated infrastructure to the extent that this requires funding by resident ratepayers.

I support the improvements proposed for the Arrowtown Pool.

I support the development of a Library in the Frankton area and would propose that the Frankton Library eventually becomes the Central Library for the District. The present library is now not in a suitable location for district resident ratepayers.

Although not part of the 10 year plan, I note that a new Toilet block is being provided in Arrowtown alongside the tourist bus park. This is clearly being provided for visitors and not local residents. The Council should consider cost recovery from visitors for this type of capital expenditure — it should not come out of the general rates charge.

I support the early harvest of the Coronet Forest.

Rating Differentials:

The rating systems needs to enable the Council to provide the services that they need to provide to the community through the Local Government Act in a fair transparent manner. The Residential ratepayers should not be asked to support projects and infrastructure

that are targeted at visitors and or events. If the rates are adjusted to ensure that this is the case I support the change.

Additionally, transparency should be such that the Council can demonstrate that it is not double dipping in regard to rates and fees charged by the Council. For example waste management.

The Council needs to address the “feeling” that many residents have; in that they are no longer considered part of the community and most Council spending is aimed at visitors and increasing the number of visitors at the expense of existing infrastructure. Central business area infrastructure has been developed and improved in several locations in the district at the expense of residential streets and footpaths.

Council Office:

I do not agree that the Council should build a new facility in central Queenstown. A new Office Building would be more accessible to residents if it was located in the Frankton area.

Central Queenstown has been developed to attract visitors rather than locals. The Council needs to accept this and look to move new office to a more accessible location for residents. If a new office is developed in central Queenstown it may be viewed as being undemocratic in regard to enabling residents to easily participate in the governance of the district. I tend to question the statement in the plan that the Council has a mandate to remain in the CBD because of “associated professional activity.”

I do not support a new Library being located in central Queenstown in any new Council Office Building on the basis that it will be more accessible to visitors than residents of the district. I would support a satellite library of a Central Library based in the Frankton area.

I do not support the development of an Emergency Operations Centre in the CBD. If a risk assessment of the hazards of a natural hazardous event was conducted I suggest that an event could potentially cut-off the CBD through landslide and bridge failure (water access may be possible). This is not very satisfactory, the Emergency Operations Centre would be better located in the Frankton area.

Queenstown Town Centre:

Work is obviously necessary to improve traffic flows through Queenstown. Until traffic flows are solved no consents should be issued in central Queenstown for projects that enable an increased number of visitors to be present in the town centre.

I support a solution to the traffic flow issue. This primarily arises because of visitor numbers and the activities promoted in the area, consequently cost recovery for this should largely fall on visitors not on residential ratepayers of the Wakatipu Ward.

If it is necessary to demolish the Memorial Hall I support its replacement, however alternative locations in the District should be explored so that a new facility is easily accessible to local residents.

I support the development of a transport hub.

I do not support the Queenstown Streets upgrade since substantial upgrade work has already occurred in the last 10 years. I note no identified upgrade work is programmed for any Arrowtown streets and footpaths. I consider that all footpaths ("where they exist"!) throughout Arrowtown are in very poor condition. It is often said that the Arrowtown people do not want improved footpaths or street curbing when this is discussed with Council. This is not necessarily the opinion of residents in the streets where there is no curbing, etc.. The Council needs to take a lead on this as it has done for drinking water.

Emergency Management

I support the action being taken to assess the effect of a Magnitude 8+ earthquake, particularly in regard to visitor evacuation from the District. I commented earlier about the proposed location of the Emergency Operations Centre and the need for a risk assessment related to access if there was a hazardous event causing landslides, etc..

Solid Waste Management and Recycling

Costs associated with both these operations need to be presented transparently. Costs need to be allocated as they lie. Residents already pay for solid waste disposal through the purchase of bags or the cost of a bin. Residents should not be faced with an additional rate for waste other than those associated with recycling.

No mention is made (that I can find) of cost recovery from material recovered for recycling (metal, cardboard, paper, plastics, etc.).

There are many opportunities for "double dipping" in regard to solid waste disposal, charges need to be fairly allocated. How much of the recycling rate is allocated to disposing the material that is not recycled in a landfill? If there is no intention of recycling

an object the ratepayer could place it in a solid waste bin and avoid a second cost for landfill disposal. Hence the need for cost transparency.

The rubbish and recycling bins that are located in central business areas of high visitor numbers, should in my opinion be financed through business rates since most of the waste/recyclable material originates from purchases at retail outlets. My interpretation of the plan is that the rate is similar for businesses as it is for householders.

Planning for the Future

Whilst 10 year plan is important to meet legislative requirements it would be prudent for the Council to look to plan for the longer term. A 30 year plan alongside the 10 year plan may consider scenarios of population and visitor growth and or decrease. The suggestion of a “decrease” arises from the Governments decision today (12th April 2018) to ban future offshore oil and gas prospecting. This suggests to me that in the medium term it may be more difficult and much more expensive for visitors to fly to New Zealand and move through the country.

Hopefully the Government has already advised territorial authorities about the risks and benefits associated with its announcement so that Councils can plan for the future with some certainty.

An issue which arises, due to Arrowtown being located next to the Mahu Whenua covenant area where an extensive walkway system is being provided, is the potential increase in the number of visitors to Arrowtown. Does the Council need to consider this in the 10 year plan to ensure that suitable infrastructure is provided in Arrowtown for the potential increase in visitor numbers due to the promotion of the Mahu Whenua walkways?

FERGUSON L D

Queenstown/Wakatipu area

Q. 1C: If the funding assumptions are not supported (NZTA) do you agree that Council re-prioritise some projects?

Agree

Q. 2B: Do you agree that this should include an interim dedicated Queenstown library space?

Agree

Q. 6C: Do you agree that Council should enter into a lease for an interim Frankton Library?

Agree

Q. 8A: Comment here.

The Centre car park SHOULD be placed in Athol St car park space ("as is now").
Ground level be high enough for buses - toilets moved elsewhere.
4/5 floors - site is blank walls all around.
(no parks either ends of Athol St, include bus/taxi/other)