

# Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023



Meeting conducted in the Council Chamber at Lvl 2, Philip Laing House  
144 Rattray St, Dunedin

Members of the public may view via livestream at: Otago Regional Council [YouTube Channel](#)

## Members:

Cr Kevin Malcolm, Co-Chair	Cr Andrew Noone
Cr Tim Mepham, Co-Chair	Cr Gretchen Robertson
Cr Alexa Forbes	Cr Bryan Scott
Cr Gary Kelliher	Cr Alan Somerville
Cr Michael Laws	Cr Elliot Weir
Cr Lloyd McCall	Cr Kate Wilson

Senior Officer: Richard Saunders Chief Executive

Meeting Support: Trudi McLaren Governance Support Officer

29 May 2024 09:00 AM

## Agenda Topic

## Page

### 1. WELCOME

### 2. APOLOGIES

No apologies were received at the time of agenda publication.

### 3. PUBLIC FORUM

Requests to speak should be made to the Governance Team on 0800 474 082 or [governance@orc.govt.nz](mailto:governance@orc.govt.nz) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting; however, this requirement may be waived by the Chairperson.

### 4. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Note: Any additions must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

### 5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are reminded of the need to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have. [Councillor Register of Interests](#) is published to the ORC website.

6.	MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION	3
6.1	<a href="#">LONG-TERM PLAN 2024-2034 DELIBERATION AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES</a>	3
	The purpose of this report is to enable deliberation on the public submissions to the Otago Regional Council Long-term Plan 2024-34 (LTP) process. Having reflected on the submissions as individual elected representatives this report enables formal direction to staff on any change(s) required to the proposed LTP prior to final Council approval.	
6.1.1	<a href="#">Submissions to the ORC Long- Term Plan 2024-2034 (summarised and redacted)</a>	30
6.1.2	<a href="#">Managers Recommendations - Requests to ORC Must do Work</a>	762
6.1.3	<a href="#">Rating Maps</a>	773
7.	CLOSURE	

### 6.1. Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 Deliberation

<b>Prepared for:</b>	Finance Committee
<b>Report No.</b>	CS2421
<b>Activity:</b>	Governance Report
<b>Author:</b>	Nick Donnelly, General Manager Corporate Services and CFO Mike Roesler, Manager Corporate Planning
<b>Endorsed by:</b>	Nick Donnelly, General Manager Corporate Services and CFO
<b>Date:</b>	29 & 30 May 2024

---

#### PURPOSE

- [1] The purpose of this report is to enable deliberation on the public submissions to the Otago Regional Council Long-term Plan 2024-34 (LTP) process. Having reflected on the submissions as individual elected representatives this report enables formal direction to staff on any change(s) required to the proposed LTP prior to final Council approval.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- [2] Council agreed a draft LTP and associated Consultation Document on 20 March 2024. The key proposals, 'ORC Must do work', and 'How we fund our work' were subsequently consulted with the community during April 2024.
  - [3] A lot of written commentary has been provided by the community across all of the items discussed in the Consultation Document. The report has endeavoured to provide some flavour of that commentary – as a general observation the positivity for the Environmental and Transport Proposals was fettered by concern about levels of expenditure and questions about what's necessary/what's affordable.
  - [4] Based on submissions received, a reduction to the level of Council's funding requirements has been recommended for consideration.
  - [5] Balancing the above recommendation is the understanding there is important work and service that many in the community expect from Council – this was evident in the feedback.
  - [6] Council staff carefully reviewed the many submission points to identify those that speak directly to the LTP work programmes – what activity we provide and to what level. These submission points have been scheduled and attached to this report.
  - [7] The 'Changing our Rating System' Proposal has been a necessary and challenging policy review. There is complexity around rating, there are limitations in what local authorities can achieve with rating, and ultimately taxes can draw criticism from many.
  - [8] The Council has invested a great deal of leadership time and energy on the consulted proposal. It's key purpose was to simplify the current rating approach, improve transparency, and align future service provision, like public transport. The community feedback is perhaps difficult to assess as while it tips towards negativity it's hard to assess what the dominant reasons are i.e. too complex; tax minimisation mentality.
  - [9] The recommendations regarding this policy review reflect the preferred options that Council decided in late 2023. That position embodied much consideration of advice, questions, debate and direction from Council.
-

- [10] Finally, the report has, for the large part, been structured to mirror the LTP Consultation Document. The 'Options' section shows where the recommendations provide alternatives [other than the status quo] to the preferred options as consulted.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

*That the Finance Committee recommends Council:*

- 1) **Receives** the public submissions to the Consultation Document for the Otago Regional Council Long-term Plan 2024-34 'A Stronger Future Otago'.
- 2) **Notes** the three proposals and associated options as consulted in the Otago Regional Council Long-term Plan 2024-34 Consultation Document.

### PROPOSAL 1 - Investing in our Environment

- 3) **Approves** the preferred consulted option for Proposal 1 'Investing in our Environment' being dedicated funding of \$500,000 from year 2 onwards for inclusion in the Long-term Plan 2024-34
- 4) **Approves** the Revenue and Financing Policy proposal to fund proposal 1 'Investing in our Environment' by dedicated funding of \$500,000 from year 2 onwards' by a targeted rate for each of the five Otago districts.

### PROPOSAL 2 – Public Transport

- 5) **Approves** the preferred consulted option for proposal 2 'Investing in Public Transport – Dunedin' being the consulted extra services on popular routes and electric buses.
- 6) **Approves** the preferred consulted option for proposal 2 'Investing in Public Transport – Queenstown Lakes' being the consulted bus and ferry service improvements.

### PROPOSAL 3 – Revenue and Financing Policy

#### **Public Transport**

- 7) **Notes** the options provided in the Discussion section [60] of this report for the proposal on the general rate allocation to be applied for Public Transport.
- 8) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to fund Council's share of Public transport cost by a 20% Otago-wide general rate and 80% target rate split.'
- 9) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to fund Council's share of Public transport cost by applying a uniform target rate for the 80% rating portion.
- 10) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to expand the allocation of each current targeted public transport rating area to include the full territorial area for Dunedin and Queenstown respectively.
- 11) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to repay the public transport deficit over five years through the existing targeted transport rate area on capital value basis.

#### **Flood Protection, Drainage and River management**

- 12) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to fund flood protection costs by an 80% targeted rate – 20% general rate split.
- 13) **Notes** the Tokomairiro Scheme is defined as a flood protection under the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy.



- 14) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to fund drainage costs by an 90% targeted rate – 10% general rate split.
- 15) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change for the general rate portion of flood protection costs and drainage costs to apply across Otago.
- 16) **Notes** the options provided in the Discussion section [92] of this report for the proposal on the allocation within zones of targeted rates for flood and drainage activity.
- 17) **Approves** the preferred option as consulted and as described in the LTP Consultation Document to change how targeted rates for flood and drainage scheme costs are allocated.
- 18) **Approves** the preferred option for the Leith Indirect Rate to be allocated to all of Dunedin.
- 19) **Approves** the preferred option to discontinue the Lower Waitaki River Control Rate and fund via River and Waterway Management - Waitaki.
- 20) **Approves** the preferred option for a new Alexandra Flood Targeted Rate allocation funded from River and Waterway Management – Central Otago.

#### **Catchment management rates**

- 21) **Approves** the preferred option as consulted and as described in the LTP Consultation Document to create a catchment management rate.
- 22) **Agrees** that the new catchment management rate is an Otago-wide general rate based on capital value.

#### **Navigational safety rates**

- 23) **Approves** the preferred option as consulted and as described in the LTP Consultation Document to create navigational safety rate.
- 24) **Approves** that the navigational safety rate is a uniform rate charged Otago-wide excluding Queenstown Lakes District who provide and fund their own service.

#### **Wilding Conifer control rate**

- 25) **Approves** the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy change to discontinue the wilding tree rate.
- 26) **Notes** that activity associated with wilding tree management to be funded through the existing biodiversity rate.
- 27) **Notes** that a proposal for a new Farm Plan Rate and associated discontinuation of the Dairy Rate will be brought to Council later in the LTP cycle.
- 28) **Approves** the new River and Waterway Management – Queenstown Lakes Rate.

#### **ORC MUST-DO WORK**

- 29) **Notes** attachment 2 provides a Council staff assessment of submitter requests relating to 'ORC Must do work' activity as outlined in the Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 Consultation Document.

#### **Environment**

- 30) **Notes** that Council staff recommend no adjustments to the work programmes under environmental activity as detailed in attachment two.

#### **Climate change, resilience and Infrastructure**

- 31) **Notes** that Council staff recommend no adjustments to the work programmes under 'Climate change and resilience' and 'Infrastructure' activity detailed in attachment 2.

#### **Transport**

- 32) **Directs** Council staff to make the following adjustments to the draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 detailed in attachment two and including:
- a. Minor adjustments to timetabling of Route 1 Palmerston-Dunedin weekend services accommodated within proposed expenditure.
  - b. An Upper Clutha passenger transport business case be included in the Long-Term Plan 2024-2034, instead of the proposed trial.
  - c. Allocate \$50,000 in Year two Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 for potential sponsorship of the activity outlined in 'Dunedin Tracks and Trails' submission or other activity that would deliver on the Public and Active Transport Connectivity Strategy.
  - d. Investigate within existing year one forecast budgets the feasibility of incorporating an Oamaru-Dunedin service within the 'Oamaru year two and three public transport trial.

#### **Regional leadership**

- 33) **Notes** that Council staff recommend no adjustments to the work programmes under Regional leadership environmental activity detailed in attachment 2.

#### **FUNDING THE WORK**

- 34) **Approves** the proposal of Infrastructure capital repayment being applied over 30 years.
- 35) **Approves** the preferred option as consulted for the level of UAGC to include in the final LTP.
- 36) **Notes** the options provided in the Discussion section [137] of this report regarding the rate increase policy limit.
- 37) **Approves** the preferred option as consulted on the Rate Increase Policy limit.
- 38) **Directs** Council staff to decrease the years one to three Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 forecast expenditure and rating requirements as defined in section [139] of this report.

#### **STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS**

- 39) **Notes** that Council staff have carefully considered community feedback relating to Strategic Directions
- 40) **Approves** minor changes to the wording of 'Strategic Directions' goals two and three as outlined in section [124] of this report.

#### **PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 41) **Directs** Council staff to implement the direction provided at the 29-30 May 2024 Council meeting to complete and present the Long-term Plan 2024-34 for Council approval at its 26 June 2024 meeting.
- 42) **Notes** that the Council external auditor's final report on the Long-Term Plan 2024-34 will be completed for inclusion in the final Council approved document.

43) **Notes** that the Council rates resolution will be put to the 26 June 2024 Council meeting following adoption of the Long-term Plan 2024-34.

## BACKGROUND

- [11] The Council agreed on a 2024-2034 Long-term Plan Consultation Document 'A Stronger Future for Otago' and supporting planning information, strategy and policies at its 20 March 2024 meeting. Consultation commenced on 28 March 2024 and sought feedback on three significant proposals including:
- Investing in our environment
  - Investing in public transport
  - Changing our rating system [i.e. Revenue and Financing Policy]
- [12] Additionally, we invited feedback about Council's 'must-do work' across the activity groupings of:
- Environment
  - Climate change and resilience
  - Transport
  - Regional leadership
- [13] The Financial Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy were also highlighted, with the first underpinning how ORC services are funded over the long-run, and the latter setting direction on flood protection, drainage, and river management services.
- [14] Comprehensive and accessible financial and rating information was provided to assist the community to weigh the cost verses desirability, and fairness of who pays and how.
- [15] Over April submitters officially had four weeks to provide feedback on the above matters. A week extension was granted to a small number of organisations.
- [16] On 20 and 21 May 2021 Council heard over 50 verbal presentations from submitters from the total of 396 submissions. The Hearings provided an opportunity for submitters to highlight points of importance to them and for Councillors to listen and ask questions.
- [17] The Council is now at a stage in the process where it decides and adopts the LTP prior to 1 July 2024 as required under the Local Government Act 2002.
- [18] To support Council in this step, a 'Submission booklet' containing a summary of all submissions along with a summary of the 'open ended' commentary was provided to all councillors.
- [19] Recommendation 1 of this report formalises the Council's receipt of all submissions received.

**DISCUSSION**

- [20] To support Council's deliberation on submissions to 'A Stronger Future for Otago Long Term Plan Consultation Document', community feedback and associated staff recommendations are presented below.
- [21] The following table provides an overview of submission count.

Central Otago	22
Clutha district	16
Dunedin city	127
Queenstown Lakes District	67
Waitaki	12
Not stated or unclear	152
Age 25-44	44
Age 45-54	39
Age 55-64	41
Age 65+	72
Under 25	6
Not stated	194
<b>TOTAL Submissions</b>	<b>396</b>
Wanting to be heard	56 [14%]
Late Submissions [all accommodated]	12

- [22] Submitters to the consultation document had a lot of scope to provide commentary across Council activity – either via the questionnaire or letters [typically e-mailed]. The commentary contained some specific service requests but a far greater amount of policy and operational advice and observations.
- [23] Attachment 2 provides a schedule of the commentary that represents either a specific service request or a generic [multi-submitter] request. This schedule has been completed by Council management who have extracted specific relevant funding requests or representative requests from the pool of all submissions. To achieve this, a level of judgement has been exercised and Councillors can bring forward matters from their observations and understanding of submissions.
- [24] This 'Discussion' section reflects the 'Consultation Document' but groups 'like' activity to support Council consideration.
- Proposal 1, including 'ORC Must-do work'- 'Environment'.
  - Proposal 2, including 'ORC Must-do work' – 'Transport'.
  - Proposal 3 – Changing our rating system.
  - 'ORC Must-do work' including 'Climate change, resilience and Infrastructure', and, 'Regional leadership' [including Strategic Directions]
  - Funding the Work.

### Investing in our Environment - Proposal 1

- [25] This proposal focuses on establishing a dedicated annual fund that could support large-scale environmental projects. It acknowledges but doesn't completely replace, the withdrawal of central government 'jobs for nature' funding. The consulted preferred option was for \$500,000 per annum funded via a targeted district rate based on the amount of uptake.

- [26] Table – Responses to Proposal 1

<b>CD Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><i>'Do you support Council funding large scale environmental projects in Otago?'</i></b>	116	55
<b><i>'What level of total funding should be available?'</i></b>		
<i>\$500,000</i>	20	
<i>\$1 million</i>	20	
<i>\$2 million</i>	59	
<b><i>'How should this initiative be funded?'</i></b>		
<i>A targeted rate on districts that participate</i>	41	
<i>A regional Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)</i>	63	

- [27] The sentiment of submitter comments to proposal 1 follows:
- Comments for Council to focus on the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity and wetlands. Specific projects were mentioned including plant pests in the West Harbour region, and wetlands restoration at Old Taieri Lake. Community groups commented that ORC's resources can go further through working with existing groups to leverage their knowledge, networks and expertise.
  - Comments that regardless of whether the proposal was rated at a regional or district level, funding decisions should be based on where there is greatest need, benefit and value for money.
  - Some submitters raised concerns about limited information of how funding would be allocated and called for further guidance and transparency. Other submitters called for a robust strategy that seeks further private sector investment, which would also reduce the impact on rates.
- [28] Recommendation 3 of this report directs Council staff to implement the preferred option for Proposal 1 – \$500,000 dedicated funding per year for large scale environmental projects.
- [29] Recommendation 4 of this report directs Council staff to implement the preferred option for proposal 1 – the dedicated funding of \$500,000 per year for large scale environmental projects is funded by a targeted rate on districts that participate.

### **ORC Must-do Work – Environment**

- [30] The LTP Consultation Document invited commentary on ‘Environmental’ activity under ‘ORC Must-do work’. This section drew attention to ORC planning and implementation work across ‘land and water’, Biodiversity and biosecurity, and Air. included partnership to protect and improve waterways and land’. It also underlined the commitment to partnership and working with communities to achieve desired results.
- [31] Approximately 18% of total submitters responded to this section. Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow.
- Submitters were generally supportive of ORC’s environment must do work. Support for environmental initiatives in Otago included calls for improved flood (and drainage) management and transparency in maintenance planning, while non-supportive views emphasised concerns over financial burdens and partnership priorities. Submitters strongly advocated for increase biodiversity and water quality monitoring and enhancements. Submitters called on ORC to effectively regulate water quality so that it improves. They also sought better management of localised pollution events and more information about where stormwater drains go into lakes and rivers. Some submitters also commented that the environment is being damaged by rabbit infestations.
  - Support for environmental work included reinstating floodways to 100% design capacity and routine monitoring and maintenance, prioritising this over new projects. There was a call for the Long-Term Plan to provide clarity and transparency on maintenance, with annual reports on work done and future plans. KPI’s for Level of Service are suggested to track planned versus achieved outcomes. Increased funding for wetland restoration, such as Old Taieri Lake, is supported to enhance biodiversity. Some emphasise the importance of water management, biodiversity monitoring, and reducing carbon emissions.
  - Non-supportive views questioned the partnership priorities and advocating for a greater focus on people over biodiversity. Concerns are raised about financial burdens on ratepayers, with calls for ORC to cut back unnecessary spending. Some highlighted challenges like rabbit infestations, pollution control, and the need for more effective air quality management. There were also calls for ORC to ensure accountability, transparency, and public consultation in environmental initiatives.
- [32] Recommendation 30 of this report: That there is no adjustments to the proposed LTP work programme for environmental activity. Considerations for noting from community LTP requests are detailed in attachment 2.

## Investing in Public Transport - Proposal 2

### Context

- [33] The Council has stepped through a comprehensive planning process to develop this proposal including both Dunedin and Queenstown services. This planning process has involved:
  - a) Sufficient time to enable consideration.
  - b) Involved partners.
  - c) Business cases.
  - d) Application of principles like funding sustainability.
- [34] A lot of the submitter commentary revisits the detail that has been well considered via this process.
- [35] The supporting submitter perspective, for the large part, is cost/funding agnostic.
- [36] The non-supporting submitter perspective, for the large part, is concerned about overall costs and rate impacts. Also, within this submitter grouping, some question the purpose and rationale of public transport in the Otago setting. Comments about 'user pays' relate more broadly to concepts of equity [i.e. the incidence of a tax/rates and perceptions of private and public benefit]. Comments about 'empty buses' relate more to concepts of efficiency/effectiveness [i.e. the use and application of tax/rate revenue].

### Dunedin services

- [37] This proposal focused on low-cost high impact improvements to services made incrementally across the network. As part of the New Dunedin Hospital (NDH) build, Council undertook a comprehensive review of both possible fares and increased frequencies or services that would, across the city, support increased use of buses to access the hospital (for workers, visitors and people attending appointments). As the NDH is centrally located, the service improvements would support access to the CBD and University as well. It is expected the improvements would support a shift from approximately 4% to 8% of trips to work and education being made by passenger transport. This modest increase would be significant in both the effect that it would have on the key transport routes (i.e. reduced congestion between Mosgiel and the city centre) and in reducing GHG emissions. To make this financially sustainable the Council has planned the changes incrementally across the period of the LTP. The initial investment is extending the running hours of buses in evenings and weekends and increasing the frequency of our most popular services.
- [38] Submission feedback to the survey question ***'Do you support increased investment in Dunedin and the addition of extra services?'***:  
*Submitter Support [96], and non-support [59]*
- [39] Many submitters provided commentary on the question. Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow.
  - Comments received emphasised the need for more frequent and reliable buses, extended service hours and expanded routes to underserved areas like Outram and the airport. Several submitters also supported the transition to an electric bus fleet to reduce environmental impacts, reduce emissions and improve sustainability. Submitters made suggestions including increasing services from Dunedin to Outram,

Balclutha, Mosgiel and Strat Taieri. Submitters also recommended investigating more park and ride options, more frequent services to the airport, and free bus fares for all.

- Some submitters did not support the rates increase to pay for public transport because it should be funded by the user. Concerns were raised about the infrastructure and the cost of public transport. Some submitters considered that the region cannot afford the rates increases. Improvements at bus hubs were suggested to create a more positive image of bus travel, including amenities like food kiosks, and enforced no-smoking areas. Some submitters noted they didn't currently have access to bus services, and that buses are overcrowded at peak times. The feedback also highlighted the need for pricing models that encourage maximum usage with minimal financial burden on rate/tax payers, suggesting models ranging from increased fares to completely free services.

[40] Recommendation 5 of this report: That the preferred consulted option for Proposal 2 – Dunedin public transport is approved for the final LTP.

### ***Queenstown Services***

[41] Submission feedback to the survey question ***'Do you support increased investment in Queenstown and the addition of extra services?'*** is:

*Submitter Support [72], and non-support [68]*

[42] Many submitters provided commentary on the question. Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow:

- Comments received emphasised the need to invest in Queenstown's public transport systems due to traffic congestion, to reduce emissions, and to extend service hours. Residents advocated for more efficient and accessible public transport to support local activities, such as swim clubs, by offering more regular bus services which would contribute positively to environmental goals by reducing on-road carbon emissions. Some submitters recommended integrating services with NZSki buses and developing a park and ride system.
- Comments received also emphasises that poor town planning and a lack of infrastructure investment had resulted in a suboptimal transport network, which had resulted in congestion and made it difficult to improve the network. Many submitters provided feedback that bus services should be funded more from fares and raised concerns with ratepayers subsidising service improvements and services that were heavily used by tourists and/or tourism businesses. Other submitters indicated that the public system should not be relied on by school children because it was generally not possible to catch buses at 8am or 4pm. Destination Queenstown also considered the 2035 zero-emissions target was not ambitious enough.

[43] Recommendation 6 of this report: That the consulted preferred option for proposal 1 – Queenstown Lakes public transport is retained in the final LTP.

### ***ORC Must-do Work - Transport***

[44] The LTP Consultation Document invited Transport commentary in addition to Proposal 2 and under 'ORC Must-do work'. This section included the topic of 'active transport', new services [ie exploring service trials], total mobility, and our planning activity.

[45] Approximately 20% of total submitters responded to this section. Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow.



- Comments highlighted the need for a broader consideration of public transport services across districts and the Otago region. There was strong support for environmentally friendly transport options, particularly active transport such as cycling and walking. However, there were concerns about the effectiveness and societal benefits of expanding public transport services, noting the low usage and questionable value that could lead to increased rates without commensurate benefits.
- There was some contention over the current policy stance that advocates for increased public transport funding through rates, which may conflict with individual choice for different modes of transport. Other submitters questioned the climate change objectives of public transport investment. Despite these concerns, there was some recognition of the social benefits of public transport, particularly for those who are lonely, isolated, or socially disconnected, as it can help expand and strengthen social networks. For some the time is considered ripe to implement the already trialled or business case evaluations in locations like Wanaka and Oamaru.

[46] Recommendation 32 of this report: That the following adjustments are made to the proposed LTP based on community feedback as detailed in attachment 2, including:

- a) Minor adjustments to bus services that can be accommodated within the planned LTP programme including weekend timetabling to route 1 Palmerston-Dunedin.
- b) An Upper Clutha passenger Transport business case to be included in the LTP, instead of the proposed trial.
- c) Allocation of \$50,000 in Year 2 LTP for potential sponsorship of the activity outlined in 'Dunedin Tracks and Trails' submission or other activity that would deliver on the Public and Active Transport Connectivity Strategy.
- d) Investigate within existing year one forecast budgets the feasibility of incorporating an Oamaru-Dunedin service within the 'Oamaru year two and three public transport trial.

## Changing our Rating System - Proposal 3

### **Context – when considering this proposal**

- [47] Given the broad scope of the Revenue and Financing Policy review and the complexity of the subject matter it was challenging to communicate and equally difficult for many submitters to understand the proposed changes. This point was discussed with Council's external auditors who gave substantive feedback on what and how to communicate this proposal.
- [48] On a positive note, the Council evidenced through the written comments, and via direct 'face to face' engagement events, that ratepayers most affected by the proposals did indeed understand the complexity.
- [49] All submitters could also easily assess the impact of the proposals at a property level via the 'rate calculator'. It provided the current rate paid, the new rate under the proposed policy, and the new rate under the existing policy – across the services tagged to the property.

### **Public Transport rating policy**

- [50] This proposal focused on changing the rating approach to better reflect the wider benefits of public transport and to support a broader bolder vision of valued and utilised district wide, and over time region wide public transport.
- [51] Table: submitter feedback to questions.

<b>CD Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Do you support a 20% Otago-wide rate for public transport (i.e. general rate)?</i>	21	25
<i>Do you support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district-wide basis?</i>	8	40
<i>Do you support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. a uniform rate)?</i>	17	41
<i>Do you support repayment of the existing public transport deficits over 5 years?'</i>	61 (58%)	44
<i>Over what period should the public transport deficits be repaid?</i>	3 years: 7/44 10 years: 28/44	

- [52] The sentiment of submitter comments to proposal follows:
- a) Some submissions commented on the need to pay back what was borrowed in a reasonable period of time so that it does not put too much pressure on ratepayers but will ensure that debt is repaid in a timely fashion. Some submitters commented that public transport in the region is not paying its way, and that the level of public transport in the region needs to be reduced to make sure it is affordable. Some submissions did not support a uniform rating approach and noted that rates should be proportionate to property values. Some submitters suggested that all public transport funding should be paid for by those who live in the area serviced by the public transport.

General rate allocation

- [53] Feedback was generally supportive of a general rate allocation for public transport. Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) commented that they preferred a higher general rate allocation of 30% (note staff original proposal was a 40% general rate allocation in public transport).
- [54] A higher general rate allocation reflects the wider public benefit of providing public transport services in the region. The analysis shown below shows the funding apportionment for public transport.
- [55] The table below shows the funding mix for public transport and also shows a comparison to flood and drainage.

	Fares	Subsidies	Direct Funding	Targeted Rates	General Rates	Rates Funding	TR % of Rates
Flood			0%	80%	20%	100%	80%
Drainage			0%	90%	10%	100%	90%
<b>Dunedin</b>							
PT DUN 23/24	17%	46%	63%	37%	0%	37%	100%
PT DUN 24/25	15%	46%	62%	31%	8%	38%	80%
PT DUN 33/34	21%	43%	64%	29%	7%	36%	80%
Target	20%	41%	61%	31%	8%	39%	80%
Target	20%	41%	61%	24%	16%	39%	60%
Target	20%	41%	61%	20%	20%	39%	50%
<b>Queenstown</b>							
PT QTN 23/24	27%	48%	75%	24%	1%	25%	98%
PT QTN 24/25	25%	42%	67%	26%	7%	33%	80%
PT QTN 33/34	37%	34%	71%	23%	6%	29%	80%
Target	30%	36%	66%	27%	7%	34%	80%
Target	30%	36%	66%	21%	14%	34%	60%
Target	30%	36%	66%	17%	17%	34%	50%

- [56] There is a significant direct funding element to public transport via user charges (bus fares) and Waka Kotahi subsidies. This funds between 60-70% of the cost depending on the network. The remainder is then funded by rates. The proposed 80% targeted / 20% general split means that general rates are funding 7-8% of the total cost of public transport. This is significantly lower than flood protection where only the 20% general rate allocation is also the funding percentage of total cost.
- [57] Examples of increasing the general rate allocation to 40% and 50% are also shown. A 50% general rate allocation results in 17-20% of the total cost being general rate funded which is more in line with general rate cost funding in flood schemes.
- [58] If the general rate allocation for public transport was increased the remaining uniform targeted rate would reduce. Analysis on this is shown in the next section on "District wide uniform targeted rate allocation".
- [59] Recommendation 8 of this report: That Council confirms the preferred consulted option of 20% general rate allocation applied for Public Transport.
- [60] Alternative options to recommendation 8 include:
- Option B: Council could agree a different general rate percentage either from year one or to be phased in over years 2 and 3 of the LTP.

- b) Option C: If neither the preferred option or B is acceptable then the status quo, no general rate allocation, would continue.

District wide uniform targeted rate allocation

- [61] There were a number of submissions opposing this particularly from the people outside of the current Whakatipu transport area in Wanaka and Hawea. Feedback included the view the targeted rate should only apply to those within proximity of the PT network ie the status quo should be retained.
- [62] There were also comments that it should be defined by the number of people rather than per property ie hotels would only pay one single charge and properties without a dwelling would pay when no one lived there to use the bus.
- [63] As noted earlier the targeted rate allocation is only funding part of the local share after direct funding from users and Waka Kotahi. As such it isn't intended to reflect the ratepayers direct use of the bus service. If a ratepayer or non-ratepayer ie tourist uses the service they still pay directly for this and the rate allocation should not be applied only to those within walking proximity of the network.
- [64] Spreading the targeted rate over the entire district on a uniform basis means all properties in the district pay a flat levy to assist in the provision of public transport in the district they live in.
- [65] Applying the uniform rate to all contiguous properties is simple to administer and understand. This is consistent with how other rates like Emergency Management and Wilding Pines have been charged. Interestingly there hasn't been negative feedback about this approach for those activities and the resistance to the uniform proposal for PT appears more focused on a fundamental aversion to paying for PT at all rather than the rating basis being proposed.
- [66] Further differentiation would increase the complexity of the rate but wouldn't necessarily resolve the concerns raised in the feedback. It was noted that hotels aren't paying enough under a single charge per property but assuming their customers use the service they pay directly. Other issues with further differentiation included that hotels aren't the only accommodation providers i.e. what about AirBnB's? and what other types of properties would also be linked to bus users i.e. restaurants, bars, retail premises etc?
- [67] A number of hotels operate under separate unit titles with an overarching management contract. These units are rated as separate properties and therefore pay separate uniform rates.
- [68] As noted earlier an increased general rate allocation would mean hotels with higher CV's would pay a greater share as a result and the remaining uniform targeted rate would be lower.

[69] The table below shows the uniform targeted rates and average general rates at different general / targeted allocations.

<b>Dunedin</b>						
<b>Targeted Rates</b>				<b>General Rates</b>		
No. of Targeted %	ratepayers Rates \$	54,465 Uniform		No. of General %	ratepayers Rates \$	124,310 Average
80%	7,752	\$163.68		20%	1,938	\$17.93
60%	5,814	\$122.76		40%	3,876	\$35.86
50%	4,845	\$102.30		50%	4,845	\$44.82
<b>Queenstown</b>						
<b>Targeted Rates</b>				<b>General Rates</b>		
No. of Targeted %	Ratepayers Rates \$	29,217 Uniform		No. of General %	ratepayers Rates \$	124,310 Average
80%	3,267	\$128.60		20%	817	\$7.56
60%	2,450	\$96.45		40%	1,634	\$15.12
50%	2,042	\$80.37		50%	2,043	\$18.90

[70] The amounts shown in yellow reflects the proposed 80% targeted / 20% general allocation. The impact of 60%/40% and 50%/50% are also shown.

[71] Recommendation 10 of this report: That Council confirms the proposal to expand the targeted rate allocation for public transport to include the full territorial authority area for Dunedin City and Queenstown Lakes District respectively.

[72] Recommendation 9 of this report: That Council confirms the targeted rate allocation for public transport will be charged on a uniform basis.

#### Transport deficits repaid over 5 years under current rating policy

[73] There was less comment on this as most submitters focused on the new uniform rate rather than the existing deficits and the proposal to repay them. Of those that did comment there was a mix of time periods preferred and some general comment that Council shouldn't have debt in these activities at all. This endorses the proposed approach going forward of ensuring transport expenditure is fully funded in the year it occurs.

[74] Recommendation 11 of this report: That Council confirms the preferred consulted option to repay the public transport deficit over 5 years through the existing targeted transport rate area on capital value basis.

#### **Flood and Drainage**

[75] Table: submitter feedback to questions

<b>CD Question</b>	Yes	No
<i>Do you support all the flood protection scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) paying 80%, and 20% through Otago-wide rates (i.e. general rates)?</i>	64	30
<i>Do you support all the drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) paying 90%, and 10% through Otago-wide rates (i.e. general rates)?</i>	59	28
<i>Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago (i.e. general rates)?</i>	54	32
<i>Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones being applied across Otago?</i>	36	29

General rate allocations

- [76] The proposal was to apply a 20% general rate allocation for flood and 10% general rate allocation for drainage schemes with the general rate allocation being regional.
- [77] This was generally supported but there were some specific comments and requests included in the feedback. Some submitters didn't think 20% went far enough and a number of these ratepayers, largely from the Taieri, attended hearings and reiterated this view. They also noted they would like a further independent review of who benefits. Based on their comments that those not paying but benefiting include Mosgiel and properties on higher ground immediately outside the scheme targeted rate area they are actually requesting a technical benefit review rather than a review of the general rate allocation which is focused on wider economic and social benefits.
- [78] Castalia has previously conducted this type of review on a number of the schemes which resulted in the move to the various general rates allocations in place prior to this RFP review. The proposed changes in the RFP round those general rate allocations up to 20% for flood and 10% for drainage.
- [79] In the RFP review Council considered general rate allocations across all schemes and also across public transport where a general rate allocation has been introduced. While some submitters requested a higher general rate allocation and/or further reviews they didn't provide any rationale for this other than their view they paid too much and others didn't pay enough or at all.
- [80] There was contrasting feedback, particularly from attendees at the engagement sessions in Queenstown and Wanaka that they opposed contributing to flood and drainage in Dunedin through general rates and their view was that only targeted rates should apply to those properties directly protected ie only technical benefits should be considered.
- [81] Recommendations 12, 14 and 15 of this report: That Council confirms there is no change to the preferred options as consulted, that general rate allocations will be 20% for flood schemes and 10% for drainage schemes and applied across the region.

Reduction in benefit zones to one or two zones per scheme

- [82] This change has the biggest impact on individual ratepayers depending on what zone their property currently is in. As expected, this proposal received a mixed response depending on whether a ratepayer was receiving an increase or a decrease in their rates. Overall, there was support for moving to a simplified single or two zone structure than reflects an integrated approach to the targeted rate area.
- [83] There was specific feedback from ratepayers in Lower Clutha zone F who noted their increase was significant. This was due to the nature of the new groupings with zone F having a much lower existing differential than zone A to E.
- [84] The review did not redefine the targeted rate benefit areas unless a change was proposed to move to district wide rating (proposed for Lower Waitaki River Control and Leith Indirect). Rather, the existing targeted rate area and zones were retained, and the differentials applied to the existing zones were then grouped and applied consistently to reduce the number of zones.
- [85] Redefining the targeted rate area and the zones would require a technical review. This review was undertaken for the Taieri schemes in 2011 however similar reviews have not been undertaken for the Lower Clutha or Tokomairiro schemes. These scheme areas and

zones have largely been in place since Council has existed. Further the Lower Clutha scheme combines flood and drainage and charges both on a CV basis which is inconsistent with the Taieri.

- [86] Technical reviews could be completed to update and confirm the targeted rate areas especially for the Lower Clutha and Tokomairiro schemes. This review could include splitting the Lower Clutha scheme into separate flood and drainage areas and the single zone methodology then applied. If this was Council's preferred way forward then no zone groupings / changes should be applied until this process is completed as there is little point in applying a temporary change.
- [87] Another alternative is to continue using the existing benefit area and zones but amend the proposed groupings for the Lower Clutha so the increase for zone F isn't as extreme. While this would alleviate the issue for these ratepayers it isn't ideal and undertaking a technical review of the targeted area first would be preferred.
- [88] The table below shows how the Lower Clutha rate allocations using the old and new zone differentials.

Zone	Rate					Rate per \$ of Rate Base	
	Units	Rate Base	Old RFP	New RFP	Variance	Old RFP	New RFP
A	4	6,232,000	52,993	7,817	(45,177)	0.008503	0.001254
B	41	63,553,720	214,581	79,713	(134,868)	0.003376	0.001254
C	85	125,431,980	399,976	157,324	(242,652)	0.003189	0.001254
D	67	35,576,000	71,181	44,622	(26,559)	0.002001	0.001254
E	74	61,996,900	65,898	77,760	11,862	0.001063	0.001254
F	635	355,523,850	44,458	445,919	401,461	0.000125	0.001254
U1	14	1,601,680	5,408	774	(4,634)	0.003376	0.000483
U2	836	260,305,220	292,962	125,744	(167,218)	0.001125	0.000483
U3	524	85,672,950	21,427	41,386	19,959	0.000250	0.000483
U4	1,381	444,573,200	83,391	214,758	131,366	0.000188	0.000483
Total	3,661	1,440,467,500	1,252,276	1,195,816	(56,461)		

- [89] Zone F is highlighted in yellow. An alternative would be to group F, U3 and U4 as one grouping and the remaining zones A-E, U1 and U2 as the other. Under this, zone F would still have an increase but it would reduce. Other zones would see their decreased reduce or now incur increases.
- [90] Rates maps for these schemes are attached to this paper.
- [91] Recommendation 17 of this report: That the Council confirms there is no change to the preferred option as consulted, being to group the benefit zones as outlined in the consultation document.
- [92] Alternative options to recommendation 16 include:
- Option B: No change to the proposal for Taieri and Tokomairiro schemes. Amend Lower Clutha groupings.
  - Option C: Retain the status quo regarding benefit zone allocations and undertake technical reviews of all schemes to define the targeted rate area and benefit zones.

*Leith Indirect allocated to all of Dunedin*

- [93] This received some feedback, mainly from ratepayers in the Taieri who wanted a similar allocation for those schemes.
- [94] This allocation is to fund the portion of non-rateable property within the scheme targeted rate area. In the Leith scheme this is approximately \$1.7BN which is approximately half of the total property value within the scheme.
- [95] There is no corresponding non-rateable amount within other schemes. The airport is often referred to as non-rateable however the majority of the airport's property value is rateable and the same rationale does not apply as their non-rateable value is only 0.3% of the total property value within the Lower Taieri flood scheme.
- [96] The benefit of the airport and transport links were assessed in the Castalia review that set the existing general rate allocations to reflect that at lower than the 20% now proposed.
- [97] Recommendation 18 of this report: That the Council confirms the preferred option.

*Discontinue Lower Waitaki River Control Rate and fund via River and Waterway Management – Waitaki*

- [98] There was limited feedback on this. WDC asked for clarity on the rationale for the change.
- [99] The activity is river management rather than flood control and the change makes this consistent with other river management activity and small-scale non-scheme works.
- [100] Recommendation 19 of this report: – That the Council confirms the preferred option

*New Alexandra Flood Targeted Rate allocation funded from River and Waterway Management – Central Otago*

- [101] There was limited feedback on this.
- [102] Recommendation 20 of this report: That the Council confirms the preferred option

***Other changes to rates***

- [103] Under Proposal 3 of the LTP Consultation Document, changes to how three other categories of work are rated for was proposed. This included:
  - a) Catchment management – simplify how existing work across biodiversity, land and water, water quality remediation, and integrated catchment management activity is funded.
  - b) Navigational safety – better reflect how benefits and more transparency.
  - c) Wilding conifer control – simplify how biosecurity is funded. This only relates to the ORC related administration costs and not the government funded control works.



[104] Table of submitter response

<b>CD Question</b>	Yes	No
<i>Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago base on capital value?</i>	60	34
<i>Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes).</i>	42	40
<i>Do you support continuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?</i>	64	39

**New Catchment Management Rate / discontinue Rural Water Quality Rate**

[105] The sentiment of submitter comments on the proposal included:

- Submitters commented that catchment management created Otago-wide benefits because Otago's systems are connected and these submitters felt all ratepayers should contribute to catchment management rates. Feedback received also highlighted the importance of simple and transparent approach, which submitters believed would reduce administrative costs and redirect more funds into substantive work.
- Other submitters objected to rates being based on capital values because it meant that some ratepayers, particularly Queenstown Lakes residents are contributing a disproportionate amount because they have higher CVs. Some submitters also opposed the cost of the rural quality water programmes being transferred from rural property owners to largely urban properties on the basis that these issues should be funded by those who live in rural areas. Feedback also called for more transparency around how these rates were being spent.

[106] Recommendations 21 and 22 of this report: That Council confirm the preferred options as consulted. The feedback was generally supportive of creating this rate and simplifying the rate funding for these activities. The issue of this being a region wide CV based rate and the impact of that on Queenstown Lakes District rates is covered later in this paper.

**Discontinue Wilding Tree Rate and fund via Biosecurity Rate**

[107] Several submissions preferred this continued as a separate rate. These submissions largely based that on the view that the separate rate increased the profile of this activity. The amount rated is only for the portion of funding (\$250,000) that is provided to wilding conifer groups for administrative purposes and not for the eradication contract work which is fully funded from MPI grants. There was also concern that the funding for these groups could be easily removed if there wasn't a separate rate.

[108] The amount being rated doesn't warrant separate funding and the rating function shouldn't be used as a form of marketing to raise the profile of specific activities. Other activities that have greater expenditure amounts are not rated separately so it is inconsistent to rate wildings differently.

[109] Recommendation 25 and 26 of this report: That Council confirm the preferred options as consulted.

*New Navigational Safety Management Rate*

[110] The sentiment of submitter comments on the proposal included:

- a) Some submitters commented on the benefits of the ORC's harbour and navigational safety improvements, with some supporting continued investment due to the real-life advantages provided by effective harbourmaster services. Some submitters commented that they were not aware that Otago Regional Council are responsible for these services. One submitter questioned why Central Otago, which has its own harbourmaster service, was not treated in the same way as Queenstown Lakes.
- b) Concerns were raised about the financial implications, with some submitters arguing that projects should be abandoned unless costs can be significantly reduced, as they believe the expenses currently outweigh the benefits. Some submitters called for a uniform rate rather than one based on capital value and advocating for a user-pays system where only those directly using navigational services bear the costs.

[111] Recommendations 23 and 24 of this report: That council confirms the preferred option as consulted. Feedback conflated the value and expense of the service with the funding proposal. There didn't appear to be any strong argument against simplifying the rate funding for this activity and while user pays was noted it would be difficult to administer for this activity.

*New Farm Plan Rate / discontinue Dairy Rate*

[112] This was noted to occur from year 2 or later.

[113] Recommendation 27 of this report: Notes no change to proposal. The RFP will note it is being considered but the Dairy Rate continues until an alternative is established. Any change will be proposed through future Annual Plans or the next LTP.

*New River and Waterway Management – Queenstown Lakes Rate*

[114] This combines separate Whakatipu and Wanaka rates into one district wide rate consistent with rating for river and waterway management across the rest of the region.

[115] There was limited feedback on this.

[116] Recommendation 28 of the report: Council confirms the proposal as consulted.

## **ORC Must do Work –**

### ***Climate change, Resilience and Infrastructure Strategy***

- [117] The LTP Consultation Document invited feedback about work on climate change and resilience under 'ORC Must-do work'. This section referenced Council work on 'climate strategy', 'natural hazards and climate change adaptation', 'emergency management' and 'flood protection, drainage and river management'. The latter included more detailed about the proposed Infrastructure Strategy.
- [118] Approximately 13% of total submitters responded to this section. Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow.
- a) Most feedback received was policy centric and focused on the approach and priorities ORC should take. Submitters were typically supportive of the current work programme, such as the Climate Change Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy. Submitters called for ORC to deal with matters such as urban design and encouraging energy efficient patterns of settlement. They also called for greater land-use management and targeted resilience building.
  - b) Supportive responses highlighted the urgency of climate change action, calling for proactive funding and measures to address rising sea levels and extreme weather events. Advocates highlighted the importance of wetland basins (such as Forbury Park), to mitigate flood risks and support the preservation of native bird populations. There as a strong emphasis on education and public awareness, with suggestions for annual (or bi-annual) drills to test service coordination and enhance community resilience. Supporters also backed continued funding for adaptation and mitigation efforts, recognising the critical need for immediate action in the face of the climate crisis. Some also expressed support for the Southern Lakes Sanctuary concept, emphasising its role in preserving native bird populations and reducing predator invasions.
  - c) Non-supportive submissions expressed scepticism about the effectiveness and enforceability of climate change strategies, questioning the focus on mitigation efforts. Some submitters considered that climate change will never be addressed by writing strategies. Some submitters also noted agriculture emissions are potentially significant and there is no clear pathway to reduce these emissions. Critics argued for a shift towards educational tools rather than costly mitigation measures, citing concerns about the financial burden on communities. Some expressed doubt about the viability of clean energy alternatives, particularly in agriculture, and called for a more holistic approach that considers land use management and community locations.
  - d) Feedback in support of the Infrastructure Strategy recognised the importance of the work and acknowledged the need to increase the programme of work and associated spending. The Strategy's focus on nature-based solutions for river and drainage management is supported because of its potential to improve water quality, enhance biodiversity, and mitigate the impacts of climate change.
  - e) Additionally, there was a strong backing for the strategy's emphasis on flood protection, despite the financial implications, highlighting the recognition of the Strategy's role in protecting properties and lives from extreme weather events, especially crucial in the face of climate change effects. Some submitters questioned the Infrastructure Strategy's approach and associated programme of work. Some submitters questioned the programme's strategic merits and others asked if other

options had been explored. For instance, a small number of submitters considered the key risks were related to earthquake, rather than flooding.

- f) Submissions and specific commentary flagged a need to complete the Silver Stream Channel / Gordon Road spillway works - frustration around a lack of progress to date was expressed.
- g) Some submitters expressed scepticism around ORC's intentions and past performance, with concerns raised about the lack of delivery on proposed works in the past. These submitters suggested a different governance approach [liaison groups] was required to advise on the services, programme and funding approach.
- h) Some responses expressed reservations about the high cost of the Strategy and called for ORC to review the level of effort and spend.

[119] Recommendation 31 of this report: Council staff recommend no adjustments to the work programme contained in 'Climate change, Resilience and Infrastructure Strategy' activity. Considerations for noting on example community feedback are detailed in attachment 2.

### **Strategic Directions and Regional leadership**

[120] The LTP Consultation Document opened with and invited comment on, broader content about Otago's challenges and opportunities, and Otago's focus areas. Approximately 20% of submitters responded.

[121] It also invited comment about Council's 'Regional leadership' activity under the 'ORC Must-do work' section. This section referenced Council work on 'Governance and community engagement' [i.e. governance processes and support, partnerships, communication], Regional planning [i.e. direction setting on sustainable use of natural resources], and regulatory activity [i.e. consenting, investigations and compliance]. Approximately 11% of submitters responded.

[122] Examples of the sentiment provided in comments follow:

- Feedback received on the challenges and opportunities facing Otago were dominated by concerns around the environment. Other concerns included the Treaty of Waitangi, partnerships, climate change, public transport, Otago's economic activity and economic base, and ORC's role in regulation and enforcement.
- There is general support for the focus areas, but hesitancy about the cost of delivering outcomes. This feedback perhaps related to other 'funding' commentary that the council organisation needs to ensure the priority outcomes are achieved in the most efficient and effective way possible. There's uncertainty amongst some that this is the case.
- The focus areas identifying the desire for more integrated transport systems to meet multiple challenges – including CC emissions, building resilience – particularly flood events, and adapting to climate change were all seen being significant issue facing the region, necessitating a primary focus. Lower level comments, albeit of potential interest, reflected concern about resilience of food production, and economic opportunity and impacts on young people, perhaps questioning the ORC role.
- Submitters typically supported ORC's efforts to develop partnerships with mana whenua. A comment thanked ORC for its leadership on freshwater and Councillors who made themselves available during LTP consultation. Other submitters called for ORC to take a balanced approach to engagement and partnership, with some

expressing concern with the current and projected cost of regional leadership activity. Submitters also suggested that Councillors need to listen to their constituents 'as a whole'.

- [123] Council staff have considered the feedback on 'Challenges and opportunities,' and note the general support for the focus areas. The support, including the effective and meaningful partnership with mana whenua is fettered by uncertainty about the cost and effectiveness of delivering against this and other focus areas. This emphasises the need for effective organisational strategy to ensure that environmental and community outcomes are achieved in the most efficient way possible.
- [124] Recommendation 40 of this report: Council staff recommend minor adjustments to the following 'Focus area' statements (shown in italics):
- a) Focus area: Environment, Goal 3: Our regional plans are effective at ensuring our resources are managed *sustainably within biophysical limits* in a planned and considered way.
  - b) Focus area: Transport, Goal 2: Carbon emissions are reduced and air quality is improved across the region, supported by our *efficient and affordable* public transport services.
- [125] Recommendation 33 of this report: Council staff recommend no adjustment to the work programme contained in 'Regional leadership' activity. Considerations for noting on example community feedback are detailed in attachment 2.

### **Funding the Work – Financial Strategy and Rating**

- [126] Key changes included in the draft Financial Strategy, feedback received on those points and staffs recommended actions are noted below:

#### ***Infrastructure capital repayment over 30 years***

- [127] In general submitters supported this change but many noted the level of spend in the infrastructure strategy and the resulting increase in debt. This is a separate budget issue and doesn't change the proposed change to the term of funding.
- [128] Recommendation 34 of this report: That Council confirms the proposal as consulted.

#### ***Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC)***

- [129] While there was no comment specifically on the UAGC there was comment regarding the difference in average rates across the districts in particular that the average rate in Queenstown Lakes District is higher than the average rate in Dunedin.
- [130] This has been the case for some time as average capital values in Queenstown are higher than other districts in the region.
- [131] This was discussed in workshops and Council specifically considered this when the UAGC was set at 25% of general rates on 21 February 2024. Other options were considered ranging from no UAGC to a UAGC of around 50% of general rates which maximised uniform rates just below the limit of 30% of total rates. A higher UAGC helps to reduce the impact of variances in capital values across the districts.
- [132] While capital values and average rates are higher in QLD that doesn't mean that a property in QLD pays more than a property in Dunedin with the same capital value.

Below are examples of properties with a capital value of \$1,580,000

<b>Location</b>	<b>Rates Act 23/24</b>	<b>LTP 24/25 New RFP</b>	<b>LTP 24/25 Old RFP</b>
Queenstown	523.31	721.87	702.09
Wanaka	431.55	695.76	496.07
Dunedin	839.67	789.07	996.58
Dunedin	854.43	806.43	1,013.33

- [133] Under the existing RFP the two Dunedin properties close to double the rates of the two Queenstown Lakes properties. That difference would continue in the LTP under the old RFP. Under the new RFP the Wanaka property increases largely due to the addition of public transport rates but still pays approximately \$100 less than the Dunedin properties and \$26 less than the Queenstown property.
- [134] Recommendation 35 of this report: That Council confirms the level of UAGC to include in the LTP.

#### ***Rate increase limit***

- [135] The draft Financial Strategy included a quantified limit on rates increases of 10% for every year of the LTP. The estimated rates increase is above this target in years 1 and 2 of the 10 years.
- [136] Recommendation 37 of this report: That Council confirms the proposed rates increase target to include in the LTP.

[137] Alternate options to recommendation 37 include:

- a) Option B: Retain the 10% limit across the 10 years and note /explain the reason for years 1 and 2 being above that limit.
- b) Option C: Set years 1 and 2 at the estimated increase and remaining years at 10%.

### ***Rates affordability***

[138] Although overall rates levels / increases were not a specific consultation item, this was outlined in the consultation document and numerous submitters commented on the level of rates increases and the general affordability of rates. The current cost of living and increases in territorial authority rates were a consistent theme within their concerns. Feedback also questioned the continued increase in ORC expenditure and requested that Council consider reducing that expenditure rather than increasing rates. Some went further and suggested ORC needed to reset its focus to reduce its funding needs.

[139] Staff have undertaken further reviews of expenditure levels and have prepared an option where rates increases would be 16.4%, 11.2%, 9.1% over years 1 to 3 of the LTP. This is down from rates increases at the time of consultation of 18.6%, 11.2%, 9.4%

[140] Further information on these charges will be provided separately prior to or at the meeting.

[141] Recommendation 38 of this report: That Council endorses the expenditure and rates decreases as proposed in section [139].

### **OPTIONS**

[142] This report presents the staff recommendations following community feedback on the LTP Consultation Document.

[143] The 'approving' recommendations of this report represent:

- a) preferred decision-making options for the three key proposals as consulted.
- b) A new option to reduce expenditure and the total rate impact for years 1 to 3 of the proposed LTP.
- c) Management recommendations on adjustments to the proposed LTP from consideration of community feedback. These recommendations relate to non – key proposals.

[144] Alternative options to the approving recommendations are provided for:

- a) Transport rate – general rate allocation
  - Preferred option as recommended
  - Option B: Council could agree a different general rate percentage either from year one or to be phased in over years 2 and 3 of the LTP.
  - Option C: If neither option A or B is preferred then the status quo, no general rate allocation, would continue
- b) Flood and Drainage rating – allocation across zones
  - Preferred option as recommended
  - Option B: No change to the proposal for Taieri and Tokomairiro schemes. Amend Lower Clutha groupings.

- Option C: Retain the status quo regarding benefit zone allocations and undertake technical reviews of all schemes to define the targeted rate area and benefit zones.
  - Rate target policy
  - c) Rate target policy [max 10% pa]
    - Preferred option as recommended
    - Option B: Retain the 10% limit across the 10 years and note /explain the reason for years 1 and 2 being above that limit.
    - Option C: Set years 1 and 2 at the estimated increase and remaining years at 10%.
- [145] Council has discretion to resolve alternative options presented in the Consultation Document for the three proposals. It also has discretion to amend recommendations and/or introduce new ones.
- [146] The scope of any amendments or new recommendations are to be considered against the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. For example, where the matters included in the consultation document and/or supporting information, is there an affected community that could have reasonably expected to have been consulted about the matter, and how material is the matter [financial, services]?
- [147] Council staff are not recommending any material change to the Consultation Document and supporting information.

## CONSIDERATIONS

### Strategic Framework and Policy Considerations

- [148] The ORC draft 'Strategic Directions' statements developed by Council leading into the LTP process (early 2023) will be refined to align with any associated direction from Council Deliberation.
- [149] The draft LTP contains the Infrastructure Strategy and the Financial Strategy. This Council meeting can potentially direct change to these strategies but within the scope of what has been consulted with the community. For example, introducing material or significant change to the 'as consulted' documents would not be consistent with the Local Government Act and would draw the attention of Council's external auditors.
- [150] Finally, the Council has consulted on changes to its Revenue and Financing Policy. This is covered in the Discussion section. As part of consultation the community could see the impact of the proposed changes alongside the status quo 'no policy change' option.

### Financial Considerations

- [151] At this stage of the process significant changes to financial forecast need to be carefully considered against:
- alignment with and impact on services
  - impact on the Council's ability to fund expenditure (i.e. ongoing service) on a sustainable basis.
  - Strategic Direction and focus areas, including but not limited to the Financial and Infrastructure Strategies.
  - Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.



- [152] Council staff have provided a recommendation that reduces the forecast expenditure as consulted. The impacts of this change, including the reduced rate requirement is covered in the 'Discussion' section.

#### **Significance and Engagement Considerations**

- [153] The Council needs to have regard to its Significance and Engagement Policy which broadly guides Council to be prudent in its decision making. The Local Government Act 2002 has specific provisions on decision-making process with this intent.
- [154] At this stage of the process Council should not introduce significant change to the consulted proposal.

#### **Legislative and Risk Considerations**

- [155] The advice and recommendations provided in this report are part of a broader Council process that Council staff have aligned with Local Government Act 2002 requirements.

#### **Climate Change Considerations**

- [156] This report contains a schedule of staff recommendations relating to submitter requests. Climate Change is one of the issues included in this schedule. This report enables the committee to make recommendations to Council about ORC's Climate Change programme and indeed a range of other service delivery matters.

#### **Communications Considerations**

- [157] For this stage of the LTP Project the Communication Plan focuses on closing out the conversation with our partners, stakeholders, submitters and the regional community.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

- [158] The programmed next steps are:
- Council staff reflect recommendations from this meeting into the draft financial forecasts 2024/25, 2025/26, 2026/27, and years 4 to 10 as required.
  - Council staff will liaise with Deloitte being ORC's external auditor to conclude the LTP audit. A final report is required for the adopted LTP.
  - Council staff to prepare reports for the 26 June 2024 Council meeting enabling adoption of the LTP and approval of a rating resolution.
  - Submitters to the LTP will receive confirmation of the Council's final decisions.
  - Post Council adoption the final Long Term Plan Document will receive an editorial proof, hard copies printed and circulated for Council leadership and for legal deposit.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Submissions to the ORC Long- Term Plan 2024-2034 (summarised and redacted) [6.1.1 - 732 pages]
2. Managers Recommendations - Requests to ORC Must do Work [6.1.2 - 11 pages]
3. Rating Maps [6.1.3 - 4 pages]



Otago  
Regional  
Council

# Draft Long-Term Plan 2024-2034



1 - Mr Dave Bainbridge-Zafar	7	38 - Mr stephen watkins	68
2 - Mrs Sarah Gallagher	8	39 - Ms Janelle Bilcliffe	69
3 - Mr John Varsanyi	10	40 - mr Justinus Yudistira	74
4 - Mr Arron Goodwin	14	41 - Mrs Christine Crothers	76
5 - Mr Test Test	17	42 - Ms Elizabeth Todd	77
6 - Mr John Doe	20	43 - Dariush Khalilifar	78
7 - Richard Dukes	22	44 - Allan Gardyne	79
8 - Mrs J Sleeman	24	45 - Mr Dave Evans	80
9 - mr bob bell	25	46 - Ms Claire Iredale	81
10 - Toni Ackroyd	27	47 - Mrs Sarah Verbiest	82
11 - Mrs Janine Race	28	48 - Mr David Allard	83
12 - Mr Glynn Babington	29	49 - Mr Rob Keith	85
13 - Mr Jim Ledgerwood	31	50 - Mr Ron Temby	86
14 - KC Greenberg	33	51 - Mrs Lynda Walsh-Pasco	87
15 - KC Greenberg	34	52 - Mrs Margaret Henry	90
16 - Mrs Angels Young	35	53 - Mrs Christine Smith	92
17 - Mr Peter Mead	37	54 - Allison Tschirley	94
18 - Mr Ben Nichols	38	55 - Sandy Brown	95
19 - J Blampied	39	56 - Mr Roy Hill	96
20 - mrs judith clark	40	57 - Ms Jan Campbell	97
21 - Deborah Palmer	41	58 - Belinda Horne	98
22 - Mr Edwin ELLIOTT	42	59 - Mr Keith Ladyman	99
23 - Mr Cyrus Lim	46	60 - Simone Handwerk	100
24 - Mr Baoping Du	47	61 - Flush the toilet	102
25 - Logan Clarke	51	62 - Mr Michael Rodriguez	103
26 - Miss Anisha Pragji	52	63 - Peter Dowden	104
27 - Mrs Patricia Doherty	53	64 - Ms Helen Chapman	107
28 - Mr William Bishop	54	65 - Naell Crosby-Roe	111
29 - Helen Weir	57	66 - Mr Duncan Ritchie	113
30 - Mrs Deborah Richards	58	67 - .r BRIAN Kusel	115
31 - Ms Meg O'Connor	59	68 - Dr Malcolm McQueen	116
32 - mr Cody Tucker	60	69 - Dr Jack Williams	118
33 - Mr Emerson Pratt	61	70 - Mr John Dow	120
34 - Mark Bain	62	71 - Mac Robertson	121
35 - Dr Howard Scott	63	72 - John Lister	123
36 - Susan Holt	64	73 - Mr Charlie James	127
37 - Dr John Harris	65	74 - Dr Michel Herde	128

75 - Mrs Allison Rosanowski	131	112 - Mr Lance Good	191
76 - Mrs Victoria Menzies	132	113 - mRS Grace Mathieson	192
77 - Mr David Fynmore	133	114 - Karina Bennett	193
78 - Ms Jo Tilson	135	115 - Troy Bennett	194
79 - miss Petrina Duncan	136	116 - Anonymous Ratepayer	195
80 - Jessica de Heij	137	117 - Mr Murray Gifford	198
81 - Margaret Pollitt	139	118 - Kylie Dallas	201
82 - Mr Alexander Foulkes	142	119 - Mr Francis Van Woerkom	203
83 - Anthea Fisher	146	120 - Mr Mike Cooper	205
84 - Ken Bagnall	147	121 - Mr Harley Bedford	209
85 - Mr Philip Jones	148	122 - Springwater Ag Limited	210
86 - Ms Sarah McCrorie	150	123 - Gillian Newman	211
87 - Belinda Smith	151	124 - Margaret Pollitt	212
88 - Miss Natalie Sharples	153	125 - Miss Lisa Boyd	213
89 - Mr John Borrell	154	126 - Mrs Renee Pearson	216
90 - Ms Ruth Harvey	155	127 - Ms Christina Shaw	218
91 - mr peter cox	158	128 - Dr. Jacqueline Jensen	219
92 - Ms Fiona Abbott	159	129 - Mr Logan Wallace	220
93 - Faye Powell-Moore	160	130 - not giving	222
94 - Monica Stone	164	131 - Mrs Raewyn Golding	225
95 - Malcolm Burgess	165	132 - Mra Loretta Grant	228
96 - Central Wilding Group (CWG)	167	133 - Mrs Susan Broad	230
97 - Mr Neil Marshall	169	134 - Ngaire Weaver	234
98 - Mrs Kay McGrath	170	135 - Remarkables Park	235
99 - Karl Buchanan	171	136 - Laurence Ashworth Brownyn Miles	236
100 - John Broekhoff	172	137 - Harry Andrew	237
101 - Mrs Susan Young	173	138 - Lynn Samuels	239
102 - Ma Tamara Thomas	174	139 - Jenny Burt Geoff Thompson	242
103 - Mr Kevin Phillips	178	140 - John Shanks	243
104 - Mr Robert Hartlebury	179	141 - Terry Drayton	244
105 - Mr Evan Johnston	180	142 - Richard and Jennifer Quelch	245
106 - Mrs Samantha Wadsworth	181	143 - Caroline Davies	246
107 - Chris Bowie	182	144 - National Public Health Service Te Waipounamu	247
108 - Carla Constable	183	145 - Rodger and Helen Grant	249
109 - Nicholas Bollen	186	146 - Julian Mumford	251
110 - Mr Jeremy Crichton	189	147 - Gerrard Eckhoff	253
111 - SRB Building	190		

148 - Sandra Lukeman	255	184 - mr barrie leslie	316
149 - Barbara and Trevor Braid	256	185 - Mr & Mrs DJ & Chris McIntosh	318
150 - Whakatipu Wilding Conifer Control Group Inc (WCG)	257	186 - Mr Gregory Kent	323
151 - Pierre Marasti	259	187 - Ms Sonja Mitchell	327
152 - Jo Ashe Marasti	262	188 - Matthew Sole	332
153 - Otago Peninsula Community Board	265	189 - Sport Clutha	335
154 - Ms Steff Todd	267	190 - Ms Sophie Chen	338
155 - Mr Josef Fodie	268	191 - Mr Chris Saunders	340
156 - Mr Nick Feaver	272	192 - Ms Melissa Rongen	344
157 - mr alexander penny	273	193 - Coastal Communities Cycle Connection	345
158 - Otago Peninsula Community Board	275	194 - Ms Sue Novell	348
159 - Richard Bowman	276	195 - Mrs Loretta Bush	351
160 - Mrs Jody Louw	277	196 - Mr Matt Love	355
161 - Johanna Morris	278	197 - Graeme Anderson	357
162 - Dugald Mactavish	279	198 - Anne Warrington Blair	358
163 - Heritage New Zealand	280	199 - Chardonnay Kyle	359
164 - Mr Mike Hammond	281	200 - George Alexander Hugh Kidd	360
165 - Mr GRANT HOWIE	282	201 - Helen Stead	361
166 - Miss Melanie Heather	286	202 - John Cant	362
167 - Mrs Lyn Wells	288	203 - Lindsay Watt	363
168 - Ms Jacqueline Fraser	289	204 - Sue Broad	364
169 - Mr Iain Lamont	291	205 - Tony Glassford	365
170 - D Cocks	293	206 - Lynne Stewart	366
171 - Dr Leslie Van Gelder	294	207 - Destination Queenstown	368
172 - Mr Parid Basha	296	208 - mr Martin Cameron	370
173 - Central Otago Friendship Network	298	209 - LINZ	371
174 - Mr Ben Cooper	299	210 - Destination Southern Lakes	372
175 - Mr Antonius Limburg	300	211 - Waitaki District Council	374
176 - Mr Ulf Uchida	303	212 - Gilbert and Judy Black	376
177 - Mr Michael Ross	305	213 - Brian Bennett	377
178 - Mr Craig Edmonds	306	214 - Greg and Melinda Stevenson-Wright	378
179 - Dr Bryony Telford	308	215 - Jim McQuillan	379
180 - Mr Peter Howard	309	216 - Otago Southland Rescue Helicopter	380
181 - Mr Trevor Tattersfield	310	217 - Strath Taieri Community Board	381
182 - Michael Farrier	312	218 - Craig and Julie Struthers	383
183 - Michael Farrier	315	219 - Alan Scurr	384



220 - Diana Evans	385	255 - Dr Ian Turnbull	448
221 - Michael Thompson	388	256 - Fiona Turnbull	451
222 - Mr Dave Johnson	389	257 - Mr Colin Goldthorpe	453
223 - Mr Martin Cameron	391	258 - Beatriz Boucinhas	454
224 - Mr Glenn Dawson	393	259 - Mr Blair Howell	455
225 - Mr James Barclay	394	260 - Mr Phillip Bradfield	456
226 - Central Otago Wilding Conifer Control Group	398	261 - Dr William (Nick) Brown	459
227 - Dr Liana Machado	400	262 - Eve Young	460
228 - Andrew Millar	401	263 - Mr Andrtew Penniket	461
229 - mrs Gillian MAcleod	405	264 - Ms Kathryn van Beek	463
230 - Ms Sue Ross	408	265 - ms Diane Yeldon	464
231 - Central Otago Environmental Society	409	266 - Michelle Greenaway	465
232 - Dr Marilyn Duxson	412	267 - Brian Grant	468
233 - Ann Wood	414	268 - Mrs Leanne Shaw	470
234 - Mr Barry Gray	415	269 - Mrs Kirsty Sharpe	472
235 - Mrs Nicole Huddleston	418	270 - Mr Richard Pears	474
236 - Mary Ann Baxter	420	271 - ms Geraldine Tait	475
237 - Ellen Walters	425	272 - ms Geraldine Tait	476
238 - Mrs J Baumgren	427	273 - Ms Charlotte Young	478
239 - Miss Jeanine McKenzie	428	274 - Dr Amir Levy	484
240 - Te Kāhano Aotearoa Trust	429	275 - Mr Brendon Storer	487
241 - Mr Tim Robinson	430	276 - NR Murray	488
242 - Mr Paul Millis	431	277 - Ms Stephanie Brunton	492
243 - Ms Chris Kjelgaard	432	278 - Mr Chris Naylor	493
244 - mrs Catherine Watson	433	279 - Ms Mary Furnari	495
245 - Lesley Anerson	435	280 - Mrs Sue Walker	498
246 - Ms Chris Kjelgaard	436	281 - Mr Dale Anderson	499
247 - Mrs Dianne Trethewey	437	282 - Mrs Barbara Sloan	500
248 - Mrs Dianne Trethewey	438	283 - Mrs Barbara Sloan	501
249 - Mrs Natasha Hopping	439	284 - WAI Wānaka	503
250 - Mrs Jose Cranfield	440	285 - Otago University Students' Association	505
251 - Ms Deborah Robb	441	286 - PHILL HUNT	509
252 - Dr Lynley Hood	443	287 - Mx Maihana Pōtiki-Grayling	513
253 - Mr Tim Walsh	444	288 - Tui Griffiths	514
254 - Mrs Woodhouse	445	289 - Bruce Bissett	516
		290 - Jenn Shulzitski	517

291 - Mr Connor Marshall	520	327 - Mr Steve Moss	593
292 - Mrs Lynelle Barrett	522	328 - Elliot Blyth	595
293 - Mrs Lorraine Davis	525	329 - Cat Prunty	598
294 - Fraser Leslie	526	330 - Tim McMullen	599
295 - Mr Brendon Storer	527	331 - Mr Duncan Davidson	602
296 - Briar Mills	528	332 - Mr Murray Neilson	604
297 - Liz ANGELO on behalf of CITY RISE UP	531	333 - Aukaha (1997) Ltd.	608
298 - Mr Utter Corruption!!	532	334 - Jason Coutts	612
299 - Mrs Karen McAnally	533	335 - Robyn West	616
300 - Gail Unkovich	535	336 - Garth Thomson and Christine Oliver	617
301 - Ms Francesca Bolgar	536	337 - Cath Gilmour	618
302 - Ian Bryant	540	338 - Ad Bekkers	621
303 - Dr Kate Stephens	542	339 - South Otago Forest and Bird	622
304 - Mr Shane Forgie	546	340 - Department of Conservation (DOC)	623
305 - Trevor Hewson	548	341 - Michelle Carruthers	625
306 - Ms Bridie Lonie	551	342 - KJet	626
307 - Miriam Barnett	554	343 - Angela Anderson	627
308 - Mrs Patricia Popperwell	557	344 - Dunedin Area Citizens Association	628
309 - Mr Ian Craven	558	345 - Southern Lakes Sanctuary trust	631
310 - Mr Stephen Popperwell	559	346 - Ratepayers at Upland Street	632
311 - Bonny Gray Thompson	560	347 - Community Networks/ LINK	633
312 - Mr Keiran Medel	563	348 - QEII Trust	634
313 - Mrs Valerie Weir	564	349 - Wise Response Society	635
314 - Gwylfa Moore	565	350 - Lee and Ross Ollerenshaw	636
315 - West Harbour Community Board	566	351 - Jeff Seymour	637
316 - Mr John Heaton	570	352 - Jimmy and Lisa Miles Pam Bain	638
317 - Mr Murray Neilson	571	353 - Te Kākano Aotearoa Trust	639
318 - Ian Bryant	572	354 - Taieri Trails Trust	640
319 - Mr Don McKinnon	573	355 - Kā Papatipu Rūnaka	641
320 - Southern Lakes Swim Club	576	356 - Colin Scurr	642
321 - Craig McGeady	578	357 - Kendal Gouman	644
322 - John Parker	579	358 - Trevor and Susan Gouman	645
323 - Mr Paul Meehan	581	359 - Dream South D	646
324 - Ms Chloe Humphreys	584	360 - Brett and Angela Anderson	647
325 - Dunedin Tracks Network Trust	587	361 - Jennie Doak	648
326 - Mr Terry Wilson	588	362 - CSS Disability Action	649
		363 - Simon and Emma Parks	651

364 - Jason and Lisa Breen	652	399 - rowmata	701
365 - Belinda Glass	653	400 - John Rowley	703
366 - QLDC Climate and Biodiversity Reference Group	654	401 - George Redditt	706
367 - Craig and Julie Struthers	657	402 - Elizabeth Herrick	710
368 - Kay Gard	658	403 - Daphne and Jim Ledgerwood	713
369 - Kim and Matt Morgan	659	404 - Dunedin City Council	717
370 - Trish and Steve Robins	662	405 - Business South	720
371 - Yvonne Craig	663	406 - Andrina and Shayne King	721
372 - Upper Lakes Conservation Alliance working group	664	407 - Roger Chittock	722
373 - Otago Federated Farmers	665	408 - Queenstown District Council	726
374 - Marie Calver	667	409 - Wanaka Upper Clutha Community Board	730
375 - Cody and Rosie Cowley	668	Footer	731
376 - David Wilson	669		
377 - Allan Kirkland	670		
378 - Save our Trains	671		
379 - Disabled Persons Assembly	672		
380 - Gerald and Karen Holmes	674		
381 - Manuharekia Catchment Group	675		
382 - Rosa Anderson-Jones	676		
383 - Alex King	677		
384 - Brian Dixon	681		
385 - Mosgiel Taieri Community Board	683		
386 - Murray Grimwood	684		
387 - Dunedin Tunnel Trail Trust	687		
388 - Rodger and Delwyn Burrow	688		
389 - Ian Bryant	689		
390 - Lightfoot Initiative Charitable Trust	690		
391 - Dunedin Tracks and Trails	692		
392 - Laureen and Sid Bennett	693		
393 - Waikouaiti Coast Community Board	694		
394 - CITY RISE UP	696		
395 - Margaret and Terry Pollitt	697		
396 - Predator Free Dunedin	698		
397 - Steve Hill	699		
398 - Upper Clutha Wilding Tree Group	700		



**Respondent: Mr Dave Bainbridge-Zafar**

**Submission Number: 1**

**Submission Date: 29/03/24 23:34**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Public Transport should be free! For everyone, all the time. All the buses should be totally free to use. A higher rates increase, more investment, it would support so many of the other strategic aims of ORC, and would benefit all the people of Otago in so many ways.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**Any other feedback?**

It should be higher! Buses should be free for everyone all the time, and a higher rates charge should therefore be levied. The benefits of free public transport would be felt by everyone across the region, not just those who ride the bus.

**Respondent: Mrs Sarah Gallagher****Submission Number: 2****Submission Date:** 31/03/24 22:14**Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 3****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 6****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support the increase in investment in public transport options in Dunedin and other areas in Otago. I support electrifying the bus network. I support making buses free for all, or at a minimum for all under 25s, community card, student card or gold card holders. Investment in public transport will positively impact: health benefits, environmental benefits, will mean less cars on the street so less impact on roads, less pressure on parking so better for those with mobility issues who need to use a are, less traffic so better safety, faster buses due to less congestion, social benefits, economic benefits.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support the increase in investment in public transport options in Queenstown and other areas in Otago. I support electrifying the bus network. I support making buses free for all, or at a minimum for all under 25s, community card, student card or gold card holders. Investment in public transport will positively impact: health benefits, environmental benefits, will mean less cars on the street so less impact on roads, less pressure on parking so better for those with mobility issues who need to use a are, less traffic so better safety, faster buses due to less congestion, social benefits, economic benefits.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

I support biodiversity initiatives in consultation with mana whenua, communities and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to ensure that appropriate species are planted in areas of need and that these plantings won't adversely affect cultural landscapes or archaeology per the HNZPTA 2014 particularly in riparian and coastal areas. I support the regeneration of wetlands, and programmes to mitigate nitrate leaching into our ground and waterways.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

Support dairy farms and other large industry to be incentivised (low interest / no interest loans?) to move to solar to generate own power and off set emissions.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

Support all public transport recommendations particularly if they are electric. Additionally support electric bus services between Dunedin airport and Central Dunedin, and University.

**Respondent: Mr John Varsanyi**

**Submission Number: 3**

**Submission Date: 02/04/24 02:34**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Cost of Living and the lack of value from ORC rates. I use none of ORC's services. Virtually everyone I know do not use your services. Most of your services are done to benefit the minority, paid by the many. All non-core ORC services should be on user pays basis.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Less or zero ORC burdens on our lives. Let those responsible for legal mis-deeds eg pollution, wilding pines etc, pay for their faults, not every ORC ratepayer. ORC costs should be borne by users of their services.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

No increase. Cull all loss making bus runs (most are near empty) during off peak. Transition to user pays, not the current everyone pays.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

zero extra ORC funding- let the users pay

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**

Targeted to a rate payer means the users pays, not the ratepayer pays. If you put this option down, that would be the clear winner from ratepayers. I dislike paying for any bus I do not use, let alone the majority which are near empty during off peak.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

The land/home owners who benefit from the flood protection. They should pay as their RV show the benefit. Why should I pay for their improvement in RV- they bought their property with water risk in mind. It is wrong that I have to pay for the Water of Leith flood protection when I live 10 kms away on a hill. Would a Water of the Leith boundary property share their profits on sale with the ratepayers who paid for their flood protection? pari passu

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Let users and those who benefit from the scheme pay for them. It is their properties that will be affected.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Let land owners pay, if they want it. Let the landowners VOTE for each cost that you want them to pay for.

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Beneficiaries should pay, if they want it.

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

If someone pollutes they pay if caught, not ratepayers. I am happy with the level of nature around us and wish no increase and prefer the ORC not get involved with DoC's remit.

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Let the users of navigation pay. I do not have a boat/yacht/windsurfer.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

No funding for this project. Let those who break the law pay (if any).

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

The ORC has lost its way and embarked on providing services outside the core functions of a regional council. Nice to have and getting ratepayers to fund pet projects is not right (it shows in ratepayer satisfaction if you bother to ask). Users should pay for things they use, not because you can make them via asset foreclosure threats.

Every item/project/scheme/proposal/asset which increases the ORC's cash outflow/budget greater than 1% in nominal terms in a given year, should be subject to referendum of the ratepayers before progressing. Further, all existing non-core services should be subject to referendum to establish the support levels. Let us give democracy a real chance, not the special interests.

---

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 14****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Perpetual debt increases along with continuous rates increases for services I do not use. What more can I say. I could only wish for a binding referendum on each non-core item which is not required by law for the ORC to provide. The ratepayers whom are forced to pay for things they do not want/use are definitely not happy. Let them vote on each item that increases assets by 1% or expenditure increase of 1%.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Looking at my rates bill which has more than doubled in the last 10 years, I could only wish for a binding referendum on each non-core item which is not required by law for the ORC to provide. The ratepayers whom are forced to pay for things they do not want/use are definitely not happy. Let them vote on each item that increases assets by 1% or expenditure increase of 1%, then you will know whether the ORC serves the ratepayer or not.

**Respondent: Mr Arron Goodwin**

**Submission Number: 4**

**Submission Date: 02/04/24 21:56**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Does your focus area include building a palace for your staff on Broadway/High St Dunedin? Everyone that I have spoken to is angry about this extreme waste of money.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We have enough empty buses driving around Dunedin. The current level is wasteful

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

The current level is sufficient



### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 11

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

#### Any other feedback?

Expand the targeted area, but reduce services where under-utilised. Consider smaller vehicles for off-peak times.  
No investment in wasteful electric buses

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* No

#### What period should deficits be repaid over?

\* 10 years

#### Please comment

The rates burden is unbearable for many (local and regional council). Pay this back over a longer time, people are desperate and you are making the region unaffordable. Try to introduce some fiscal responsibility

#### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

Cut back on under-utilised services.

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 12

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

#### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

\* Yes

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

\* No

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

You do not need any Climate Change Action plans. Stop wasting our money on this frivolous nonsense

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

We do not need any more investment in public transport. If people want to travel out of Balclutha to the airport they can drive like everybody else. If you are to introduce longer route bus services they must provide a payback. Transport by private car needs to be supported, not demonised.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

How about engaging with ratepayers before throwing away money building a palace in the Dunedin CBD? You want to engage with everybody but the ratepayer is marginalised and treated as an ATM.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

You have no fiscal discipline. You are empire building and waste is a way of life for you, with no consequences as you can just coerce the ratepayer into funding increases several times the rate of inflation year on year. You need financial managers that will go through your opex line by line and cut out the waste. I could guarantee that you could cut your operating budget by 50% with no discernable difference in output.

## Respondent: Mr Test Test

Submission Number: 5

Submission Date: 02/04/24 22:27

### About You

Comment Number: 9

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 15

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 11

Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

S

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 12

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

S

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 4

Do you support this proposal?

\* No

What level of total funding should be available?

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 3

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

**Please comment**

Status quo

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Status quo

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Support 100% targeted

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Expected consideration of options in addition to current networks/services partic when looking out  
pacts

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Ideally should to look further than 10 years

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Service risk and debt not adequately considered

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

T

**Respondent: Mr John Doe****Submission Number: 6****Submission Date: 02/04/24 23:42****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 6****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I'm tired of paying rates / levies and fees to subsidise bus users. As I watch massive buses travel around with 3-5 passengers (except peak times) you have to think surely there's an innovative / better way to provide public transport in a small city like Dunedin... It needs to go back to more of a user pays system. Massively heavy electric buses are going to further destroy or aging road network and this hasn't been properly considered. Everyone is tired of never ending roadworks in Dunedin and electric buses are only going to make this worse.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 5****Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 3****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**~Transport****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

shift from cars to public transport. It's a made up dream that doesn't exist constantly being pushed upon us by councils and green groups. You need to plan for the reality that exists, there will be more cars not less & heavy EV's... The Swedish future where we all ride bikes 15km to work in the freezing cold and rain is not coming.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

It seems totally unfair that both the DCC and ORC can just do whatever they want to rates with no real rules or restrictions placed on them. Every other business has to live within their means / make cuts the ORC just whacks rates up, year after year. We need some legislation to limit what rates can be increased by annually.

**Respondent: Richard Dukes****Submission Number: 7****Submission Date: 03/04/24 03:27****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 4****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support any initiative anywhere (across Otago, NZ etc) to get cars off the road, make it safer to walk, bike (I have 2 kids biking to school in Oamaru and it can be a bit nerve wracking as so busy on roads incl large trucks). Seems crazy when they are doing the 'right' thing for their health, climate change = their future! Also good for people without a vehicle (for various reasons) to have options.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 6****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

More targeted rates, within reason, sounds reasonable. User pays is usually fair, again within reason.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 7**



**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

simplification and transparency always good!

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

as earlier, simplification is always good, ? more efficient.

But I would be concerned if this important work got lost in the various other biosecurity issues!

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

water, water quality for all, climate change, resilience, long term planning over short termism should be the focus, and leading the way / doing what is right rather than succumbing to noisy pressure groups / lobbying / short term financial gain.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Charge more if you have to. I know some people do not have much resources and others have considerable! (how many have multiple properties in Otago?! perhaps we could be charged additional?) We have seen recently what happens when councils, govts do postpone, procrastinate with some of the important issues / resources you are in charge of. Get the money and lead for the long term future, for our children.

**Respondent: Mrs J Sleeman**

**Submission Number: 8**

---

**Submission Date: 03/04/24 03:48**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I dont see why Dunedin rate payers should pay for a tourist resort for a multi million dollar resort mist of us dont visit . Invest money in proper public transport for Dunedin people who work not timetables for pensioners I would love to use the buses but find they are in adequate for those that work weekends portchalmers bus timetable is geared to baby boomers school children and cruise ship customers not working people

**Respondent: mr bob bell****Submission Number: 9****Submission Date: 03/04/24 09:09****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 4****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Times are tight and i would be funding a service that i do not use and cannot effort to pay for. this should be user pays and is again an additional cost that does not need be added right this second!!!!

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 3****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

again this is an additional cost that is not needing to be paid back as fast as 5 years. this puts additional financial pressure on households who do not need this at the moment

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 2****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

This is not a needed priority. this should be user pays, charge a ramp fee for use of public launch ramps instead of making me (someone who most likely will never use a boat) pay for what is either a hobby (recreational) (or commercial) which have the coast guard if not needed. this is not the time to add additional costs to ratepayers who for the most part are struggling themselves. user pays!!!!!!

**~Transport****Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

Now is not the time for costly trials that ratepayers pick up the tab for. Either user pays or leave it until better times

**Respondent: Toni Ackroyd**

**Submission Number: 10**

**Submission Date: 03/04/24 18:45**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I checked my rates estimate and this would be a \$128+ increase to our rates just on this whakatipu transport alone. Who is getting the use of this? Tourists. Not the rate payers. Figure out a way to get the governments tourism fund to cover these costs. ORC residents can't afford these increases to services they don't even use. What you have is fine. Your preferred estimate is an overall increase of \$200+ a year to our ORC rates. That is almost double from 23-24 rate year which is honestly extortionate. We are forced to pay these rates for your own bad decisions. The current cost of living crisis is hard enough. People on superannuation have a limited income, how are they expected to keep up with these increases. I do not support your changes and in the current economic state highly advise a pause on all the unnecessary increases. Disgusting greed by ORC and QLDC

**Respondent: Mrs Janine Race**

**Submission Number: 11**

**Submission Date: 03/04/24 22:43**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I wish to ask ORC to consider expanding public transport to allow approved people to take their dog on the bus. This could be available outside peak hours and incur an agreed charge. I suggest that owners and dogs could be appropriately vetted if necessary and an annual fee paid.

Any poor behaviour could mean that the permit to travel be revoked.

My reason for this is that I live on the hill and if I walk down with my small Shihtsu/Bichon, neither of us are capable of walking back uphill. This means I either take my car on to the flat to walk or contact home for a return ride. This means creating emissions from the car.

We are known as the Edinburgh of the south, and the real Scots city allows dogs freely in a multitude of places, including on all modes of transport. We should be able to do the same.

## Respondent: Mr Glynn Babington

Submission Number: 12

Submission Date: 03/04/24 22:50

### About You

Comment Number: 4

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 6

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

You need to offer flexible payment options like the DCC does, e.g. I pay my DCC rates with each pay cycle making it more manageable!



**Respondent: Mr Jim Ledgerwood**

**Submission Number: 13**

**Submission Date: 03/04/24 23:44**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I live in Wanaka. No service. Trial was a miserable failure FINDING THIS SURVEY VERY HARD TO MANAGE ITS ALMOST AS THOUGH YOU DO NOT WANT MY COMMENTS !

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Very confused now.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Please stop all this spending , for the next year or two anyway. ORC used to be a dozen people , and we paid as part of our QLDC rates. Now over 200 and most on high salaries with fancy titles. and rates of many thousands We have more rabbits than we ever had, and ORC MONITOR THE SITUATION!! We are charged heavy fees , for items that you never even perform. I will be interested to hear where you are making the New Government required reductions

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I'm going to have to attend your meeting

**Respondent: KC Greenberg**

**Submission Number: 14**

---

**Submission Date: 03/04/24 23:55**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Any other feedback?**

This form is really confusing and difficult to use. All I want to say is that the proposed increase to public transport fares (especially for teenagers) is rubbish. My teens can't get CSCs of their own-- only me. The increase in fares makes it more economical (except in terms of my time) for me to drive three teens to school than for them to bus. In long terms, this is a detriment to the environment and also to the roads. Policy-wise, the fare hike makes me HATE everyone who was involved with it. It is also a bad look if you're trying to "be green" and encourage people onto busses. Figure out another way to realise ORC/DCC goals, but keep bus fares what they are now. I'd also encourage you to increase the user-friendliness of this form. I'm reasonably well-educated and tech-adroit and this form makes me want to throw my computer out the window. Can't be bothered to try to give feedback on anything else because of it.

**Respondent: KC Greenberg****Submission Number: 15****Submission Date: 03/04/24 23:57****!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 2****Any other feedback?**

This form is really confusing and difficult to use. All I want to say is that the proposed increase to public transport fares (especially for teenagers) is rubbish. My teens can't get CSCs of their own-- only me. The increase in fares makes it more economical (except in terms of my time) for me to drive three teens to school than for them to bus. In long terms, this is a detriment to the environment and also to the roads. Policy-wise, the fare hike makes me HATE everyone who was involved with it. It is also a bad look if you're trying to "be green" and encourage people onto busses. Figure out another way to realise ORC/DCC goals, but keep bus fares what they are now. I'd also encourage you to increase the user-friendliness of this form. I'm reasonably well-educated and tech-adroit and this form makes me want to throw my computer out the window. Can't be bothered to try to give feedback on anything else because of it.

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**

Quit pretending the "environment" and "climate change" actions are must-dos-- if they were "must-dos", you'd be doing everything you could to keep people using public transport, not raising fares (even for young people). Put your money where your mouth is, bc making it less-desirable to use the bus and then saying you're committed to climate change and the environment is just lip service and it's gross.

## Respondent: Mrs Angels Young

Submission Number: 16

Submission Date: 04/04/24 06:10

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 3

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

There is no public transport in outram!!!!!!

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Dunedin residents should not be paying for central otago busses. Not ok for us to pay

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I live in outram with zero public transport. I am not interested in paying for electric busses

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Here's an idea - work within your budgets, don't over spend and stop wasting money on things that are not needed eg your new building

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 2

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

I live in outtram and what am I paying for for flood protection??? I see no maintenance and minimal work done on one portion of the bank near the town. They say this river bank is going to fail yet you do nothing. You cannot charge extra for something you do not provide.... provide the maintenance now we pay the most on the taieri and you waste the funds

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Why should the taieri pay for the leith??????

**Respondent: Mr Peter Mead**

**Submission Number: 17**

---

**Submission Date: 04/04/24 22:16**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I fully support the investigation and trialing of public transport for regional Otago particularly the Alexandra -Cromwell to Queenstown route. In days past Central Otago/Lakes districts frequently, in future planning discussions was quaintly referred to as the 'hinterland'. It can no longer be disdainly regarded as not requiring the level of attention historically accorded coast/near inland Otago. It now needs equal attention.

**Respondent: Mr Ben Nichols**

**Submission Number: 18**

---

**Submission Date: 05/04/24 02:08**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

You are the challenge. You embracing racist separatism and the climate religion and expecting us to pay for that is the problem. Your never ending growth just for the purpose of growth is the problem. You are a cancer.



**Respondent: J Blampied**

**Submission Number: 19**

**Submission Date: 05/04/24 06:05**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Privatise the bus service 100% and focus on infrastructure

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Not required

**Respondent: mrs judith clark**

**Submission Number: 20**

---

**Submission Date: 06/04/24 00:10**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I live in Alexandra get no public transport and find it hard to justify what we get  
you are ripping everyone off we are paying for a big fancy building and higher administration  
I cant see were you look after the environment at all pine control here is a mess  
long term plan would be speaking and writing in english  
and cutting costs as the average new zealander cant live now your rates

**Respondent: Deborah Palmer**

**Submission Number: 21**

**Submission Date: 06/04/24 01:08**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

The busses we have are modern and fit for purpose. There is no need to replace them with electric bases until they are old and need replaced. This is a waste of money. You need to first work on making the service reliable. The service needs to be reliable. I have tried commuting by bus to Queenstown from Lake Hayes Estate. It's not always reliable. Coming back in the evening is even less reliable as traffic on Frankton Road holds the busses up. So I prefer to cycle on the brilliant cycle ways in summer and I just don't commute in Winter. So all the authorities responsible for the roading infrastructure need to work together to replan how to make the network usable. I know plans are in place but I don't see them as solving things long term.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I can't see any point in paying more for a system that isn't efficient. Show us a system that will work first

**Respondent: Mr Edwin ELLIOTT**

**Submission Number: 22**

**Submission Date: 07/04/24 02:44**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The ORC are negligent in putting the Long Term Plan thru and not waiting on the New Government policy. This is again wasting rate payers money. The orc rates increases are outrageous and not affordable and taking a toll on our us. The excessive spending on a new palace building for Orc in Dunedin is an utter waste of our money and only for the glory of certain Dunedin orc board members and the ceowho is doing an appalling job!

sack the ceo and those Dunedin socialist board members now. Orc is totally dysfunctional

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I have made two or three pollution reports re horn creek I. Queenstown and on all occasions there was no proper follow up re qlde and the gentleman whom followed up was rude and deriding to me. We don,t trust orc on environmental matters and it just shows wastes our money on bloodie buses and a new palace for its board in Dunedin.

new government should bring a a commissioner

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

In Queenstown this is wasting our rates. We don,t use buses and never will. This this an outrageous wastes of our money

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Wastes our money. We can't afford it and won't use buses at all. Also clogs our roads when trying to run a business

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

We have suffered enough from orc outrageous rates

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

We don't want bus transport at all in Queenstown

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have any feedback**

Orc negligent in not waiting on new govt policy. Wasting our money  
bring in a commissioner, dysfunctional

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Rate payers have no money left and therefore no resilience. Ignoring new govt policy is illegal.  
lets us gather our breathes instead of bull rushing ratepayers,  
stop the Dunedin orc palace building being built. It is affecting climate and our mental healthcare

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

Get rid of buses in Queenstown. We don,t

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

Orc does not work close with communities at all.

it's a bunch of Dunedin board members on their own socialist agenda.

New govt should get a commissioner in to recover outrageous rates by orc that are wasted on a totally dysfunctional

**Respondent: Mr Cyrus Lim**

**Submission Number: 23**

---

**Submission Date: 07/04/24 10:49**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Can't see any benefit to rest of the district when supporting Dunedin and Queenstown, however adding burden to the already not flourishing town other than Dunedin and Queenstown and it's people is just no right. Shame on whoever thought of this proposal.

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No



**Respondent: Mr Baoping Du**

**Submission Number: 24**

**Submission Date: 07/04/24 22:38**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

you are wrong with the directions. you are serving to the peoples, your job is solve the poeple's biggest concern. The biggest challenges with ogoing increase of living expense and higher tax, you should priotise the cost&saving within the Otago Council.

The biggest opportunity is ustilise the nature resource including Oil, tourist etc to resort the economy first. Technology is feak opportunity over last decades, people are getting poorer with technology improve, I'm not balme the technology, i am saying your council never sucessfully uusing it.

Overall, solving the current problem first, start from cutting you cost first, and if you can't then you should go

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Non of these are helping people at Otago region.

Your focus should be increase the efficiency and ability of working within your Council.

Climate - that's fake assumption, it's not a prove problem, and statisitically human activity provide zero effect to the climate.

i won't list one by one, but please remember, we are watching on you, do your real job.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

no need

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

no need

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

no need

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

you should do full assessment of covid measures and using of those borrowed money. how should we prevent this happens again, and you should need get people's approval before borrowing money. do your internal cost&saving to fill this gap

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

no need

---

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

keep as it is

---

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have any feedback**

there is no future if you are keep spending money to those 'frivolous affairs', and keep people poor.  
do your real job first.

---

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

don't change anything, you didn't prove you have the ability of solving problem

---

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

climate change is not a proven problem, do your real job first

---

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback**

no need

**-Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

this is not something you should ask for, this should keep same.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

how come it's higher each year, you need improve your work and planing well to improve your reaction protocol

**Respondent: Logan Clarke**

**Submission Number: 25**

**Submission Date: 07/04/24 22:58**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Investing in a more frequent service adds more options and flexibility, and it would be useful for travelling within Dunedin in the evenings or during the day.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Trial Bus Services are very relevant to the needs of the expanding Dunedin-Mosgiel urban area and connecting the airport frequently will enable far more reliable service for passengers without using private operators.

**Respondent: Miss Anisha Pragji**

**Submission Number: 26**

**Submission Date: 07/04/24 23:33**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support the airport bus servicing passengers to/from Dunedin airport. As a student at the University of Otago, I have found that the only way of transport to/from home is via shuttle which gets quite expensive over time (~\$60 round trip). Having a direct service to the Dunedin Central Bus Hub would be great for cutting down travel time and increase the number of passengers using Dunedin busses, as the shuttles often take detours to drop other passengers off. Using purpose fit busses to allow for luggage and potentially integrating the Bee card for paying fares would be a great way to encourage people to use the bus with little cost. Although there may be less people using the shuttle, it still gives options for people who live outside the reach of public transport an option to get home. A direct bus service would be great for students as most residential colleges and student housing is very close to Dunedin public transport routes.

**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Doherty**

**Submission Number: 27**

**Submission Date: 08/04/24 00:34**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

As Lake Hawea rate payer we get stung enough for Queenstown if Queenstown wants all the chaos let them pay for it themselves do not put anything on my OCR rates fot that area i am not prepared to pay for anything my area doesn't benifit from.

## Respondent: Mr William Bishop

Submission Number: 28

Submission Date: 08/04/24 01:23

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

#### Please comment

Bus services should be self funding and user pays and should not be a service subsidised by not-users.

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* No

#### What period should deficits be repaid over?

\* 10 years

#### Please comment

The fact that Council chose to borrow to run an uneconomical service shows that Council lacks the expertise to run a public transport system.

#### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

Make all public transport user pays without any ratepayer subsidies.

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* No

#### Please comment on flood protection scheme rates



Should be restricted to affected properties only without any cross-subsidisation.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

No cross-subsidisation. Fees should be based on directly affected properties only.

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 6

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

This is just another pathetic attempt to apply fees to unaffected properties. No council funding should be charged to unaffected properties.

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 4

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

This rate should be funded by charges on mooring owners and boat owners - not on all ratepayers, the majority of whom will never use the navigational aids funded by this scheme.

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

All pest species should be controlled and funded by affected landowners, not a cross-subsidisation by charging all property owners.

#### ~Environment

Comment Number: 3

**Do you have any feedback**

All environmental expenses should be funded by directly affected property owners, not the general community.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback**

All transport levies and subsidies should be discontinued immediately and the public transport system returned to a user pays system. It is the height of stupidity to be running empty buses around the city, as is frequently seen, especially the Otago Peninsular service which must rate amongst the most uneconomic services in the country.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Charges should be restricted to only affected properties without subsidisation from unaffected properties.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Council needs to do what every other member of our country has to do - Live within your means. This could be done by reducing waste, operating more efficiently and not wasting money as is apparent when examining Councils proposed new headquarters.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Rate increases should be restricted to inflationary increases only, and if this means that services, and more particularly staffing, needs to be reduced, then that is what every other business in this country has to do.

**Respondent: Helen Weir**

**Submission Number: 29**

---

**Submission Date: 08/04/24 04:33**

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Strongly disagree with ratepayers outside of Queenstown fundibg the Queenstown public transport system Costs should be borne by those using the service including a levy on tourists

**Respondent: Mrs Deborah Richards**

**Submission Number: 30**

---

**Submission Date: 08/04/24 05:28**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

It is ridiculous that people in Wanaka, Hawea and Albert Town would be subsidising transport for Queenstown. Why should these towns , which have no public transport subsidies tourists and businesses in Queenstown. Charge the people of Queenstown more or introduce a higher fee for non residents.

**Respondent: Ms Meg O'Connor**

**Submission Number:** 31

**Submission Date:** 08/04/24 07:33

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Love this! Investing in public transport is a great idea for both the public and the environment

**Respondent: mr Cody Tucker**

**Submission Number: 32**

---

**Submission Date: 08/04/24 08:41**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

Seeing that not only is there no plans to introduce the promised buses in the Upper Clutha but to actually have the audacity to make us pay for Queenstown's buses is adding insult to injury. The district wide theory is a grossly negligent approach to further take from surrounding communities to privilege metro centres. These centres like Queenstown and Dunedin already benefit from higher levels of service and political visibility, you cannot create this charge while continuing to deliver nothing for our communities. We already suffer the consequences of local and central governments centralising resource and justifying collective spend on city centres, please stop considering everyone in the district as the same for the convenience. It is hurting.

**Respondent: Mr Emerson Pratt**

**Submission Number: 33**

**Submission Date: 08/04/24 11:22**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I find it hard to support an increase to public transport when my current bus stop is 3.2km walk away (Living in East Taieri. Options are either to walk along SH1 with no footpath (1.5 km to bus stop) or 3.2km via footpaths). I would be more willing to see a proposal that saw increase in service frequency as well as bus routes that better serve rate payers. We are literally looking at moving to a location that is better served by public transport.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Increasing rates by 15% plus year on year is unsustainable for many of our community. Very few can expect income increases of this magnitude which essentially means that rate payers will be financially worse off because of this plan. For some this is annoying, for others this will cause real financial hardship, especially as they see cost increase for other essentials.

**Respondent: Mark Bain****Submission Number: 34****Submission Date: 08/04/24 22:05****About You****Comment Number: 3****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Why do we keep pumping more & more money into public transport when this is clearly not being well supported in the QT Lakes Area. Despite numerous people telling both OLDC & ORC why they would rather use there cars, they continue to think throwing more money at this will get people to start using this service. I think it speaks volumes when a local ORC councilor makes a comment that she is on a majority empty bus over a busy weekend period & can't understand why people aren't using public transport (listen to your customers...your rate payers) , Money would be better spent investing in another bridge over the Shotover river to eliminate the single lane gridlock congestion that this causes. Dedicated bus lanes & more buses all still have to go over this same single Lane bridge.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Regarding repayments of money borrowed for public transport over the Covid period, why did the ORC & OLDC continue running empty buses over this period. Despite these clearly not being supported, or being able to be used, there didn't seem to be any consideration to suspending or downsizing services over this period (restaurants didn't continue to open, when no one could go to them). As a result, we as rate payers are now faced with the burden of having to wear the cost to pay this cost back.



**Respondent: Dr Howard Scott**

**Submission Number: 35**

---

**Submission Date: 09/04/24 03:29**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I would like to see small 15 seater buses on routes that can be flagged down anywhere on route. No bus stop required. Once full (15) they do not take more passengers

**Respondent: Susan Holt**

**Submission Number:** 36

---

**Submission Date:** 09/04/24 08:04

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Climate change is a real worry. If we don't do work now things will be more expensive in the long run.  
Only invest in relationships time wise that will make a difference to the environment.

**Respondent: Dr John Harris**

**Submission Number: 37**

**Submission Date: 09/04/24 12:34**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

**copling with climate change**

**public ttansport**

**cycle ways**

**sustainable tourism**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

**Agree these are critically important.**

Conservation of native vegetation, water quality

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Access to Dunstan Hospital Public transport to major. Shopping areas

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Rates to target areas of need. E.g. Manuherikia river

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Improve water.m

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 16**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Aim to minimize carbon enissions particularly methane, Non-ideological dialogue wth farmers,**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 9**

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

Reduce costs of resource applications eg allow standard rules without detailed individual compliance requirements

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

A

**Respondent: Mr stephen watkins**

**Submission Number:** 38

---

**Submission Date:** 09/04/24 19:38

<b>About You</b>	<b>Comment Number: 1</b>
------------------	--------------------------

**Respondent: Ms Janelle Bilcliffe****Submission Number: 39****Submission Date: 09/04/24 21:01****About You****Comment Number: 1****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 5****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 18****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Rate increases of this amount are unacceptable. Debt levels 150% of rates income is not a good business model and not sustainable. The debt being incurred is on rate payer assets, and is payable by the ratepayer not Council.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Crown partnerships are fine but stick to your knitting and just manage your finances and what can be done within existing budgets. You cannot mitigate climate issues, manage the areas being developed properly and do not support those areas where nature will take its natural course.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 17****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 19**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I do not support electric buses. It is not a good long term sustainable option given the power shortages, increased costs and no proof the batteries will last long term. Increased levels of service should be billed to the area entirely, Waitaki has no public transport at all and should not be paying for Queenstown and Dunedin's infrastructure and additional services. No need for additional services.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 15****Tell us what you think**

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**

Waitaki has no public transport so should not be contributing at all.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 13****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

ORC should not have incurred the debt, should have reduced the service level and staff rather than borrowing to keep it running. Unacceptably poor financial management. Given Waitaki have no public transport the area should not be paying for it at all.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 7****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

Flood protection should apply only to the area which is affected, no one else should be paying for this. user pays model.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Drainage schemes should apply only to the area which is affected, no one else should be paying for this. user pays model.



**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

should apply only to the area which is affected, no one else should be paying for this. user pays model.

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

user pays

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Waitaki has a small port and should be paying for Dunedin commercial port costs

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Wilding pine removal should be managed by DOC or land owners

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

User pays is a better model and it is unacceptable for Waitaki to be funding debt incurred in Queenstown and Dunedin transport debt or infrastructure upgrades.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback**

Climate change should be about managing growth into areas which are at risk of erosion or weather events and limiting it to that. managing existing infrastructure and managing long term what will be repaired after events and what will not.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

Compliance and water testing and management of run off will be key to good waterways

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

Regional diversity strategy is just a waste of money. Stick to your knitting.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Rural areas have no ability for public transport, and should not be paying for others cycleways or public transport

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

Costs far too much to consult with iwi separately. That consultation should be under general and not specific

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Ignorant and poor financial management. incurring increasing debt is unacceptable and must be the over reaching plan.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

debt must not be seen as an income stream, it should be the exception not the norm. If you cannot fund what needs to be done from current rate take then reduce levels of service until you can. Austerity is required! We do not incur debt to pay our daily bills, nor do we expect councils to

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Unacceptable given current inflation and the financial situation of people.

## Respondent: mr Justinus Yudistira

Submission Number: 40

Submission Date: 09/04/24 23:11

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 6

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

\* Yes

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

\* Yes

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 3

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you have any feedback

Make an agreement with ECan for a competitive bus service connecting Dunedin to Christchurch

Investigate the use of heavy rail in these routes

Open an Oamaru-Dunedin bus service, or as an extension of the Parlmeston service

move the bus routes heading to the university to frequent

Create a bus route to Dunedin Airport every half an hour

### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 11

#### Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?

A special levy can also be considered to rate factories and those who create waste and pollution. Create a 2c petrol tax for dunedin to fund public transport measures subject to a referendum. Intensify housing in the middle of the city and charge a development rate.

#### Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?

Create a more progressive rating system where large homeowners proportionally pay more rates

**Respondent: Mrs Christine Crothers**

**Submission Number: 41**

---

**Submission Date: 10/04/24 00:16**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I am hugely disappointed in some decisions made by our previous mayor and city councillors. The coloured dots just being the tip of the ice berg! Now I find that we are to be constantly impoverished by the vast increases in Regional council rates and city rates. The rated rebate hardly makes up for that! and with the small increase in the pension each year it is exceedingly difficult to find that extra money especially when you live on your own

**Respondent: Ms Elizabeth Todd**

**Submission Number: 42**

**Submission Date:** 10/04/24 05:55

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

we dont want the same level of service we have now! its never on time takes forever and not frequent enough! we need better convient timely services! we need better weekend and after hours services staff meetings are often after 7pm also noted that an Oamaru service is being looked at is this dunedin to Oamaru? ORC need to be audited for how they are managing the bus service its so terrible! popular routes? - needs to be all areas!

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

stop adding stuff we dont need! and then asking rate payers to pay for it this is ridiculous!

**Respondent: Dariush Khalilifar**

**Submission Number: 43**

---

**Submission Date: 10/04/24 06:19**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

no



**Respondent: Allan Gardyne**

**Submission Number: 44**

---

**Submission Date:** 10/04/24 21:52

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I understand that you want to achieve a lot, but please slow down. Your "preferred option" is to increase our rates by 32%. Try to imagine what an increase of that percentage means to someone who retired years ago.

**Respondent: Mr Dave Evans****Submission Number: 45****Submission Date: 10/04/24 23:20****About You****Comment Number: 2****!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

By no change I mean no change for areas outside Queenstown. There is simply no justification for rating areas outside of Queenstown to subsidise their cheaper P.T. Your argument that Queenstown's P.T. Has benefits for all is spurious, misleading and dishonest at best. You miss a significant user of Queenstown's P.T.....visitors. For so many years all ratepayers are subsidising a tourism industry which simply does not pay its way. National Government takes huge taxes from Tourists (gst etc) but proportionally does not give back to the region for infrastructure and things like P.T. Of course for ORC extra rate demands are the easy way of funding. Rate payers have had enough. If you truly believe in user pays then those that use must pay. Having spent some time overseas I have seen first hand the benefits of congestion charges. Queenstown does have a huge congestion problem. If people want to take their vehicles into areas where congestion is an issue then they pay for that privilege. Then they have to make a choice of using P.T. Or paying a significantly higher(my suggestion) congestion charge. Then of course if I chose to drive over into Queenstown and wanted to take my vehicle into Queenstown I must pay that congestion tax and so too must every visitor who wants to drive into Queenstown. ORC and QLDC just have to get away from the thinking that the ratepayer is a source of unlimited funds. You really are at risk of being the organisations who kill the geese that you perceive lay golden eggs ....i.e ratepayers.....we are over it!

**Respondent: Ms Claire Iredale**

**Submission Number: 46**

---

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 00:57**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

There is no way I can condone a rates increase that supports a single small coverage area, and benefits no one. This would double my current ORC rates, and simply put, I cannot afford food, let alone an increase of this percentage/scale as a fully solo parent paying a mortgage alone. What you're asking in real terms is that my ORC rates go from \$210 to approx \$450, which I have not saved for in advance over the year in addition to my regular ORC savings, so will not be able to pay when it comes due. Which I'm sure will be the case for many many households. This is not a good solution, or time. Do not do it.

**Respondent: Mrs Sarah Verbiest****Submission Number: 47****Submission Date:** 11/04/24 01:02**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Great for Dunedin. But many of us live in the upper Clutha region and on the very rare occasions that we have to visit Dunedin, we have to travel there by car for 3-4 hours so we do not use Dunedin buses and should not be expected to contribute to their funding.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

While I applaud the intention to gradually upgrade Queenstown's bus fleet to electric, those of us who reside in areas such as Wanaka, that have absolutely no public transport, should not be included in this proposed new PT targeted rate. There was a short trial of a bus service from Wanaka to Hawea a year or so ago. I don't know what the uptake was but it was only of benefit to a few residents in the Hawea area. It would be nice to have a shuttle bus service around Wanaka, Albertown and Hawea but the reality is; It would need to cover such an extensive area, the investment would be too high in relation to the number of users. Councils should be prioritising other services instead. And the costs of Queenstown's PT should be targeted at ratepayers who live in the Wakatipu basin.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 3****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

ORC ratepayers who live in areas that have no access to any form of public transport should not be rated on the costs of providing public transport to those areas that do.

**Respondent: Mr David Allard**

**Submission Number: 48**

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 01:06

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

As a Wanaka resident I strongly object to subsidising public transport in Queenstown.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

The questionnaire is a bit like asking a condemned man if he would prefer to be hanged or shot. Neither outcome suits. In my opinion public transport should be funded by those who use it and especially not by those who don't live anywhere near where it is available

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

There are too few people in the Wanaka area to pay for a viable transport system. However, over recent years private operators have established a useful taxi network. Some of these vehicles are hybrids etc and there may be the odd EV too. I suggest that rate payers within the Wanaka area be given a card which entitles them to a discount on any taxi journey. The ORC would pay the taxi operators appropriately to offset the discount given. There would be little capital cost involved, the number of taxis in operation would increase/decrease to meet the changing demand.

**Respondent: Mr Rob Keith**

**Submission Number: 49**

---

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 01:07

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

So why should we pay for public transport when we do not have any in albert town. It's a bit like me going out for dinner and saying just charge it to the Queenstown council. You all need to wake up and start living within your means and not expect to keep bumping up rates because of these big ideas. We do not come over to Queenstown and if we do we have our own transport. So no we are total against paying for a service we do not have.

**Respondent: Mr Ron Temby**

**Submission Number: 50**

---

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 01:26

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**-Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Hi

You say you are concerned about water quality and want more money from me to help with that but I live in a drought prone area which currently has water restrictions.

A couple of years ago we had to rely on water that was trucked in because the rain had contaminated our water supply.

Why don't you work with the CODC to improve our water quality?



**Respondent: Mrs Lynda Walsh-Pasco**

**Submission Number: 51**

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 02:02**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Electrification of buses fine but those outside Dunedin area should not pay for this.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Those in Wanaka, Hāwea and other districts should not be paying for buses in Wakatipu region. We do use this service and costs should be met by visitors and others using the service.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

Only those with services available in their area should pay this charge.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Only from those who have the service.

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Leave unchanged.

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

L

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

No explanation about Queenstown district. Need better explanation

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

L

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

N

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

W

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

T

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

We should not be increasing debt for future rate payers to have to pay. Council should be living within budgets and not spending money they don't have. Just like individuals the council should be living within its budgets.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

S

**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Henry****Submission Number: 52****Submission Date: 11/04/24 02:05****About You****Comment Number: 2****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 3****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback****Emergency management: plan for Outram**

In nearly 10 years of talk very little has been accomplished in developing and implementing an emergency plan for Outram. Mosgiel has had one for years. The Outram community is vulnerable and flooding as recently as 2017 cut off the township.

The responsibility for emergency management lies with the ORC who have devolved this to the DCC and the Mosgiel/Taieri Community Board. All have failed Outram.

The Chairman of the MTCB spoke at an ORC meeting on flood protection and the Lower Taieri area in Outram last year. In spite of that, the progress to date seems to have advanced only as far as concern about being cut off:

"Outram Emergency Group Dean McAlwee advised that they are looking at pulling their own information together to keep in touch with the communities in the area, as in an emergency, **there is a concern that the communities may be cut off.**"

Actually the community has been thinking that for the last 10 years. Finally the MTCB has caught up. When will there be an actual plan with actual information about where to go and what to do in the event the township is cut off or the flooding so severe evacuations are needed?

ORC this delay is unacceptable. You need to step in and ensure that the work gets done. There has been far too much hot air from the MTCB and no progress. The MTCB is clearly not up to the task. If local politics are the reason, then ORC needs to sort out the location of an evacuation centre in the township and in the event of cell phone network collapse, methods of communication. The advise the community of the plan.

This is urgent. Climate change and heavier rainfall and rising sea levels will catch us out with the possibility of lives lost.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Bus service trial Balclutha to Dunedin including airport**

I would like ORC to add a stop at Allanton. Currently there is no public transport between Allanton/Outram and the city unless by taking a bus from Mosgiel. A bus stop at Allanton would give residents in these areas an opportunity to "park and ride" and reduce the numbers of vehicles travelling into the city. Also there are thousands of people through Dunedin airport every day and the only transport options are shuttles, taxis or pick up by friends/family. A space for parking cars would need to be available in Allanton.

**Respondent: Mrs Christine Smith****Submission Number: 53****Submission Date:** 11/04/24 02:40**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 7****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 5****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

using the estimator my rate would increase to over \$700 from \$400 and something. I was surprised by the increase to \$400 odd this last time. Being on a fixed income the way the QLDC rates, and now the ORC rates are increasing impacts on my capacity to remain in my home.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 4****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 6****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 1****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 2****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Stick to the basics while the economy and people recover

**Respondent: Allison Tschirley**

**Submission Number: 54**

---

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 03:00**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This strategy will be very important in moving us away from single-occupancy vehicles. The increase in routes and frequency will make public transport an easier option to choose for many people. I would like to propose an added bus stop at Goodwood Road where it meets State Highway 1 (closer to Waikouaiti). The #1 bus already passes and the bus driver is very helpful in dropping you off there if you ask, but if it were an official bus stop then it would be on the bus route map, encouraging the locals to consider it as an option for transport and encouraging tourists to take the short walk down to the end of wetlands road to visit the beautiful Pleasant River Estuary, or to bike down to Tavora Reserve. Thank you



**Respondent: Sandy Brown**

**Submission Number:** 55

---

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 03:04

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**Respondent: Mr Roy Hill**

**Submission Number: 56**

---

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 03:27

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Any other feedback?**

A shuttle bus service between Oamaru and Dunedin Hospital is very much needed. There are a lot of people here that have great difficulty in getting to Dunedin.

**Respondent: Ms Jan Campbell**

**Submission Number: 57**

---

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 03:42

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Important component for climate change mitigation and is key to having a vibrant city (vs a car centric/congested city like Auckland)

**Respondent: Belinda Horne**

**Submission Number: 58**

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 06:21**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

**The Silverstream at the Gordon Road Bridge has lost 37% of its design capacity due to degradation and aggradation of the river channel.**

**This poses an unacceptable risk to the residents south of this area. These residents are paying a targeted rate for flood protection.**

**Residents were given an assurance by the ORC that physical work on restoring the Silverstream channel to its original design during the summer 2023/2024**

**THIS DID NOT HAPPEN**

**This has put incredible stress on all residents.**

**Our community expects the ORC to give Priority to the restoration of the Silverstream Channel to at least 100%of its design capacity without delay**

**Respondent: Mr Keith Ladyman**

**Submission Number: 59**

---

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 06:59**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Wanaka residents should not have to subsidise Queenstown Public Transport. Just like Hamilton residents who may occasionally travel to Auckland, do not subsidise Auckland public transport.

## Respondent: Simone Handwerk

Submission Number: 60

Submission Date: 11/04/24 07:44

### About You

Comment Number: 5

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I support making further improvements and investments into public transport

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I would also support paying back quicker

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

## Respondent: Flush the toilet

Submission Number: 61

Submission Date: 11/04/24 10:03

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 3

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 2

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Get rid of ti-treaty and co- government.

As per what the new government has set out. Then go sack yourself.

You 3 waters pirate's



**Respondent: Mr Michael Rodriguez**

**Submission Number: 62**

**Submission Date: 11/04/24 11:30**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Please stop spending so much money. The ORC should be reducing spending. Rates are 10 times what they were 7 years ago.

Spending half a billion dollars more on public transport is not what is wanted by those paying rates.

Huge amounts wasted hunting wallabies. Millions converting a huge building into an office.

These are all unnecessary spending.

We need to tighten spending!!!

Please stop spending our money!!!!!!

**Respondent: Peter Dowden**

**Submission Number: 63**

**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 21:26

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

### Any other feedback?

All taxation should be based on people's ability to pay. The ORC isn't able to tax based on income or expenditure (such as income tax or GST) but it can tax based on property value. Property value based tax is the fairest way to tax Otago people that is available to the ORC therefore it should be used wherever possible. The ORC should see its role as maximising property value for the region by improving infrastructure, services and the environment. With a focus on improving property values, property value-based taxation is the fairest approach. Regarding district-wide rates for public transport, I say "yes" but it should come along with district wide public transport, so for example Taieri Mouth, Outram and Middlemarch should have public transport, or be excluded from paying.

## Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* No

### Please comment on drainage scheme rates

The present rating area for Leith flood protection is far too small and unfairly and disproportionately affects student housing while the University and stadium don't contribute. The 1923 flood reached as far as Queens gardens, so many properties through the inner city should contribute, plus also Dunedin city in general as everyone benefits from having a city centre that works.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

## Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 5

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

see my comment on previous question about Leith rating

## Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* No

### Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change

It's best to keep a precise focus on wilding pines

**~Transport****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback**

I support new regional public transport to Alexandra and Balclutha but it should not jeopardise the existing long distance services that use these routes but rather compliment and build on them. "Code sharing" (as done often by airlines) should be used, as ECan has done on the Dunedin-Christchurch Intercity coach to provide a Timaru-Temuka service. This is done by the regional council buying a block of seats, say 10 seats, on an existing coach service and reselling these for local passengers. So the services should include the existing Intercity service in their timetable, with Orbus ticketing made valid on Intercity, to make the best selection of service times available at a very reasonable extra cost. This should also be done to improve the existing Palmerston service.

Likewise the new services should compliment and improve on existing worker transport provided by Macraes gold mine and Finegold freezing works. These services could be "codeshared" with ORC and integrated with the new services (and intercity services as described above) to provide a very good Palmerston-Dunedin-Balclutha service.

**Respondent: Ms Helen Chapman****Submission Number:** 64**Submission Date:** 11/04/24 23:07**About You****Comment Number:** 1**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 7**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I support the focus areas. I urge ORC to take fast action on developing the climate change strategy and identifying how to reduce emissions. A stable environment is essential to underpin economic growth and community wellbeing.

I suggest ORC consider if territorial local authorities should also be consider partners alongside mana whenua in delivering healthy and connected communities.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 4**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 12**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Improving public transport frequency, reach and reliability is essential for community wellbeing and emissions reductions. I would support extra frequency being considered on other routes than just the proposed routes. Low frequencies are a barrier to many using public transport if they cannot travel when they need to. I oppose ratepayers funding buses for low-cost budget cruise travellers who do not respect the local community. I would like ORC to work with DCC, Port Otago and Cruise companies to find a longer-term solution where ratepayers are not subsidising

tourists, and the children and elderly of West Harbour are not expected to suffer the consequences of overcrowding of buses by tourists. I would like to cruise companies to be forced to take responsibility for transporting passengers to the city.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 2

##### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

##### Any other feedback?

I support balancing the direct and indirect benefits through a combination of general and target rate. Household being charger targeted rates should be able to access services they are rated for. There are parts of Dunedin City that do not have access to public transport, ORC should consider extending services to these areas .

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 10

##### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 11

##### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 3

##### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* Yes

##### Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?

The largest property owner benefiting from the Leith flood protection scheme being exempt highlights the inequity of government owned property not paying rates. I urge ORC to lobby government to pay rates on their properties.

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 14

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

This provides greater flexibility to target the most needed interventions that separate rates for individual river management schemes.;

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 9****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 8****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 13****Do you have any feedback**

I support work to adapt to and mitigate climate change. ORC should take urgent action to support emissions reductions. Changes to reduce emissions and can have significant benefits for public health and community cohesion. A stable climate is critical to underpin the long term economic wellbeing of Otago. Adaption is a more costly response in the longer term than taking action now to emissions.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback**

In addition to the proposed trials. I request that ORC consider introducing on-demand services to communities within Dunedin who are not currently served by public transport, like Purakaunui and Aramoana. Many elderly people live in these communities and as driving becomes more challenging they lose independent mobility and must rely on friends and family for transport.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 5****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I encourage ORC to lobby central government for necessary changes to funding tools available to local government. With increased costs falling on local government more funding tools must be made available to councils.

The exemption of government owned properties from rates creates an inequitable situation where in areas with higher proportions of publicly owned land a greater share of the rates burden is borne by private individuals. I urge ORC to lobby the government for government owned properties to pay rates.

#### **How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 15**

#### **Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I support an approach that makes necessary increases rates but smooths the impact on ratepayers through debt to minimise hardship.

#### **Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I support increases to rates to enable ORC to do critical work to ensure the wellbeing of communities. The historically low rates do make it challenging to increase rates to a sustainable basis without causing hardship for the many in our community who are struggling with the cost of living.



**Respondent: Naell Crosby-Roe**

**Submission Number: 65**

**Submission Date: 12/04/24 00:58**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Although I support the additional investment in services I do not agree with it being part funded by areas that have no access to public transport and where the majority of people do not use the Queenstown-based public transport network.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

Areas that have no access to public transport shouldn't be paying for one specific area to benefit from. If it needs more investment then increase the user charges so that those who benefit from the service are paying for it.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

Very supportive of trialling public transport in these areas that are growing and need access to them

**Respondent: Mr Duncan Ritchie**

**Submission Number: 66**

**Submission Date: 12/04/24 05:23**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 8**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I strongly disagree that wanaka ratepayers should have to pay for a service we dont have and dont use!! Especially those of us who live in the country.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

The service is not available in Wanaka so I disagree with having to pay for this

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Once again there is/was no benefit to Wanaka residents so why should we have to pay it-disagree with having to pay thispay it

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Unfair to charge people who have no chance to use a service. Easy in queenstown. Impossible in wanaka

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: .r BRIAN Kusel**

**Submission Number: 67**

---

**Submission Date: 12/04/24 06:19**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

## Respondent: Dr Malcolm McQueen

Submission Number: 68

Submission Date: 13/04/24 00:39

### About You

Comment Number: 7

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

I see no benefit in working "along side mana whenua": "We are one people". Distinguishing us and them on racial grounds is the essence of racism.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I support increases in services but do not support the replacement of diesel by electric busses. This is a ridiculous piece of virtue signalling.

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback**

Environment and Transport are the only ones that ORC should be involved with.

Climate Change and Resilience is such a broad classification as to be meaningless. Resilience has some meaning when referred to specific events eg. earthquake, fire, storms.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**

Not worth comment.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

No

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 2****How we fund our work****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

The probability of interest rate rises must be anticipated. It is essential borrowing is only used where there is a direct economic return.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

They are much too large. Maybe the council sees as its aim to keep increase as small as possible: it should aim at zero increase.

## Respondent: Dr Jack Williams

Submission Number: 69

Submission Date: 13/04/24 03:21

### About You

Comment Number: 5

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 6

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Just to say, I live in Opoho and regularly use the number 10-11 routes. I find the service reliable, good value for money, and LOVE the new electric buses. Keep up the good work!

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes



**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: Mr John Dow**

**Submission Number: 70**

---

**Submission Date: 13/04/24 07:32**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Yes indeed....Michael Laws states the ORC has 50 too many staff.

Be like the Govt and get rid of the "DEAD WOOD" !!!....and cut our rates....John D Dow

## Respondent: Mac Robertson

Submission Number: 71

Submission Date: 13/04/24 21:33

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I would also like to see increased evening bus services to Brighton.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 6

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 8

Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Would be happy for the amount allocated to wilding tree control to be tripled.

**Respondent: John Lister**

**Submission Number: 72**

**Submission Date:** 14/04/24 03:45

**About You**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Rate increases of this magnitude are not sustainable. Council will have to start making decisions about what is essential and start cutting the 'nice to haves'

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I'm surprised that pest control is not listed as a focus. I would rate it as a much higher priority than partnership with Mana Whenua

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 20**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 22**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

But increase in rates must be covered by the areas that can use the service. Living in Central Otago means I have to use my vehicle to get to Dunedin for example and the purpose of the trip is usually purchase of goods which I couldn't carry on a bus even if there was a park and ride available.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Same comments as for Dunedin.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 21**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

20 % is to much to pay for ratepayers who can never benefit from the service.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

I support a uniform rate for this.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

I struggle to reconcile expenditure on wilding pines with reducing our carbon footprint.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 14**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 9**

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 15**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback**

The population base in much of rural Otago would not sustain effective public transport in the foreseeable future.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 7**

<b>Infrastructure Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 4</b>
<b>Financial Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 1</b>
<b>How we fund our work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 17</b>

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

At some point, probably soon, council will have to cut its coat to suit its cloth. It is not long term sustainable to continue as a 'cost plus operation'.

Central govt funding will have to be a part of the solution.



**Respondent: Mr Charlie James****Submission Number: 73****Submission Date: 14/04/24 04:23****About You****Comment Number: 4****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I have no objection to the change of services per se, but object to paying for someone else's benefit. Why should people who get no benefit from Dunedin's public transport pay towards it? Money syphoned from the power company has cost us all to subsidise Dunedin City rates, now you are promoting more of the same.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I have no objection to the change of services per se, but object to paying for someone else's benefit. I see no reason why people like me who do not live in or near Queenstown and seldom go there (especially central) and never use its public transport (since it would not assist me) should pay for services to benefit residents. I only go to the wider Queenstown area to access the airport and the occasional shopping trip to Frankton and for neither of those would existing or proposed public transport services be relevant.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I object. The "wider benefit" of transport is a massive exaggeration. There is no benefit to me (living in Wanaka) to improve Dunedin and Queenstown bus services which I have no prospect of using. Since I do not live in these areas, impacts like reduced congestion there are also irrelevant to me. Let the people who benefit pay for the services.

**Respondent: Dr Michel Herde**

**Submission Number: 74**

**Submission Date: 14/04/24 06:06**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We need more and better public transport desperately. I would propose to even go beyond \$315 million spent in Dunedin.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Better and more public transport options are desperately needed.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 8**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* No

#### **What period should deficits be repaid over?**

- \* 3 years

#### **Please comment**

Best to pay back as soon as possible to reduce interest payments

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 2**

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

#### **Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

#### **Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* No

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 4**

#### **Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* Yes

#### **Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

I don't know how much owners of pine plantations are contributing to this control programme. It should be the vast majority as they are the ones adding more trees which then can go wild.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback**

Air quality is not monitored adequately in Dunedin. More sampling stations are needed to better document the poor air quality in areas e.g. Kaikorai Valley, Brockville, etc. These are low socioeconomic areas where still a lot of coal and fireplaces with wet firewood are used. A huge health burden for the communities living there.

**Respondent: Mrs Allison Rosanowski**

**Submission Number: 75**

**Submission Date: 14/04/24 07:53**

**Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Queenstown transport should be paid for by Queenstown properties only- not from Wanaka etc that gets no benefit from improvements to services.

**Respondent: Mrs Victoria Menzies**

**Submission Number:** 76

---

**Submission Date:** 14/04/24 19:15

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I live in Wanaka and am already paying for public transport in Queenstown which is of no benefit to me. I am not at all happy about an increase in my rates for transportation that I cannot access. You should only be increasing those who can access it

**Respondent: Mr David Fynmore****Submission Number: 77****Submission Date: 14/04/24 22:56****About You****Comment Number: 3****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

As I am now 65 I am using the bus service on a much more regular basis however my big concern is the very poor Shiel Hill to Opoho and return service. Upon delving into the ORC Dunedin bus timetable I can clearly see that this service (10 and 11) is one of , if not the worst service in Dunedin. I see that during the off peak times the frequency of this service is one bus every 40 minutes. Off peak runs from 9.50am through to 3.10pm and then again from 6.21pm through to 10.21pm. Almost all other services within the city are 30 minutes or less during the day as their peak times are generally for the whole day, thus more frequency. What the Shiel Hill/Opoho service boils down to is two buses running between each end point. Years ago the Shiel Hill to Opoho and return service was on a par with the St.Clair to Normanby and return service. At present the St.Clair Normanby service runs at a 15 minute service from 6.05am to 6.50pm as that peak time is indeed most of the day.

I have spoken to a number of passengers over the last few months and they say they only take the bus if they have to due to the very poor frequency. Interestingly they simply believe the frequency issue is the bus service in general but I highlight the fact, that's not the case at all. I inform travellers, our service does have very poor frequency compared to the likes of St.Clair/Normanby. When they hear of the frequency of St.Clair/Normanby service they are amazed that it is more that twice as frequent as our Shiel Hill/Opoho service.

At the very least, I believe the Shiel Hill/Opoho service should have the same peak operating period as St.Clair/Normanby service thus increasing the number of buses to one bus every 20 minutes during the best part of the day. That's doubling our bus service but still not the frequency of the St.Clair/Normanby service.

Incidentally, the Waverley service used to be operated by Otago Road Services when I was young and had an appalling frequency. Now I see, and rightly so, it has a service every 30 minutes throughout most of the day Now that is better than the Shiel Hill/Opoho service.

Understandably, it would take some time for a more frequent service to be used as people became aware of the better service, but once aware, I'm sure the passenger numbers would grow reasonably quickly but it wouldn't happen overnight.

I support option 1 in the OCR transport proposal and do see a more frequent service for route 10 and 11, but this proposal is far too far off. The frequency needs to change now. Why has one of the best services years ago become one of the worst in recent years.





**Respondent: Ms Jo Tilson**

**Submission Number:** 78

---

**Submission Date:** 15/04/24 01:04

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Yes, I totally support putting more of our rates into Biodiversity, the environment is and climate issues. I am happy to pay an extra \$12 per year in support of this..

kind regards

Jo

**Respondent: miss Petrina Duncan**

**Submission Number: 79**

**Submission Date:** 15/04/24 01:59

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**Respondent: Jessica de Heij**

**Submission Number: 80**

**Submission Date: 15/04/24 02:27**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

agreed.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Totally agree

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

Very important to prepare us for the future where climate change plays a big part.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

My general feedback is that we really need to focus on reducing car traffic in this city. Dunedin has one of the highest rates of air pollution in the country which leads to a lot of health issues. Totally support the carbon zero alliance but we need to go harder and faster; more investment in public transport (more frequency) so people

are more inclined to take the bus, more enforcement of car parking, and get on with building pop-up bike lanes (which can cheaply be built with planter boxes or timtams). I know investment is low, but we can make a difference with cheap options. We also need to focus on more medium-density; more townhouses and make it easier to build apartments as well. More housing like this, will also help reduce rates and will help with more patronage in buses and more people on bikes. Now people choose the car because it's easy and convenient, but cars are expensive and lead to a lot of debt and poverty. Not to mention we really need to focus on reducing emissions. Keen to see this reflected in the plan and the focus for Dunedin for the next year(s). The great cities of this world aren't great because you can drive a car through it but because they are great places to be and gather eg. London, Singapore, Amsterdam, Paris etc. I hope the council has the same vision and determination. Change the Street, Change the World

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback**

no

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 4****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Focus on these issues is very important, I don't mind if rates go up and we are actually prepared for the future.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 8****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

No, I actually would like to see more rate rises if that means it will prepare us for the future.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Agreed.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Nope happy with it especially if it prepares us for the future.

**Respondent: Margaret Pollitt**

**Submission Number: 81**

**Submission Date: 15/04/24 09:28**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**Any other feedback?**

Ratepayers who do not have easy access to public transport from their property should not incur targeted rates for transport.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

River management would be better done by catchment rather than arbitrary lines on a map. Flood protection and drainage should be combined. Identify who pays for the flood protection more fairly. Who benefits from it, and who exacerbates the problem? For example, urban Mosgiel residents benefit from the Gordon Road Floodway and the run-off from their homes exacerbate the risk of the Silverstream overflowing its banks, but the ORC appears to think the ratepayers on the GRF should pay more than those protected by it. Mosgiel residents near the Silverstream or other waterways should help more significantly to pay more from the schemes created to protect their property. Why should a ratepayer on the GRF, especially one living in a property built before the GRF was created, pay more for the maintenance of the GRF than a ratepayer on Goodall St, for example? One gets all the benefit while other experiences all of the risk and most of the cost.

#### ~ORC's must-do work

Comment Number: 7

**Do you have any feedback**

We are residents living on the Gordon Road Spillway, and we ask that you include the following in your Long Term Plan:

- **That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. This work needs to be carried out immediately and not over a period of years.**

By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%.

Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.

- **That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.**
- **That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed.**

The Floodwater Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

The Gordon Road Floodway and other similar schemes should be reinstated to 100% design capacity as a minimum and then routinely monitored and maintained. This should be the highest priority before embarking on any new projects.

The Long Term Plan should introduce Clarity and Transparency of maintenance, eg What has been done in the last year? What is the work programme for the coming year/5 years/10 years? How will progress be monitored and assessed? This information should be sent out annually with our rates demands. We should clearly see the benefit from the rates we pay. Non-performance by the ORC costs individual ratepayers too much as can be seen from GRF examples.

The Long Term Plan should introduce KPIs for the ORC for Level of Service. What was planned/promised and what has been achieved?

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Instead of proactively making excuses for not delivering on its proposed programme of work, the ORC needs to commit to getting the work done in a timely manner. The ratepayers of the Gordon Road Floodway have been severely impacted by the ORC's failure to maintain the Silverstream. It is now more than 6 years since the last flood event in 2017. A major reinstatement project needs to begin in 2024.

Please also see emailed submission from me and my husband.

**Respondent: Mr Alexander Foulkes****Submission Number: 82****Submission Date:** 15/04/24 21:28**About You****Comment Number: 9****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 7****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 16****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

We must do all we can to protect the native biodiversity and environment of Otago. Dunedin is the Wildlife capital of New Zealand, and the Regional Council should work with partners to ensure we protect the wildlife in Dunedin and wider Otago - especially threatened and regionally endemic species.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 14****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

They sound sensible - is it not time that Otago has some regional parks for its people to enjoy?

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 21****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1**



**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This is excellent news. We should work to get people off the roads and into buses and making them convenient and affordable is important to that. It will be money well spent.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

It seems very unfair that people with a house worth \$400k should pay the same as people with a house worth \$4 million. This sounds like a poll tax.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 22**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Let's not mortgage the future for our children. Pay it now.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 17**

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 18**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

The ORC should fund and support widescale trapping and pest control across Otago as well as establish Regional Parks to protect biodiversity. We should prioritise significant targeted funding on endemic and protected species in the Region. We should work with partners to stop the Yellow-eyed Penguin going extinct.

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 8**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

The ORC should take a regional lead on climate change and work with partners on this. We should oppose government initiatives which do not address climate change.

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 20**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

I support this 100% - we need regional buses to connect our towns and cities. We should work with partners on regional rail as well to connect Dunedin with other places.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

The ORC should strongly oppose the Fast Track Approvals Bill. This is a regressive piece of legislation that will not benefit the environment in Otago.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I support the financial strategy.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

No

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I support this increase.

**Respondent: Anthea Fisher**

**Submission Number: 83**

---

**Submission Date:** 16/04/24 01:53

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

There is not logical rational around why residents of Wanaka, Hawea and Albert Town should be paying for public transport that is not available to them. Without a commitment to public transport in these areas the rate increase is unjustifiable!

**Respondent: Ken Bagnall**

**Submission Number: 84**

---

**Submission Date: 16/04/24 02:07**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Please do persist to move to electric buses - well worth the initial outlay. Re: Balclutha to Dunedin, including airport trial - Done right this could meet several needs. The Airport is very poorly served - not only could this address this - but may prove a financial asset to the route. Also - the journey from Mosgiel to Dunedin needs to be direct via the motorway - especially at peak times. This will really enhance the viability of commuting from Mosgiel by bus which is currently too slow to compete with the car. It may also prove to be another strong source of income to support the route as a whole.

**Respondent: Mr Philip Jones**

**Submission Number: 85**

**Submission Date: 16/04/24 02:57**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 5**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I think the no change option is best given the current financial troubles

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Given the current financial pressures it is best to delay the repayments

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

As a QLDC ratepayer I think the concept is totally unacceptable. There is no way a smaller ratebase should be funding more than the larger one (Dunedin).

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Totally out of sync with what is happening in our society right no. This is a time to cut back on costs and not add to them. Take a leaf from the government and cut back - staff and projects.

**Respondent: Ms Sarah McCrorie**

**Submission Number: 86**

---

**Submission Date: 16/04/24 05:19**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

I don't think its right to charge 80% of the targeted rate to the entire Dunedin district. Middlemarch is within the Dunedin district but does not have any access to public transportation. The 20% charge is understandable and appears justifiable, but an additional \$164 for a service we don't have access to is not.



**Respondent: Belinda Smith****Submission Number: 87****Submission Date:** 16/04/24 06:13**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I really like the focus areas chosen. I realise they're aspirational, but I feel proud to come from a region that chooses those kinds of aspirations!

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 6****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support option 1.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 1****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

If I've understood correctly, this will mean there will be dedicated funds going to Catchment Management, which I agree with.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 4****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

This is an important and never ending job, but if the ORC means what it says regarding caring for biodiversity and our environment, then I trust that their preferred option is the best to manage this.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

I strongly support this work. As I said earlier, it's time the environment and biodiversity were properly prioritised and I feel so heartened that the ORC is doing this. Personally, I'm very happy to pay higher rates for this to happen.

**Respondent: Miss Natalie Sharples**

**Submission Number:** 88

---

**Submission Date:** 16/04/24 22:14

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**Respondent: Mr John Borrell**

**Submission Number: 89**

**Submission Date: 16/04/24 23:48**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

With your preferred options I am looking at a 27% rates increase largely driven by an increase in bus services which I am unable to use being 5-6 kilometres from the nearest bus stops. The buses presently are often near empty such that there may be an argument for reduced services but certainly not for an increase. Although I live in Queenstown I would say it is entirely unreasonable to charge Wanaka residents for Queenstown buses!!

**Respondent: Ms Ruth Harvey****Submission Number: 90****Submission Date: 17/04/24 02:52****About You****Comment Number: 5****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I live in South Dunedin, parts of which are vulnerable to a rising water table, flooding, sea level rise and liquefaction in an earthquake. I'm genuinely shocked at the rate of high intensity, multi-unit new builds happening in South Dunedin (8 units in my street alone!) in an area considered to be facing multiple risks from the climate crisis and currently undergoing significant investment in finding solutions to the forthcoming issues facing the community. If the Resource Management Act currently allows there to be this kind of high intensity building development happening in communities relatively immanently at risk of climate crisis impacts, the RMA should be changed. It's not responsible and only compounds future issues. I think the ORC and DCC should be lobbying for those changes to be made in at-risk communities nationwide.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 1****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Affordable, reliable public transport is a public good, a necessity, and helps to address long-standing equity issues in our communities. The more cheap public transport services the better. It also needs to be promoted more as a green alternative to car driving.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 4****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Whatever steps are taken to ensure consistent, best practice work to protect the environment, species, biodiversity and water is great by me.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 6****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Environment****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback**

Keep working with mana whenua -- Pākehā have a long history of exploiting the whenua's natural resources, but mana whenua have generations of knowledge about best practice in this respect. Respect their advice.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**

The climate crisis will continue to bring existential crises to our door -- invest in this area heavily and act fast. You're going to have to work hard to educate the public about what you have to do and why -- people are going to struggle to adapt and let go of the ways things have always been done. You'll have to have courage, and be creative -- pay artists and creatives from communities to help share your vision for the future and its benefits.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 7****Do you have any feedback**

Don't backpedal on co-governance with Kāi Tāhu just because the right-wing, racist central government is -- co-governance is the only way forward, and the only just thing to do.

**Respondent: mr peter cox**

**Submission Number: 91**

---

**Submission Date: 17/04/24 22:46**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Please comment**

No. The amount being levied on me as a resident in terms of rates increases is too much. I ask the council to go back to the beginning and appraise 'need to dos' and 'must dos' and come back to rate payers. Double digit annual increases in rates is just outrageous at a time when people in the community are truly hurting with immediate cost of living pressures with interest rates and inflation. I support sticking with the status quo on rates - for now and until the council has done more work on proposing a forward charge that is manageable for the ratepayers



**Respondent: Ms Fiona Abbott****Submission Number: 92****Submission Date: 18/04/24 05:15****!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

First, we have a deficit we need to pay and limited means to find funding so increasing service levels should only be done where there is a sustainable funding model. Secondly, the current GPS is firmly in the camp of user pays. Wanaka and Hawea have no real service and there is no priority given to establishing one. Whilst it may be tempting to spread the costs over a larger rating base, there is limited quid pro quo for these communities. Also, Do we have sufficient charging infrastructure for an electric fleet? A plan is needed before you ask this question. See my comments on spreading cost below.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

The costs for PT can be split into infrastructure and operations. For places like Wanaka and Hawea, there is limited of both. We should recognise the value PT provides to decarbonisation and reducing congestion but we also need to acknowledge there are communities who would love a service and get nothing. I would recommend a rate that perhaps charges ratepayers for the infrastructure assets (as they benefit all through our balance sheet) but operational costs need to be on those communities that have a PT service.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Yes - those that do not benefit from PT should not have to pay through rates. ORC needs to consider other means of revenue, including increasing fares and targeted rates so user pays. Also, the costs are only going to increase and there is limited funding from NLTF so how are we going to afford this in a more sustainable way?

**Respondent: Faye Powell-Moore****Submission Number: 93****Submission Date:** 18/04/24 05:24**About You****Comment Number: 8****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Strengthening partnerships with mana whenua is something that I fully endorse and take into account when voting in local elections. Protecting and managing our environment is important and strategies must be adapted for this

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 13****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I think that these are appropriate goals and am excited to see how these will grow and develop this city

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 14****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 6****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I live in one of the areas that is effected by this and from personal experience i can confirm that bus frequency is an issue, the fact that this is being looked at is good news, I also support green busses, i would however like to preface that with the caveat that these busses should actually be better for the environment, if their charging is done through a diesel generator that impacts the environment the same or worse then i would prefer actual change over greenwashing.

#### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 16**

#### **Please comment**

I don't live here and don't feel i have a good enough understanding of this region to comment

#### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

#### **Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

#### **Any other feedback?**

I do think that some of these rates should be income tested and opt out for people with sufficiently low income in case of people losing their homes.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 17**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I would also support the ten year plan if rates are becoming too high to be managed

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 12**

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you have any feedback**

Seems like these are resonable

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

H

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have any feedback**

I

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you have any feedback**

These are all very exciting ideas to trial, i will add that i would also be extremley interested in a train service between christchurch

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

The dunedin area, particularly young people cause really do with n easier way to interact and make comments on the councils descisn

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

These are large problems that need to be solved and in doing so the workers who are employed will s

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I am not a rate payer, but as a renter who is disabled i am concerned that these prices will trickle down from those who can pay to those who cannot. I think that looking at ways to make rates more fair with income testing and rent controls could be hugely beneficial to the

**Respondent: Monica Stone**

**Submission Number: 94**

**Submission Date:** 18/04/24 05:54

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I think it is great that you are putting more money in offering better and more frequent services within Queenstown, However I don't believe it should come at a cost to Wanaka and Hawea residents to fund services they don't use and won't be able to use. Until there is public transport options offered in Wanaka, there should not be targeted rates required by these residents.

## Respondent: Malcolm Burgess

Submission Number: 95

Submission Date: 18/04/24 08:32

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$1 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

While I support the additional investment in public transport I am totally opposed to the suggestion rate payers outside of Queenstown should pay additional rates for something which is of no benefit to them. In the 8 years we have lived here our ORC rates have increased five fold with absolutely no increase in service. To suggest we should absorb more cost for something that does not have the slightest impact on our community is outrageous.

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 3

#### Tell us what you think Any other feedback?

See comments above - completely unjustified rates increase for absolutely no additional level of service - now or in the foreseeable future

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 2

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Why are these charges not being funded through user pays - the vast majority of ratepayers extract no value from this activity. Those who use the harbours should fund the navigational safety.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

It is difficult to accept that we are expected to pay ever increasing rates bills for services we do not receive. It appears that ratepayers are increasingly saddled with costs to meet ORC aspirations, with limited opportunity to push back on council expenditure proposals. It is very difficult to see what value ORC adds to communities like ours for the money they require us to contribute. Despite the fact that I have engaged in this feedback opportunity, I have no faith that this is anything more than a tick box exercise to meet statutory obligations to consult with the community. I have no expectation that any feedback provided will alter the proposed plans in any significant way.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Frankly outrageous given they exceed the inflation rate and do nothing to enhance the service offered.



**Respondent: Central Wilding Group (CWG)****Submission Number:** 96**Submission Date:** 19/04/24 00:34**About You****Comment Number:** 1**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 3**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Wilding pine control****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Tēna koutou katoa

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to the ORC Draft LTP for 2024-34.

Firstly, we want to acknowledge the continued, essential and direct financial support the Council provides our group to work with community to address the issue of Wilding Conifer spread in Central Otago, and to a lesser extent Clutha and Waitaki.

This year particularly we further want to acknowledge the willingness of ORC operations to engage with us within our work through the provision of a robust contract process to engage providers of control work. At the time of writing this was in the final stages of sorting this transition from DOC to ORC for a commencement date in April. There remains one point of concern that arises because of existing Council delegations not anticipating the new relationship but we continue to work with Council Officers to find an outcome that works for both.

There are two items we want to submit on with the Draft Long Term Plan and these relate to

- folding the previously separate rate for wilding conifer control into a general pest funding
- collaboration to extend and increase the scale the funding sources.

**Rate visibility and application:**

One of the factors that we are convinced is essential for success to control and prevent wilding spread, and also highlighted in The ORC Wilding Strategy, is the visibility of the issue and the work undertaken, so that community support continues to grow. As you will know this isn't a pest issue impacting only on a part of the community. It impacts rural sustainability and urban safety, plus is a critical environmental issue impacting water quantity, biodiversity and landscape values.

It is clear to us that the actions required must come from all parts of the community, and will only succeed when everyone gets on board and action is universal. Anything that improves the profile and visibility of this work is therefore important.

Folding the Wilding Conifer rate into the general pest funding may make sense from an administrative point of view, but from the perspective of achieving the desired outcome it makes it harder. Not only does it bury it's existence to the community but it will also lead to competition with other biodiversity programmes.

We are highlighting the importance of this decision as every opportunity to make the issue visible and secure the appropriate funding at a governance level will impact on delivery. If one is driven by the purpose of the work rather than administrative convenience, our submission is the separate rate should stay.

#### **Collaboration to widen and increase funding sources**

We all are troubled by the current cost of living issues being dealt with by our communities. As a group CWG is being impacted by agencies we have relied upon for support, actively reducing their input into the programme locally. While we are seeking alternatives ourselves, identification of wider regional or national sources from those who have responsibilities for wilding spread is an initiative that requires more 'muscle' than CWG has. The group offers to collaborate with the Council to identify and engage with agencies, industries and any others so that further funding sources are identified and widened.

#### **Submissions**

CWG submits that there is sufficient value in retention of a separate Wilding Conifer Rate and ask that the Council agrees to this.

CWG further submits that the matter or a more widespread funding structure is prioritized so that the Wilding Control and Prevention programme is on a more stable and assured basis.

**Respondent: Mr Neil Marshall**

**Submission Number: 97**

---

**Submission Date: 19/04/24 01:21**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

However, my wife and I live in Wanaka and we benefit very little indeed from the public transport options that are available in the wider Queenstown Lakes area. I do not, therefore, support a targeted rate for public for Wanaka residents that is identical to the target rate for public transport for Queenstown residents.

**Respondent: Mrs Kay McGrath**

**Submission Number: 98**

---

**Submission Date: 19/04/24 03:02**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

As a property owner and ratepayer living in Wanaka I am totally opposed to being charged rates for Queenstown public transport. This has no effect or benefit for residents outside of Queenstown/Frankton and it is not a 'fair' system to charge us rates for this.

**Respondent: Karl Buchanan**

**Submission Number: 99**

---

**Submission Date:** 19/04/24 09:03

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Patently unfair for ratepayers to pay for public transport in Wakatipu Basin. Over \$100 for us, and ZERO availability of public transport. Pure money grab.

**Respondent: John Broekhoff**

**Submission Number: 100**

**Submission Date: 19/04/24 11:31**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We should not be funding flood zones outside of our residential area. I live on a hill at east taieri, i would much rather be paying towards taieri flood zone than bloody leith in town. Plenty of population in central dunedin to cover that.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

MINIMAL RATE CHANGES PLEASE, PEOPLE CAN NOT AFFORD IT THIS YEAR, BUSINESSES ARE CLOSING UP. Instead, how about sacking the extra unnecessary staff youve taken on board in the past 5 years, minimise your consultations, and stop wasting money on buildings! These rate increases every would only be worth it if you put half as much money into dunedin as you have been putting into queenstown/wanaka!!!! ORC is hopeless!

**Respondent: Mrs Susan Young**

**Submission Number: 101**

**Submission Date: 20/04/24 00:42**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

The level of debt and mismanagement over the years is concerning and that increasing borrowing is going to help? If you were a corporation you would be in liquidation right now.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

This is disgusting. You've got people in a in a cost of living crisis, and you wanting to borrow more and expect people to pay more. Your projects are ridiculous. The cost of the electric buses alone is ridiculous, Let alone the cost to the environment through hydro dams electricity through lithium mines to fund your batteries for your buses. The impact to the environment getting rid of the batteries that can't be recycled. You know in the 80s they decided to be cutting down trees for making paper products. They opted for plastic. This was thank you to the greenies. And now we have a problem with micro plastics in our waters. Now we've gone back to paper. You really need to think beyond the limited vision people have. Look at the consequences. You're now expecting people to pay more when they're already stretched because wages don't grow, public sector jobs are going, rising unemployment, people will lose their homes. And what are you doing to fund the homeless. Nothing. You're just expecting people to pay more and more and more for your ridiculous projects to see no benefit because our waterways are still highly polluted. I would opt for the lower cost option 2, if anything. But I would also like to see the firing of incompetent managers who put us in this position in the first place and get financial experts in to remedy it. Wasting

## Respondent: Ma Tamara Thomas

Submission Number: 102

Submission Date: 20/04/24 04:36

### About You

Comment Number: 14

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 7

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 12

Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 2

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 9

Do you support this proposal?

\* No

What level of total funding should be available?

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 5

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?



\* No

**Please comment**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 16

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 17

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 18

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have any feedback**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### **Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### **Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

#### **How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

No more rates increases!we cannot afford these and we have no way of stopping them.

**Respondent: Mr Kevin Phillips**

**Submission Number:** 103

**Submission Date:** 20/04/24 05:03

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

The only increase to Bus services are of no use to me what so ever. I live in Mosgiel and you obviously have no idea that Mosgiel is the fastest growing part of Dunedin. We have no late buses from Dunedin to Mosgiel at all, the last weekday bus departing Bus Hub at 8.42 pm. This means that to have an evening out in Dunedin for Mosgiel residents requires the use of a private car or taxi. So much for trying to reduce our greenhouse gases! This just isn't good enough considering that Mosgiel residents pay some of the highest rates in this city. I object to having to pay even higher rates for a service that I will not be able to use!

**Respondent: Mr Robert Hartlebury**

**Submission Number:** 104

**Submission Date:** 20/04/24 05:44

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Otago already represents very poor value for money. All of your proposals involve considerable increase in rates. Instead do not increase rates, run your organisation more efficiently, get rid of all unnecessary managerial and backroom staff and focus on providing high value low cost infrastructure. Stop wasting my money.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Tell us what you think**

**Respondent: Mr Evan Johnston**

**Submission Number: 105**

**Submission Date: 20/04/24 06:03**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

Again we are being charged for something we dont have, should be on a user pays , and not just a blanket rate charge

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Again Kingston not even mentioned, so again we are asked to pay for something we dont get

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: Mrs Samantha Wadsworth**

**Submission Number:** 106

---

**Submission Date:** 20/04/24 07:16

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I strongly disagree with the targeted rate with regards to Wakatipu Transport Fixed Charge.

This service will in no way benefit me living in Lake Hawea.

Why should i have to contribute to a service in queenstown when we don't even have any public transport in Wanaka

This is very unfair!

**Respondent: Chris Bowie****Submission Number:** 107**Submission Date:** 20/04/24 10:03**About You****Comment Number:** 3**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 4**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

It would be useful to have provided current patronage data for this consultation - how much are the existing services used and how does this vary between peak and non-peak? What is the forecast patronage from a 15 minute schedule based on current usage? Congestion will not be reduced if people are not travelling on the buses no matter how regularly they arrive. Further, residents in Wanaka, Albert Town, and Lake Hawea are a 45 to >1 hour distance from Queenstown where these services are located. Residents in Lake Hawea live further from Queenstown than residents in Cromwell. Yet the targeted rate is blanket across QLDC district for services that are only accessible to a minority. I feel that the goals set by ORCs preferred option are over-ambitious, should be justified by actual demand, and should be funded by the users of these services, or by those that this "reduced congestion" will benefit which is presumably the residents living in the Ladies Mile and Frankton to Queenstown corridor as I have never experienced congestion anywhere else in the entire QLDC district.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The current financial strategy does not appear fit for purpose for a region where capital values Queenstown and Wanaka are more than double that of Dunedin. resulting in ratepayers there paying excessive ORC rates relative to the rest of the district. Not every person and household in QLDC has significant income to justify a >%40 increase in general rates when the rest of the region has much smaller increases, this is exacerbated by the large targeted rates proposed for this district. Effectively the ratepayers of QLDC are subsidising the rest of the region for ORC's proposed increase in expenditure based purely on unrealised capital value of their properties.



**Respondent: Carla Constable**

**Submission Number: 108**

**Submission Date: 20/04/24 21:35**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

What a lovely way to say that you are wanting to pay off the maroi, upgrade your own technology and blame climate change for the crap water we have oh and not to mention the water reform hang on are we not paying for this in our dcc rates

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Electric buses how the heck are you going to charge them all I assume every night or will dunedin start facing blackouts

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

All for addition of extra services for peak times but there are times I see buses empty maybe look at smaller sized bus options for off peak times

#### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Can't comment unsure how much buses are used in Queenstown

#### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Tell us what you think**

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

We are in a rescission have a thought on the people paying this

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 15**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

## Respondent: Nicholas Bollen

Submission Number: 109

Submission Date: 21/04/24 00:02

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 12

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

As with all things, ideally you'd invest more. There's still many buses with hardly anyone on-board. I applaud use of electric buses

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 15

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

What's proposed sounds good

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

What's proposed sounds

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

What's proposed sounds

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

What's proposed sounds good

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

You've got balance right between doing what really is necessary minimum and not increasing rates too much. It's well argued and presented, and rates estimator is persuasive

**Respondent: Mr Jeremy Crichton**

**Submission Number:** 110

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 03:26

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

It is the only viable solution we have going forward. More people need to use public transport in order to avoid paying for expensive bridge, Frankton Rd and secondary road upgrade projects which no one can afford.

**Respondent: SRB Building**

**Submission Number:** 111

---

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 03:35

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Dissolve ORC immediately and hand over your responsibilities to the local governments. Pay back the ratepayers after sale of you assets and hand over any money to the local governments to complete ongoing projects.



**Respondent: Mr Lance Good**

**Submission Number: 112**

---

**Submission Date: 21/04/24 03:38**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

As far as I am concerned Putting the rates up while there is a cost of living crisis is unreasonable people are struggling don't

**Respondent: mRS Grace Mathieson**

**Submission Number:** 113

---

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 06:28

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Respondent: Karina Bennett**

**Submission Number:** 114

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 06:58

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

There is no public transport in Wānaka. When going to Queenstown or Dunedin our family and friends do not use public transport as we've taken our private vehicle. Rate payers in Upper Clutha should not be charged for a service they do not have access to where they live

**Respondent: Troy Bennett**

**Submission Number:** 115

---

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 07:01

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I don't agree with paying for public transport in our rates when we don't have it

**Respondent: Anonymous Ratepayer****Submission Number:** 116**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 08:02**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 2****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 7****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 3****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We do not have enough people using buses to warrant this. A better solution would be to offer more buses at peak times and reduce the number at less busy times. Ratepayers should not be asked to continue subsidizing this service for the minority.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 8****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

This is expensive and unnecessary, please cut back on spending. As Queenstown has so many tourists, perhaps a cheaper rate for locals and more expensive rate for visitors would help to fund the buses.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 9****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

Please cut back on spending on public transport. It is also unfair to put costs onto parts of the district that have no services.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Could this not be funded by reserves or Port Otago dividends.

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I support this as a general rate

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Again this should be a general rate

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Ratepayers are facing increasing rates from both councils. Please try to keep costs down, it is becoming unaffordable for people.

**Respondent: Mr Murray Gifford**

**Submission Number: 117**

**Submission Date: 21/04/24 08:31**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase. Cant see why a Wanaka resident with no public bus service should pay for any public bus service, This rate needs to be targetted at the users.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**



Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase. As a Wanaka resident I see no reason to subsidise Queenstown public transport which we will never use. This will add \$128 per year to our current rates nearly 25% of current rates.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 9

#### **Tell us what you think Any other feedback?**

Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase.

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 2

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

#### **Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase.

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 6

#### **Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

#### **Please comment**

Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase.

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Your proposal has our rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase. It appears we have another \$86 increase in rates to fund Queenstown catchment management, Again this needs to be targetted at the properties to benifit. Wanaka residents have had enough subsidising Queenstown infrastructure.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

More work needs to be done on Wilding pines. The Govt planted many of the pine forests and should pay for the damage they are causing.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Your proposal has our Wanaka rates increasing by 50% in the first year. This is unacceptable. We got a 4.5% increase in the pension, Happy to have a 4,5% increase. Your Estimate 2 looks much more realistic, I support this.

**Respondent: Kylie Dallas****Submission Number:** 118**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 08:39**About You****Comment Number:** 8**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 6**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I have my own challenges facing me as a householder and sole carer to a disabled child. So with cost of living going up and DCC rates going up...I can't afford ORC rates as well. So I would prefer if you left things as they are for the next few years.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I would like a freeze on any non essential (especially non essential environmental areas). I can't afford a rates increase.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 5**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I vote for no change, I can't afford a rates increase.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 9**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Absolutely no change. I can't afford to feed us let alone have an ORC rates increase on top of DCC.

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Not at the moment...to be reviewed in a few years...once we can afford living again.

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

No changes at this time.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Don't spend what you don't have!!!! BTW...this is the worst format of a feedback 'form' (not a form) I have ever completed. And I have been an administration supervisor being paid \$97,000 before I had to give up work to care 24/7 for my disabled child.

**Respondent: Mr Francis Van Woerkom****Submission Number:** 119**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 09:07**Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 10****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

User pays. If Queenstown needs a better public transport system then the people of Queenstown need to pay for it! That's why I choose not to live there or visit. Would Hamilton pay for Auckland's public transport? No!

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think****!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 7****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 9****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

U

<b>~ORC's must-do work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 6</b>
<b>~Environment</b>	<b>Comment Number: 4</b>
<b>~Transport</b>	<b>Comment Number: 8</b>
<b>Financial Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 5</b>

**Respondent: Mr Mike Cooper****Submission Number:** 120**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 16:02**About You****Comment Number:** 1**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 11**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

User pays. Don't leave the burden on rate

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 7**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 9**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 12

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

100%

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No



**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

100%

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Areas pay

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

A

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 8**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I dont agree with the proposed rates increases for funding of buses. It should be i=user pages. Why do the home owners have to subsidise buses to meet the councils wish list. Let the bus users pay

**Respondent: Mr Harley Bedford**

**Submission Number:** 121

---

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 19:34

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: Ray Parker****Submission Number:** 122**On-behalf of:** Springwater Ag Limited**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 23:50**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Level of spend on Taieri Flood and Drainage Schemes (the Schemes): The Plan indicates a total level of spending on the Schemes of \$34.8m, up from \$19.9m in the 2021/31 plan. SAL has meet with several practical farmers located within the Schemes and they are unanimous in their view that the spend is excessive, unjustified and, in some instances, a frivolous waste of rate payers' money. For several years SAL, along with others, have been promoting the use of a liaison group (LG) to help ORC executive and councillors with understanding the Schemes and how they can be effectively and efficiently operated. SAL is certain that restoring this group would lead to widespread efficiencies and result in significant savings for ratepayers, whilst still achieving a satisfactory level of service and risk profile for the Schemes. When the ORC agreed to hold the Schemes rates at last year's level until a review was undertaken, they also undertook to look at how they could re-establish a LG.

**SAL requests** that the ORC provides that in year one of the Plan, the ORC will establish a LG for the Schemes, with appropriate ratepayer appointees and the LG is tasked with working alongside the ORC to maximise the efficiency of spend within the Schemes.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

SAL requests that the ORC, within year one of the Plan, appoint an independent advisor (IA) to undertake a comprehensive review of the Schemes' funding model, the scope of such review to be agreed with the LG (Liaison Group), and the IA be instructed to seek meaningful input from the LG in undertaking their review.

**Respondent: Gillian Newman**

**Submission Number:** 123

---

**Submission Date:** 21/04/24 23:51

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The priorities need to be:

- ensuring the health of our natural environment
- Maintaining Public Transport

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Happy to pay fair rates especially if they are correctly targeted

**Respondent: Margaret Pollitt**

**Submission Number:** 124

**Submission Date:** 22/04/24 00:19

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Steam Channel/Gordon Road spillway to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Rd Sth are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey spilt water from the Gordon Rd spillway to teh Upper Ponding Area as designed.

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed

## Respondent: Miss Lisa Boyd

Submission Number: 125

Submission Date: 22/04/24 00:26

### About You

Comment Number: 4

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 5

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 14

Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

Biggest challenge is the unjustified ORC rate increases

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 21

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

The focus should be steps to abolish ORC. A regional council is not necessary.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 11

Do you support this proposal?

\* No

What level of total funding should be available?

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 15

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

## Tell us what you think

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 6

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

### Please comment

Shouldn't have borrowed this much in the first place

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 17

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 19

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 16



**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

~ORC's must-do work	Comment Number: 2
~Environment	Comment Number: 9
~Climate change and Resilience	Comment Number: 18
~Transport	Comment Number: 8
~Regional Leadership	Comment Number: 12

**Do you have any feedback**

This leadership is wasteful spending

Infrastructure Strategy	Comment Number: 13
Financial Strategy	Comment Number: 3

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

ORC should be cutting it's operational expenditure, just like people have to tighten their spending in the current financial climate

How we fund our work	Comment Number: 20
----------------------	--------------------

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

ORC should be finding the money to pay back debts from within current rates revenue. There should not be an increase in rates to fund this. The rate payer did not agree to incur this debt

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I strongly oppose any rates increase

**Respondent: Mrs Renee Pearson**

**Submission Number: 126**

**Submission Date: 22/04/24 06:56**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I support the identified focus areas

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Early wilding pine control is proven to be cost effective

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

Addressing biodiversity loss with on the ground action should be a priority.

**Respondent: Ms Christina Shaw**

**Submission Number:** 127

---

**Submission Date:** 22/04/24 07:18

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**Respondent: Dr. Jacqueline Jensen**

**Submission Number: 128**

**Submission Date: 22/04/24 07:36**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

In this time of economic uncertainty and the rising costs of everything. Yes prices are up all across, however we are trying to hold on to our homes

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

This is a huge burden on elderly homeowners, I'm sure younger people too. The rates  
For regional and DCC are just putting us at terrible financial risk. There needs to be relief

## Respondent: Mr Logan Wallace

Submission Number: 129

Submission Date: 22/04/24 08:56

### About You

Comment Number: 6

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 3

#### Tell us what you think

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* No

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: not giving****Submission Number:** 130**Submission Date:** 22/04/24 22:26**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 15**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

good idea working with mana whenua as a group as they understand, care for and have mana over the land.  
 any technology that save \$\$ and helps environment worth investing in.  
 The government is a challenge very frustrating changing of government and time and money wasted  
 unfortunately climate change is going to need a lot of resources and investment.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 11**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

think these are good and needed. I think communities is really important as orc cant do everything themselves. I  
 think education is so important both ways.  
 Transport is really important and good to see looking at oportunities outside Dunedin and Queenstown

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 12**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 13**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

If we can get more people using then it is good. Parking and time taken to travel increasing.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes



**Please comment**

I don't like that wanaka etc are asking to fund what is essentially a Queenstown service. It should be more user pays to cover more of this cost

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 9****Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 4****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

It is really sad that the council have got in this position.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 7****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 14****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

- \* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 10****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 5**

## Respondent: Mrs Raewyn Golding

Submission Number: 131

Submission Date: 22/04/24 23:11

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

#### Please comment

They have no affect on me as we don't have a bus service in Central Otago!

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 17

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

#### Please comment

As stated previously we bus services in QLDC do not relate or affect me

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 11

#### Any other feedback?

I don't agree on paying for services that I will not be using ever here in Central Otago!

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 13

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 18

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

I don't agree on adding new proposals for further funding in this economic climate

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 12**

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 10**

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 6**

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback**

I don't agree with this proposal as it will not affect me in my location now or in the foreseeable

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

Does not affect me as there will not be any transport services to my location so don't agree with this proposal

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

It sounds like how most people are trying to manage their budgets in this ever increasing and demanding economic climate! No more

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Not happy with the amount of debt due to 'organisational' structural spending in every year! A huge cost to the regional area's! Also it seems an ongoing forever cost to us as ratepayers - just saying!

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Like most people on limited budgets not happy but can't do anything about it apart from comment which won't change the ever increasing

## Respondent: Mra Loretta Grant

Submission Number: 132

Submission Date: 22/04/24 23:17

### About You

Comment Number: 6

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

Yes, feel all borrowing should be cleared before spending more on anything

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

Keep all focus areas stable and pay back loans

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* No

#### What level of total funding should be available?

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

**Please comment**

Maintain what is in place effectively, changes may be needed to timetable to accommodate more people but restrict it to areas that use this service

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

The wider public should not have to pay to upgrade a service they do not or never have had access to, review other areas when debts are cleared

**Respondent: Mrs Susan Broad****Submission Number:** 133**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 00:58**About You****Comment Number:** 7**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 3**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I do not support an increase in investment primarily due to the fact I and my fellow Outram residents will derive no benefit but have noted the proposal will have a significant affect on our rates \$164! Outram/Allanton residents rarely opt for car travel to Mosgiel (nearest bus service) then switch to buses. Why bother? so we are left subsidising others. If there was some kind of service incorporating the Airport via Allanton with a park and ride then I imagine we Outram residents would accept a fixed rate but until then we are left out of the "bus loop" so to speak. It seems odd that bus services are available to some outlying settlements such as Palmerston but no option for the Airport given the large number of vehicle movements to and from and the dangerous parking along rural roads adjacent to the airport. My other gripe with the bus services is on behalf of my Mother in Law who is now unable to catch a bus to her medical centre in Mosgiel, her Western bus loop is no longer travelling down Mure Street, Shaw Street and Inglis Street. She is unable to walk from the Argyle Street stop to the medical centre. She now has to arrange a ride with family



**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 5****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

While I disagree that rating for transport should not be based on property value, this concept seems ludicrous to me as property value has no impact on the operating of a bus service, I do feel commercial businesses that would benefit from ease of efficient transport should have a targeted rate ie central business district of Dunedin and Queenstown. I do not appreciate being expected to fund a public transport system that I have no ability to use.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 6****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Repayment over 5 years seems the most acceptable option

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 1****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

My concerns regarding the targeted rating around flood protection schemes are many. I note that the usual targeting involves those property owners who might derive benefit from investment in protection schemes but benefit can be seen in several ways. For instance Outram hopes to derive benefit from future work on the flood protection adjacent to the township, securing homes and lives in the event of a catastrophic failure of the present system. There are others who equally derive benefit in their ability to secure a flow from their properties into the flood protection schemes' many drains and streams, it could be said their 'runoff' creates further pressure on the very flood bank that protects vulnerable communities from devastation. So we can ask the question who derives benefit in a more broad fashion? In the case of Outram the catchment of Strath Taieri contributes profoundly to the vulnerability of our flood protection but to my knowledge pays no targeted rate towards the eminent and very necessary upgrade of the flood bank scheme. As we debate the targeting of rates in respect of benefit I note we in Outram are now expected to contribute to the Leith Flood Zone, I appreciate that the scheme secures elements of Dunedin infrastructure all residents depend on but I also am aware that significant property within the boundary of this scheme make no or very little contribution. If targeting is true to its name then it must be applied in a fair and equitable way surely.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Once again, I expect the concept of 'targeting' to be fully reviewed and applied in an equitable way before proportionate rates are distributed across all Otago rate payers. The term 'benefit' requires better definition in all ways.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

After attending a drop in session I have noted that the general rate presently applied to all of Otago has elements of undisclosed rates subsidy for area/districts outside the rate payers own. I was unaware of this practice, I see it is the preferred option to distribute up to 20% of specific flood and drainage schemes over the general region. I personally feel this is unfair particularly when it is undisclosed. As an Outram resident who pays an exorbitant amount in Lower Taieri Flood protection rates I would feel aggrieved to be expected to pay for the Alexandra, Clutha scheme or Leith scheme as well, particularly in an undisclosed fashion.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 4****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I absolutely do not support the present proposal to reduce the benefit zones for flood and drainage. I note the Lower Taieri Flood protection schemes WF1 and WF2 are to be amalgamated into a single zone one. I also note the ORC are embarking on a massive overspend to the Contour Channel at the base of Maungatua Mountain range. By amalgamating these two targeted rate areas this now puts the burden of financing the ridiculous overspend on the contour channel onto the already substantially over rated residents of Outram, who will have to accept a paltry \$5m to try and stabilize their flood protection. I note in the preferred option the residents of the existing WF1 zone are expecting a rates decrease while the residents of Outram (WF2) will be hit with another! substantial increase. I also note that the residents of Mosgiel make little contribution to the Lower Taieri Flood scheme but derive substantial benefit by being able to distribute their storm water into several drainage/flood protection options. Ensuring their properties remain high and dry but contributing to the woes of Outram who have no right to distribute storm water into the same catchment and rely on storm water 'storage' in their residential developments. I also note there is no targeted rate on Strath Taieri property owners who also have the benefit of draining flood water into the Taieri but make not contribution to the stabilizing of the flood banks protecting Outram, again the "Who derives benefit?" question. Instead of reducing the benefit zones I suggest they should be extended or in fact new ones created.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

After attending a drop in session with the ORC my attention was drawn to the Infrastructure Strategy 2024 - 2054, in particular page 41. I note that on top of existing massive partially funded program to upgrade the Contour Channel Resilience, the ORC intend to continue with an excessively expensive and entirely unnecessary program over the next 30 years on what is affectively a drain for Maungatua run off. This run off affects only farmland and a small number of homes with a relatively small population and totals nearly \$40m! on top of the already huge investment to date. I can only ask WHY? while Outram, a residential township of over 400 properties, 70 of which were established after the 2017 flood with values in excess of \$1m, remains behind a potentially unstable flood bank? Since the last major flood event in 2017, where some residents were evacuated due to fears for the unstable flood bank, our rates have climbed exponentially, yet we have seen little resilience upgrade. We live in an environment exposed to potential catastrophic flooding and also potential loss of life yet it has taken over four full years for any small amount of stabilizing work to be done on our flood protection. Meanwhile we will now be expected to contribute to a drain overspend of outrageous proportions. (Lower Taieri Flood Protection Zone one) ORC councilors and employees may not be aware of the fact that Outram becomes cutoff from all road evacuation during an event as large as 2017. Residents are left often with no power and due to poor telecommunication infrastructure, no means of communication. By prioritizing drainage of farmland exponentially more than the loss of life and homes in Outram, the ORC is endangering Outram residents with no means of escape. I see this unwarranted infrastructure overspend (Contour Channel) has been scrutinized in the press recently in an opinion piece by an ex council member, I challenge the ORC to justify their priorities in this instance. Justify them to the

over rated and under protected residents of Outram. Otherwise if the ORC is unwilling to provide resilient protection from flood then it must do it's utmost to prevent any further development of residential property in Outram so as not to expose further unsuspecting residents to an unsafe environment.

**Respondent: Ngaire Weaver**

**Submission Number:** 134

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 01:53

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Please be aware not everyone can afford to pay the rates let alone your proposed increase. You work for us but you are being tone deaf regarding people's ability to pay, doesn't look good getting a brand new building and proposing rates for years you aren't evn voted in for. Get real, the cost of living is crippling most people and your proposal is not affordable.

**Respondent: Brian Fitzpatrick**

**Submission Number:** 135

**On-behalf of:** Remarkables Park

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 01:57

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

RPL is generally supportive of the LTP proposals for better targeting of rates and, by way of example, RPL accepts that there will be targeted rates for public transport in Queenstown and Dunedin that do not apply in other parts of the region. However, RPL is concerned that when the average rates proposed to be paid by ratepayers in separate parts of the region are compared, the outcome is inequitable. At present the average rates charged to a Queenstown ratepayer are 8.45% higher than the average rates charged to a Dunedin ratepayer.

**Respondent: Laurence Ashworth Brownyn Miles**

**Submission Number:** 136

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:00

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Steam Channel/Gordon Road spillway to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Rd Sth are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey spilt water from the Gordon Rd spillway to teh Upper Ponding Area as designed.

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed

**Respondent: Harry Andrew**

**Submission Number: 137**

**Submission Date: 23/04/24 02:02**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Request a service up the east coast. Gives suggested timetable

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

#### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 11

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Efficiencies needed via reducing the reliance on consultants



**Respondent: Lynn Samuels**

**Submission Number: 138**

**Submission Date: 23/04/24 02:09**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Spread too thin - stick to basics and avoid the nice to have's

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Buses are underused - adding more will not improve use

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I have no public transportation within 10km of my home Those that benefit should pay I do support a uniform rate

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Ratepayers are not a bottomless pit for money. ORC also needs to make cuts as well.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

Do not benefit from Flood Protection for my property

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Stop wasting money on vanity projects, cut managers, consultants and various gravy-train employees

**Respondent: Jenny Burt Geoff Thompson**

**Submission Number:** 139

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:10

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Request urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. This work needs to be carried out immediately and not over a period of time. . If the Spillway is not immediately restored to its full capacity, it is only a matter of time before another event will put life and property at risk.

The submission gives details about the M4/M3 drainage

**Respondent: John Shanks**

**Submission Number:** 140

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:12

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Have your say why, you just go and do what you want to do anyway.

**Respondent: Terry Drayton**

**Submission Number:** 141

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:14

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Totally oppose subsidizing Queenstown transport as a wanaka ratepayer. With the rapid increase in new housing surely these substantial rate increases are not fair to existing residents, time to look at targeting more user pays than blanket across the board increases.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I would support an increase online with inflation but we are a long way short of that.

Let's get back to affordable living, user pays and targeted increases on new dwellings as that is where the need for increased services is generated.

**Respondent: Richard and Jennifer Quelch**

**Submission Number:** 142

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:16

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Request ORC to:

- Restore design capacity to the Silver Stream and provide ongoing maintenance in the LTP
- Rates levied for above that reflects a broader benefit
- Mill creek diversion should be grated to prevent reverse flow in flood
- The impediment to flow caused by the height of Riccarton Rd West, below the bridge be addressed by resizing culverts and pipes.

**Respondent: Caroline Davies**

**Submission Number:** 143

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:17

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

All I want to say is NO NO NO (NO MEANS NO!) on raising our rates, yet again!!

No apologies here at all - we don't have infinitely deep pockets as you are assuming we all do.

Between you, the DCC, the current govt., the cost of food, the cost of energy, even the cost of home repairs is out of reach for many (oh including us)...Seriously - what are you thinking?



**Respondent: Tom Scott****Submission Number:** 144**On-behalf of:** National Public Health Service Te Waipounamu**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:19**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

NPHS Te Waipounamu believes the biggest challenges facing ORC are managing the impacts of climate change and getting traction on the proposed Water and Land Plan acknowledging impending changes to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

NPHS Te Waipounamu commends Otago Regional Council on a thorough and transparent Draft Long Term Plan.

The strongest recommendation that we wish to make is that if we are to improve the health and wellbeing of our population, collaborative action across all national, regional, and local government agencies needs to be taken on all health determinants with a focus on addressing the needs of the most disadvantaged parts of society. While we acknowledge that ORC's remit is very clearly on environmental determinants, we contend that this must be framed in addressing the needs of those parts of our society who are most disadvantaged. While we acknowledge that ORC does this to some extent with public transport, air quality and climate change mitigation (South Dunedin), there needs to be sustained effort in this regard. Over the next 10 years we look forward to working closely with the ORC to build a healthy, connected environment with our communities. We also look forward to mutually working together to achieve equity for our communities.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**~Environment****Comment Number:** 4**Do you have any feedback**

NPHS Te Waipounamu has supported ORC on the development of their Water and Land plan through participation in some of the catchment conversations and high-level input on some of the underpinning principles. We look forward to supporting ORC as the current process is concluded and we would like to provide support for its implementation as required.

27. Air quality has a significant impact on respiratory health primarily from particulate matter and specific chemicals of concern including Sulphur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). NPHS Te Waipounamu supports extending the focus on air quality to Milton as this is a more disadvantaged (higher deprivation<sup>7</sup>) community than Alexandra, Cromwell and Arrowtown. As air quality has a very real impact on public health<sup>13</sup>, we would welcome the opportunity to work with you on updating the Regional Air Quality Strategy.

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 5**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

NPHS Te Waipounamu appreciates the work ORC have underway with the Climate Change Strategy. In conjunction with ORC, we are currently working with Local Authorities across Otago to see if there is value in replicating workshops that were undertaken in the Canterbury Region looking at understanding the human health impacts of climate change across Otago.

## Respondent: Rodger and Helen Grant

Submission Number: 145

Submission Date: 23/04/24 02:20

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Buses are empty

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 2

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 3

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 4

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

Forestry should pay for wilding pines

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Keep assets

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

No debt- don't do things that aren't funded

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

keep increase to absolute minimum

**Respondent: Julian Mumford**

**Submission Number:** 146

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:26

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Concerned about the past and planned level of rate increase

2022 - \$681

2023 - \$815

2024 - \$1234

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Little if any benefit to Wanaka

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Only want to pay for services that we can use and enjoy in Wanaka

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: Gerrard Eckhoff**

**Submission Number:** 147

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:33

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

ORC needs to focus on being an advisory environmental service and not a local authority

Partial sale of Port

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

user pays

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

What are the projects- what are the benefits to whom?

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

Nothing we or ORC will do will make a difference

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

That is for DCC, CODC and Lakes to manage - not the ORC.

No electrification

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

River authorities vs regional control is especially important

Contact energy pay for gravel clearance at confluence of Clutha and Manuherikia- so what work are we paying for?



**Respondent: Sandra Lukeman**

**Submission Number:** 148

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:53

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I would like to have more frequent services for all areas and focused around the peak times of the day.

**Respondent: Barbara and Trevor Braid**

**Submission Number:** 149

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 02:55

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Estimate 2 would be our choice less Lower Taieri flood bank.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Why are we in Outram paying for Lower Taieri Flood protection.- don't support.

## Respondent: Whakatipu Wilding Conifer Control Group Inc (WCG)

Submission Number: 150

Submission Date: 23/04/24 03:16

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 3

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 1

Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

\* No

Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change

**Whakatipu Wilding Control Group (WCG) submit against supporting ORC's preferred Option 1 with proposed changes and instead WCG prefer Option 2 with no change.**

**Option 2. Continue to use the wilding tree rate as follows.**

*"The amount budgeted for supporting wilding pine groups (\$250,000) will be rated separately through the wilding tree rate.*

*This rate is charged to all properties in Otago on a uniform basis. The fixed amount per rate unit for this is \$2.42. This applies to over 119,000 properties. "*

**WCG don't support Option 1 as a preferred option with proposed changes:**

**Option 1.**

**Discontinue the wilding tree rate**

*We propose to discontinue the wilding tree rate and fund support for wilding conifer groups through the existing biosecurity rate.*

*The amount budgeted for supporting wilding pine groups (\$250,000) will be included in the biosecurity rate requirement.*

*This rate would be charged to all properties in Otago on a land value basis. The average rate amount will be \$2.31. This applies to over 124,000 properties.*

*As this rate is based on land value, properties with higher land values will pay higher amounts than this.*

**Why does WCG submit against the preferred Option?**

- 1 WCG understand that Option 1 is the preferred option for wilding control funding and that the proposed separate reserve within the targeted biosecurity rate would be ring fenced and also that the proposed change is to simply smooth rates.
- 2 However, we believe the wilding tree rate would lose transparency if removed as a targeted rate and would not be as clear to ratepayers if it is buried as proposed in the Biosecurity rate. What the October 2023 “Benefits and Costs of Additional Investment in Wilding conifer Control in the Otago Region” Report shows is a massive Benefit:Cost Ratio (BCR of 96) with the “Minimum Protect the Investment” scenario and shows what future costs will look like if little control is undertaken. WCG consider it is beneficial for ratepayers to continue to view on their ORC rates bill a targeted wilding tree rate and the current miniscule amount they fund towards wilding control per household (especially when considering Polyakov’s 2021 household survey “Willingness to pay for wilding conifer control” which shows the average household willing to pay up to “\$105 a year for five years...”). WCG consider it would be beneficial to continue the transparent targeted rate so as to keep ratepayers and elected members informed, but to also further increase education to ratepayers about the consequences of wilding spread if total funding is not adequate.
- 3 If wilding control is not funded adequately, other biodiversity projects are put at risk from wilding spread and there is potential for biodiversity funds to be wasted. If a separate targeted rate is maintained and not buried in the biosecurity rate as proposed, this is more likely to keep the issue front and centre in ratepayers minds so that it can be weighed up alongside biodiversity funding.
- 4 The wilding targeted rate is negligible at \$2.42 per rate unit and changing from the current uniform basis to a land value basis could have the unfair effect of penalising households living in a high capital value area but who are also likely to be pressured with higher interest, rates and insurance costs and these ratepayers may see it as an unfair increase in their wilding rate.
- 5 WCG are pleased to note the proposed increase for wildings from \$200,000, (which has traditionally been distributed to Whakatipu WCG and Central Otago WCG), to \$250,000 but it is unclear why it has increased. Does the increase include distributing funding to other wilding groups? Or is the increase to account for inflation adjustments as previously lobbied for by WCG? As there has been no adjustment for inflation to the wilding rate over many years, its value has substantially decreased over time. WCG submit that if inflation hasn’t been accounted for, that this oversight be remedied, and the amount be adjusted for inflation as WCG has previously submitted over numerous years.
- 6 WCG appreciate the 4.4.24 letter of congratulations from the ORC Chairperson, Gretchen Robertson for the Shotover MU “outstanding achievement” of moving to a maintenance only phase. “Our combined goals of protecting both the natural landscape of Otago and native biodiversity by reducing the spread of wilding conifers...” will only be realised if both funding and education of our community are supported in every way possible. The recent ORC media release reiterates this message by quoting the chair - “...adequate funding is still needed to control seedling regrowth and to control wildings on neighbouring management areas so that wind-blown seed doesn’t re-infest the Shotover management area”. WCG see the removal of the ORC targeted rate for wilding trees as a step backwards from achieving the combined goals of ORC and WCG.
- 7 WCG would like to draw attention to the disappointingly low percentage of our total funding that comes from ORC and to signal that we will continue to press for a much larger percentage and actual wilding contribution, particularly in light of the reduced funding coming from Central Government, which enhances the need and argument for a targeted rate.

WCG appreciate the time and energy that elected members have given to grow their understanding of this important issue and sincerely thank relevant ORC staff for their dedication to our wilding control programme of works

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

No

**Respondent: Pierre Marasti**

**Submission Number:** 151

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 04:01

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 11

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We need to accelerate even more the electrification of public transport.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 10

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We need to urgently electrify all buses in Queenstown.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 5****Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

With a Climate Change perspective, I support necessary flood protection work keeping in mind that managed retreat will be necessary at some point, but I do not want to participate (pay for) in the destruction of wetlands through drainage. Drained areas are the first ones we need to retreat from and we should start rewilding them right away.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

It is good to have more visibility into our environmental problems. But I do not understand why less properties are paying in the current system? I do not wish to see this change but I would like to have 124,000 properties paying for it as in the new proposal.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback**

I fully support more environmental work being done.

And in the context of Climate Change, the Otago Regional Council needs to use its mandate to monitor air quality to accelerate the electrification of the country by banning new fossil fuel vehicles and new houses being built with fossil fuel appliances (gas, diesel,...) or with log burners.

Now that we know that electrified homes, beyond being more sustainable, are also cheaper to run, it is way past time we start banning polluting machines and appliances. Air quality monitoring is a great way to enforce this change as beyond their climate impact all burning appliances are also making us sick through the pollution they generate.

<https://www.rewiring.nz/electric-homes-report>

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 12****Do you have any feedback**

Climate change mitigation must be our constant priority

**~Transport****Comment Number: 13****Do you have any feedback**

We need as soon as possible a fully electrified public transport system, not only in the largest towns but as well between them.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 8****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

On the infrastructure side, in preparation for Climate Change, we must include as well planning for managed retreat from areas we will not be able to save whatever amount of money we'll throw at it.

**Respondent: Jo Ashe Marasti**

**Submission Number:** 152

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 04:01

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

It is important that we accelerate the electrification of public transport.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes



**Please comment**

All busses in Queenstown need to be electrified.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

I support flood protection in areas affected by Climate change. However I don't support unnecessary drainage of wetland areas, as these areas should be rewilded.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

It is good to see where the rates are going.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

I support all environmental work done in the region. This needs to be done at the same time as reducing our emissions for the region.

The ORC can use their air quality mandate to enforce a reduction of fossil fuel powered machines and appliances. Log burners should also be replaced by clean electric heating systems.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

Climate change mitigation must be our constant priority.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have any feedback**

As soon as possible, we need a fully electrified transport system. Within the towns, and also linking the towns together.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Managed retreat from flood prone areas must also be included within the infrastructure strategy.

**Respondent: Otago Peninsula Community Board****Submission Number:** 153**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 04:07**About You****Comment Number:** 4**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 2**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 1**Please comment**

• With the proposed acceleration of the Peninsula road widening project, cyclists will increase on the road but also we expect the possibility of using the bus to take a bike one way and then ride home, will become a popular trend. The Board submits that buses need to be able to accommodate cycles inside as they do in other countries.

• The Board submits that a continuation of the live information on timetable delays of the current service be continued for our community of commuters. • Consultation and implementation of bilingual place names and signage on the Otago Peninsula including work with the ORC over bus signage as pictured. • That the Otago Regional extend the Peninsula service to Taiaroa Head • That the current turnaround area at Harington Point be altered via the above route change to accomodate the elderly and school users

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 5**Any other feedback?**

Public transport is essential for many people within our Otago Peninsula community and the efficiency and regularity of that service must be continued to ensure our community thrives. The Council have made improvements to the route of the service and recently staff have altered the afternoon timetable in consultation with the Board and the community. This has been a significant improvement for our community, However, like any service improvements could make the service more attractive to Peninsula users. • With the proposed acceleration of the Peninsula road widening project, cyclists will increase on the road but also we expect the possibility of using the bus to take a bike one way and then ride home, will become a popular trend. The Board submits that buses need to be able to accommodate cycles inside as they do in other countries. • The Board submits that a continuation of the live

information on timetable delays of the current service be continued for our community of commuters. • Consultation and implementation of bilingual place names and signage on the Otago Peninsula including work with the ORC over bus signage as pictured. • That the Otago Regional extend the Peninsula service to Taiaroa Head • That the current turnaround area at Harington Point be altered via the above route change to accommodate the elderly and school users

## ~Environment

Comment Number: 3

### Do you have any feedback

#### Biosecurity – Pest Plants and Animals

- The Board submits that this should be a priority for the Otago Regional Council so that conservation and biodiversity gains made on the Peninsula and other areas are able to be built on and enlarged.
- It is the submission of the Peninsula Community Board that resources in control, research and advocacy are required from the Otago Regional Council to support landowners and organisations who are undertaking this type of animal control on the Otago Peninsula. Again there is opportunity for information and resource sharing from the ORC and other agencies.

**Respondent: Ms Steff Todd**

**Submission Number:** 154

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 09:49

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Public transport is absolutely not working at all .....firstly the bus app and real time is very unreliable , much like the drivers . You can never guarantee the bus is where it should be , or guarantee the drivers will actually stop to pick you up .when you have appointments or work commitments you can't rely on public transport .....very sad as it's affordable compared to car costs.

Household via the rates should not have to pay for a unreliable resource and especially if the household do not use the bus service .Why should be fund a service we don't use? As households we fund ALOT that we do not use but there comes a time when that line has to stop !!!!

**Respondent: Mr Josef Fodie**

**Submission Number: 155**

**Submission Date: 23/04/24 17:12**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 21**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The challenge otago us going to have is the constant increases in the cost of living. Over the last few years orc has raised the rates by almost 500%. People are struggling as it is let alone adding another large rate increase

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The dog parks are in a sorry state. The rivers around dunedin are in a disgusting state it's a joke

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

### ~ORC's must-do work

Comment Number: 17

**Do you have any feedback**

Transport and climate change are nice to have but must do work. Your climate change goals will have us starving and unemployed

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 15

**Do you have any feedback**

Focus on cleaning up the rivers instead wasting more time and money on pointless discussions

### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 22

**Do you have any feedback**

No

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 20

**Do you have any feedback**

Your anti car framework is detrimental to all of Otago. It's not feasible to expect the area to thrive when you keep removing car parking and trying to force people out of their cars

### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 13

**Do you have any feedback**

ORC should be disbanded and all their tasks covered by local councils. Then some work might actually get done

### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 12

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

The focus should be on getting the rivers healthy



**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Poor planning

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I believe your constant rate increases are robbing otago residents blind.for years you took the money and did nothing of value and now claim you need more and more

**Respondent: Mr Nick Feaver**

**Submission Number:** 156

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 20:46

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

The option for change that everyone wants is not in the list. - here i will add it for you dissolve ORC and leave decisions about rating up to each districts individual councils. Nobody wants ORC. I mean all you have to do is read the comments on your posts on Facebook to figure it out. ORC is Just another leach on peoples bank accounts. Its disgusting to be honest. Tyrannical [REDACTED].

**Respondent: mr alexander penny**

**Submission Number:** 157

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 21:16

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number:** 4

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

if the service cannot run for a profit scrap it and look at other transport measures.these busses run empty all day long spewing out fumes,its a disgrace and a waste of money

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

on demand bus service ,used like UBER who actually know how to turn a profit

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have any feedback**

You chop down wilding pines and pay for carbon credits for planting pines !!!!

just stop spending our money and keep the rates the same in the next couple of years ,people are on their knees and will be loosing their houses to the bank this year and yet you take no notice .Let them eat cake eh....

**~Environment**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Do you have any feedback**

Use the present rates wisely and do not increase it at all ,cut back your expenses and balance your budget .This is how a business works ....

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number:** 5

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Stop the increases and just work with what you have , we are all broke and you blunder ahead building new offices and ever increasing your staff numbers to produce these such wonderful documents for an excuse to fleece our poor elderly population.We cant take any more ...

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

DISGUSTED

**Respondent: Lauren Riddle****Submission Number:** 158**On-behalf of:** Otago Peninsula Community Board**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 21:30**~Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

The Board submits that this should be a priority for the Otago Regional Council so that conservation and biodiversity gains made on the Peninsula and other areas are able to be built on and enlarged.

The rabbit problem in our community is high and this creates serious problems with predator/prey relationships for our area due to increased numbers of mustelids surviving on rabbits. This creates high risk for iconic species of birdlife such as Yellow-eyed Penguin and Blue Penguin through predation that the Peninsula and the City relies on for economic wealth and development. While the Otago Peninsula Biodiversity Trust has made excellent inroads in the possum numbers of the Peninsula and has formed a model of community led control, the opportunity is now required to extend that model onto the rabbit/mustelid issues that we have on the Peninsula.

- It is the submission of the Peninsula Community Board that resources in control, research and advocacy are required from the Otago Regional Council to support landowners and organisations who are undertaking this type of animal control on the Otago Peninsula. Again there is opportunity for information and resource sharing from the ORC and other agencies.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**

Consultation and implementation of bilingual place names and signage on the Otago Peninsula including work with the ORC over bus signage as pictured.

- That the Otago Regional extend the Peninsula service to Taiaroa Head
- That the current turnaround area at Harington Point be altered via the above route change to accommodate the elderly and school users.

**Respondent: Richard Bowman national Wilding Pine Network**

**Submission Number:** 159

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 22:23

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

See comments under 'Environment

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Request the Council to raise the priority of the wilding conifer problem in its Long Term Plan. This would enable the provision of more financial as well as political support to increase the level of funding and to allow the programme to be completed in both Otago and across New Zealand over the next decade.

The submission provides background about the reasons for this request

**Respondent: Mrs Jody Louw****Submission Number: 160****Submission Date: 23/04/24 23:11****~Transport****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**

I would like to wholeheartedly support the proposed bus between Dunedin and Balclutha for these reasons:

1. Trips to and from the airport would enable and increase visits to our region.
2. Trips to medical appointments and hospital visits involve long drives from Balclutha and often require two people to take time off work as the patient is not able to drive back. Public transport would help to alleviate the 'postal code' lottery system for public health in our region. It would also ensure that productivity increases in our region by preventing the need for people to take off work just to drive the patient/service user there and back.
3. Children attending boarding school in Dunedin would have access to public transport to travel home on weekends. This also applies to children of divorced parents wanting to visit the other parent on a week-about basis or children wanting to visit grandparents.
4. Commuters, including teachers, mental health professionals, doctors and meatworks staff would have access to public transport.
5. The congestion on SH1 would be significantly alleviated, saving money on roadworks, preventing delays and saving lives. One only has to look at the line of traffic that occurs every time there is something on at the stadium.
6. When accommodation is sold out in Dunedin for stadium concerts and events, punters would easily have access to accommodation in Balclutha - thus boosting our regional economy.
7. Shopping, cinema-going and attendance of local events would be boosted by people being able to use public transport between Milton and Balclutha.
8. The bus could even include transport for some parcels from Dunedin.
9. Locums coming down on a weekly basis would have access to public transport.
10. Traffic emissions would be significantly decreased, there would be fewer cars on SH1 and people would feel connected to their whanau, their workplaces and centres for health and wellbeing.

Thank-you for considering my submission and I wish you well as you endeavour to improve the quality of life for all in our region.

Regards

Jody Louw

**Respondent: Johanna Morris**

**Submission Number:** 161

---

**Submission Date:** 23/04/24 23:26

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I wish to reject estimate 1 on the rates rise.

I object also on the fact that only the people in the area are forced to pay for the huge raise. This should be a cost that is distributed amongst all ORC rate payers



## Respondent: Dugald Mactavish Wise Response

Submission Number: 162

Submission Date: 24/04/24 01:48

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

The submission suggests changes against the ORC Draft Goals for:

Partnership

Community

Environment

Resilience

Landuse and Climate Change

Transport

**Respondent: Fran Davies**

**On-behalf of:** Heritage New Zealand

**Submission Number:** 163

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 02:15

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Council retains the community outcomes and initiatives supported by HNZPT, as outlined in this submission.

ORC have regard to archaeological sites and work with HNZPT regarding ORC work.

**Respondent: Mr Mike Hammond**

**Submission Number:** 164

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 02:16

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Keep existing subsidies on buses for Gold card users, under 15yr olds & tertiary students.

Support existing and future cycleway proposals, including connections to North & South of Dunedin.

**Respondent: Mr GRANT HOWIE****Submission Number:** 165**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 02:42**About You****Comment Number:** 2**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 11**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

1. Public Transport should be 100% user-pays. Having a collective tax to pay for other people's transport never works. It is inefficient and very wasteful. This can be seen everyday with empty buses traveling the streets of Dunedin. If a private business ran it, as it used to be, then timetables would be focused on consumer needs not some ORC Planners' whims that are clearly wrong and not being adjusted. 2. The proposed plan for electric buses is quite frankly ridiculous. The \$289 million should not be spent (and is very likely to be much more than this). Switching ORC buses to electricity just means less hydropower is available to go to the NI. This means that the NI burns more Indonesian coal to generate electricity. Which means more CO2 emissions not less. Even if this was not true (which it is), spending \$289 million on electric buses will not make a measurable difference to global CO2 emissions. So a zero impact on any theoretical climate model let alone the actual climate. \$289 million equates to more than \$5,000 per Ratepayer in Dunedin. That is an extraordinary sum. Lastly, where is the ORC cost-benefit analysis on the massive \$289 million spend? Even if net emissions went to zero it would still be a very expensive method on a cost per MT of CO2. 3. The expected useful life of an electric bus is only 8 years. Their batteries quickly degrade, down to just 30% capacity. That means more charging time, more buses and regular replacements. So is the ORC actually saying that we would have to spend another \$300m in 8 years time to replace the worn out buses? How on earth does this plan even make it through to this stage?

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 4

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

1. No to electric buses - see previous comments under the Dunedin City Buses. The exact same argument holds here. It is quite frankly financial lunacy! 2. Buses in Queenstown need to be privatised and 100% user pays. This is a tourist town, why should Ratepayers pay for tourists to travel on ORC buses? Let private companies develop consumer-focused solutions to transport needs. Stop wasting Ratepayers money.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 6****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

No way! As a Dunedin resident, why would I pay for Queenstown buses??? This just makes the collective tax model even worse. User Pays on all buses. ORC gets out of the bus business altogether.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

This just illustrates all my previous points about ORC buses - and just makes me even more angry! ORC should not be running buses. Making an \$11.2 million loss then funding it through debt is beyond belief! What are you doing? This is completely nuts. If you were Directors of a private bus company and trading at a loss and pretty much insolvent (because now you have to repay that debt), then you would all be financially liable.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

In summary - just stop! This entire public bus plan is a financial disaster that you are simply passing onto Ratepayers.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 5****!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 9****~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 12****Do you have any feedback**

Your current plan has the wrong focus. The biggest threat from the environment in Otago is a major earthquake on the Alpine Fault. This threat isn't even mentioned. Civil Defence systems and infrastructure across Otago have to be strengthened to plan for this coming event. We know it will happen, and it is more than likely to be within the next 50 years.

The section on Climate Change is simply virtue signaling and makes no sense. NZ has a cap-and-trade ETS whereby emissions from all fossil fuels are capped and taxed automatically. So any investment that the ORC makes into, for example, expensive electric buses, has zero impact on NZ's total emissions. All it does is frees up carbon credits for other emitters to buy on the ETS. This is a well-understood economic principle of cap and trade schemes.

Furthermore, from what I have read, the ORC is basing its Climate Change scenarios on the IPCC RCP 8.5. Even the UN has stopped using this scenario as it is so extreme in its alarmism. The ORC is over-exaggerating and using 'fear-porn' to create public anxiety over Climate change impacts in Otago. To claim we are facing severe extreme weather events like never seen before is simply rubbish. Have a read on the NIWA site about the 1868 storm that hit NZ including Otago ([https://hwe.niwa.co.nz/event/February\\_1868\\_New\\_Zealand\\_Storm](https://hwe.niwa.co.nz/event/February_1868_New_Zealand_Storm)). 37 deaths and 12 shipwrecks from what appears to be an ex-tropical cyclone. Otago was affected massively. So, don't hide behind false flags of CO2-induced severe weather events. Invest Ratepayers money in mitigating real risks - Alpine Fault Earthquakes.

#### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 10

##### Do you have any feedback

See my previous comments on climate change. Yes, Otago has flood risks. Read up on the 1868 floods to get some historical background and perspective. Only spend mitigation money where there is a real, verifiable risk. Do not use the IPCC's RCP 8.5 otherwise, you will waste scarce funds. Be realistic not alarmist.

And, again, where is the Alpine Fault Earthquake plan? Do we even have one?

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 3

##### Do you have any feedback

All buses should be run by private companies and not the ORC. People who choose to ride on a bus should pay for that service.

The ORC clearly can not operate an efficient bus service. You have continually lost money. Otago Ratepayers can not be expected to continually fund loss-making ventures. And your plans to invest eye-watering \$'s into expanding these inefficient services, and to electrify the buses is simply irresponsible.

Your opening statement below reeks of elitist nonsense;

"We anticipate that how people get around needs to change (e.g. shift from cars to public transport, cycling and walking) for environmental and wellbeing reasons.

We're working towards a transport system that helps people to get around and connects our communities, while also reducing congestion and supporting wellbeing. We're committed to providing efficient, reliable and accessible public transport that meets our communities' needs."

Why do you lot decide that we all need to walk more? And to then charge us all with massive rates increases for the pleasure!!

I strongly oppose any ORC-operated bus services. Sell them back to private operators who know what they are doing.

#### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 13

##### Do you have any feedback

Approximately \$30 million each year on 'Regional Leadership'....?? It is very vague what this huge amount of money actually gets spent on. A lot of buzzwords in your spiel about "informing, sharing, partnering, collaborating, etc, etc"

I recommend you actually allocate the \$30 million against specific objectives and projects rather than have a general slush fund called "Regional Leadership". This would provide better transparency, would highlight wasted investment, and would avoid the existing unaccountability.

I suspect that currently there is a whole lot of virtue-signaling and pointless meetings consuming this budget.

#### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 14

#### **Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

As previously stated, change the focus away from climate change using the RCP 8.5 to the known impacts of a major Alpine Fault earthquake.

You have the completely wrong focus.

#### Financial Strategy

Comment Number: 7

#### **Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I am genuinely very worried. Not only is the ORC planning an ongoing astronomical series of annual rate increases, but also a massive increase in debt. This is totally irresponsible, and in my view as a ratepayer, unacceptable.

I am shocked by the scale of this planned spending at a time when we are all facing inflation in other areas. Where do you think all this money actually comes from? It appears that you have built a bottom-up shopping list, costed that out, and then flicked the bill at ratepayers and future ratepayers (debt). To make it worse, you plan to 'invest' even more on international share markets - another \$20 million of ratepayers funds you are playing with (effectively borrowing to take a punt with ratepayers funds!)

All my other comments in other sections now have to be multiplied by the ridiculous cost of all this bad activity you have planned.

I suggest you start with a 3.5% annual rates increase, zero increase in debt, and trim ORC activities to fit. That is the reality of the real world. Prioritise what we can afford. And you have no right to assume that the ORC should operate activities such as buses etc.

Get back to basics and stop all the waffly nonsense.

**Respondent: Miss Melanie Heather****Submission Number:** 166**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 04:23**About You****Comment Number:** 2**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 5**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 4**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I live in Cardrona. My rates (according to the calculator) will go from \$264.44 to \$462.40. This is a 57% increase on my rates bill. \$128.58 (this year) of the increase is a targeted rate for the Wakatipu transport service. I cannot support this when I live in rural Cardrona with no access to public transport, nor go to Queenstown regularly (i.e. I am not affected by congestion). I wouldn't mind paying up to \$40 to support investment in Queenstown Lakes public transport but this is just too much. How can one proposed targeted rate amount to 50% of my current rates. This is the only charge I oppose in its current form. I'm really sorry team, but it is just far far too much for a service that isn't available to me.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 3**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number:** 1



**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I don't agree with rates based on capital value. Queenstown Lakes residents are paying significantly more for rates based on capital value. Asset rich cash poor. Many bought properties well before the property value increase, yet we are paid the same etc but have to pay significantly more for rates. How do low income earners continue to live here when the cost of living here continues to rise.

**Respondent: Mrs Lyn Wells**

**Submission Number:** 167

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 04:31

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 1

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I don't see why Wanaka, Albert Town and Hawea areas are required to pay for Queenstown when the people of these areas are needing their own service. You have known from the housing developments happening in the Wanaka area that a percentage of people would be coming here to live and work permanently, especially with new schools being added to cater for the extra children. Why are we only doing trials of public transport last year and this year when people have got themselves sorted with ride sharing or driving themselves to town and children to school. The rates collected in this area should be used in this area as we are growing faster than anticipated.

**Respondent: Ms Jacqueline Fraser****Submission Number: 168****Submission Date: 24/04/24 04:54****About You****Comment Number: 9****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 4****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

The electric buses on the Opoho route are a great addition to the fleet and it would be good to see them rolled out to other parts of the city. One minor thing (along with DCC) would be better management of illegal parking in bus stops, perhaps if driver's were able to take a photo if a vehicle was in their stop and provide it to DCC, a ticket could be issued to the car owner. Might be a deterrent.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 10****Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 11****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 2****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

An increasingly important area - keeping up with the science and sharing it with those of us in the community in a user friendly way

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

The proposed bus trials all have my support. Airport bus service would be very useful

#### **Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

It's well recognised that the cost of living has increased significantly in the last few years, and people are struggling. It would be appreciated if efforts are made to keep increases to a reasonable level to assist people to manage the ongoing impacts of the cost of living

## Respondent: Mr Iain Lamont

Submission Number: 169

Submission Date: 24/04/24 05:33

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$1 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I strongly support conversion of the bus fleet to electric (Option 2). I also support addition of extra services, I do not live in those areas but am in favour of increased public transport on principle.

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 9

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

#### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

Five year period is a good compromise between long term debt and a larger jump in rates

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Benefit is Otago-wide, not just to affected districts

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

It is clearly very important to increase work to mitigate the effects of climate change and I support this priority

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

I am in favour of this plan that will support people to move more towards public transport and also cycling.

#### **Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

I am supportive of the draft infrastructure strategy, for reasons of the risks described in the document.

#### **Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I am comfortable that the Council (elected to serve ratepayers) has thought through a balanced financial plan (balance between debt/ using assets/ rates increases)

**Respondent: D Cocks****Submission Number:** 170**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 05:34**Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 1**Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

As a resident of Wanaka/Upper Clutha I have no direct access to public transport. As there is no public transport in the Upper Clutha, forcing me to pay the proposed targeted rate for public transport is manifestly unjust. I already pay for Otago's public transport services through the general rates but adding a uniform charge, even if it means a minor decrease in the public transport portion of my general rates, is still wrong. As public transport is rated on a capital value basis I'm already required to pay a much higher percentage than most Dunedin residents in my general rates. My home is no different than thousands of Dunedin residences, yet because of its capital value I am required to pay the ORC much more for infrastructure I do not use, council staff I never see, the fit out of a council HQ that I'll never visit, and so on. Making me pay a targeted rate for a transport service I cannot directly access is adding insult to injury. If the ORC was to invest in public transport in the Upper Clutha, such as a commuter bus service from Hawea to Wanaka, then I would be willing to contribute to that but until that happens it is wrong to demand Upper Clutha residents pay a targeted rate for ORC funded public transport.

**Respondent: Dr Leslie Van Gelder****Submission Number: 171****Submission Date: 24/04/24 06:04****About You****Comment Number: 2****Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I think you've done a great job with this. It's clear, well expressed and are all key strategic areas in which the ORC can truly make a difference. Lean into this going forward. In your next iteration, frame it in Te Ao Maori -- the circularity of this is good, but be bolder in your language and concepts.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 3****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 4****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I would like this to be reconsidered. I support the electrification of the buses and an investment in public transport, however, it is not equitable. Unless there is a park and ride system developed, Glenorchy and other outlying communities bear the financial burden for a system they cannot use. I would like to see the rating for this revisited.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**



I'm pleased to see the commitment to biodiversity and biosecurity. I encourage you to keep the wilding pines rate as a separate rate as it serves as a reminder to residents as to this critical work, and also makes sure that the work won't be absorbed into the biosecurity general budget and be subject to the potential whims of the day over the next decade.

Very pleased to know that there will be work on catchment plans in the Southern Lakes in the next few years. I encourage ORC to work in with the conservation groups and catchment groups who have made huge progress over the last decade and to take a facilitator role rather than an expert one. Working in collaboration would be the best of all approaches as there is already a strong ecosystem of collaboration across the region, and ORC would be a welcome partner in that.

**Respondent: Mr Parid Basha**

**Submission Number: 172**

**Submission Date: 24/04/24 06:34**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Congestion and lack of reliable public transport is a huge issue that needs to be resolved, only way to stop increased congestion is more funding for public transport

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

need to make crucial investments now instead of paying down debt

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

increase regional pest management plan funding

**Respondent: Central Otago Friendship Network****Submission Number:** 173**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 06:34**~Transport****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback**

As an organisation that supports those who are lonely, isolated or socially disconnected to broaden and grow their friendship and social networks, we see first hand the huge barrier to social connection created by the lack of public transport in Central Otago. Not only would public transport in the region create greater social connection and strong communities but also lessen environmental impact of carbon emissions from single user car traffic and open up greater economic opportunities in the region as people are able to travel in an affordable way to work from outlying areas to central towns which are in need of workforce. I strongly support that funding be allocated to planning for workable public transport solutions both locally such as Alexandra and Clyde and regionally to allow people to connect and travel on public transport around other towns and areas in Central Otago. There should be a priority focus on understanding the public transport needs of the area which could be achieved through communication with grassroots social services organisations in the Central Otago region of which there are strong networks such as Alexandra Council of Social Services among others. I also support that not only funding and staff be allocated for planning and trials phase but also for implementation of recommended PT solutions within the next 3 years. With our large population of those aged over 65 years, it is essential that people have public transport and Total Mobility options to allow them peace of mind about their ability to maintain independent living for as long as possible for when they may no longer be able to drive. As our aged population increases this is going to become an even more pressing need so essential that ORC start planning and implementing solutions now. Public transport options would allow those who may not be able to drive due to disability to have equal access to community participation. Some examples I can give from our services of the need for public transport include an elderly lady reaching out to our services as she was very isolated after her husband had passed away. It turned out after conversation that she did have many friends in the area but due to not being able to drive was not able to visit them or attend regular social outings or groups so had lost contact with her community. This is a common story. Any public transport solutions also needs to consider accessibility and universal design to meet the needs of a wide range of community members.

**Respondent: Mr Ben Cooper**

**Submission Number:** 174

---

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 07:29

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The financial strategy is now resulting in people on fixed incomes such as retirees having to sell their property and move away from the district. Some of whom have lived in the area ok their lives

**Respondent: Mr Antonius Limburg**

**Submission Number:** 175

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 08:38

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 5

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number:** 4

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number:** 10

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Agree with vision

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 9

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 6

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Happy with option one of increased frequency on popular routes. Sometimes the wait for the next bus is just too long to be viable. Love the electric buses both as a bus user and as a cyclist

#### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

#### **Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

#### **Please comment**

Support better public transport but I am not a Queenstown bus user.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Everyone in the community benefits from good public transport whether they actually get on a bus or not so everyone should pay. Happy with preferred option

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 8**

#### **Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

Real concern about the state of the Taieri River.

Recently in the Patearoa area and could not believe the amount of irrigation mainly for hundreds of cows. This during a period of water restrictions in the area. In some cases irrigation water was running across the road during the middle of the day.

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 11**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

Public transport is proving increasingly popular but suggested upgrades need to happen.

Pricing public transport so that this is the one of the first options for people is important.

Anything that can be done to continue the development of cycle lanes/ trails is vital





**Respondent: Mr Ulf Uchida****Submission Number: 176****Submission Date: 24/04/24 08:42****About You****Comment Number: 1****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 3****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Yes to some more electric buses but No to increasing services at this stage. Maybe later once we are out of this cost of living crisis.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 4****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

As a pensioner on a fixed income these constant big rate hikes by ORC and DCC are terrible on top of inflation and everything else.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 7****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Targeted rates appear to be the way to go.

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

The new harbour master has sorted out the most pressing issue already. No need to go overboard.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Makes sense to discontinue and go with the biosecurity rate.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Whatever you do keep those rates down or you will rate people on low and fixed incomes out of their properties!

**Respondent: Mr Michael Ross**

**Submission Number:** 177

---

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 08:45

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

I totally oppose the proposal to include the Upper Clutha / Hāwea Ward being included in this proposal to fund public transport. Happy to contribute to the cost of a trial only . Our community should not be required to fund something which will provide no direct benefit.

**Respondent: Mr Craig Edmonds**

**Submission Number: 178**

**Submission Date: 24/04/24 09:48**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Needs to be more heavily funded by the user. Not so heavily rate payer subsidised

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I would like to see the service improved but be a more heavily user based system. Especially in a tourist heavy area tourists should pay more per ride. Not be heavily subsidised by rate payers. The public system should not be relied upon by school children, catching the 8am us 4 is often not possible. Review better ways to carry bikes, two is not much capacity at peak times

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

No option for direct user based funding. Rate payers should not subsidise this.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Payback should be driven/funded by the bus user. Not rate payers. Rate payers should not be supporting an unsustainable (financial) if the figures don't stack up. Charge tourists more.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

User pays. Charge tourists more than people residing here.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

User funds public transport 100%.

Recoup environmental damage costs from those responsible. Hold them accountable. Why are the general public paying for damage they have not caused.

Vista levy to help fund projects. Tourists contribute to the damage and we should get funds from them to help protect the environment

**Respondent: Dr Bryony Telford**

**Submission Number:** 179

---

**Submission Date:** 24/04/24 10:30

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

I have recently moved to Waiwera South with my family and strongly support a trial for a regular bus service from Balclutha to Dunedin. My partner commutes there for work 4 days a week and would use a bus service if it was available. He would leave a bike at the bus depot in Dunedin so that he could get to his job once in town, and a slightly longer trip via Momona would be a small price to pay for the more relaxed journey not having to drive and the environmental benefits. I can also imagine us using it to get to the airport to save on parking at the airport (provided the fare is cheaper than parking) and to get up to town to visit friends and family. Public transport is much easier than driving with a toddler. As a parent I also imagine it being a useful way to give teena

**Respondent: Mr Peter Howard****Submission Number:** 180**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 01:11**About You****Comment Number:** 2**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

To start with, the heading "Bus services in Queenstown Lakes" is at best misleading and could be considered to be designed to be so. This is entirely about Queenstown, not Queenstown Lakes. There is no proposal to invest in any public transport other than in Queenstown itself. The proposal to gather rates for public transport in Queenstown from the Queenstown Lakes area including Albert Town, Hāwea and Wānaka area is manifestly wrong. As a Wanaka resident of many years, I have used the bus in Queenstown once and that was some four years ago. To suggest that residents from "over the hill" can drive to Queenstown and then hop on a bus is a strange notion. If I travel to Queenstown it is to Frankton for the airport or other businesses in that area, I avoid central Queenstown. The funding of public transport in Queenstown should rest entirely with Queenstown and immediate surrounds. The likes of Albert Town, Hāwea and Wānaka area should not be required to contribute to this through either a Targeted or General Rate.

## Respondent: Mr Trevor Tattersfield

Submission Number: 181

Submission Date: 25/04/24 02:41

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 5

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 3

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

It is grossly irresponsible and reprehensible to propose a rate increase greater than inflation.

Our country is in recession, times are tough, people are feeling the pinch and will continue for some time - RATE PAYERS SIMPLY CANNOT AFFORD the increase proposed.

Its not the time for "nice to aves" - but for "essentials only"

Councillors have the opportunity to show leadership by reducing any increase to the level of inflation only.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 4

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Based on my experience on QLDC - There is absolutely no community of interest between DND and QLDC public transport. It is ridiculous to even consider additional rating for Upper Clutha. I strongly recommend ORC should divest QTN public transport complete operation, to QLDC where it belongs

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 2

**Do you have any feedback**



In order to reduce rate increases I strongly recommend your bio-diversity programmes be immediately cancelled/deferred - no one would notice.

**Respondent: Michael Farrier****Submission Number:** 182**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 04:56**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 4**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I am concerned that it is business as usual particularly in regard to water quality and other environmental aspects which the Council should already be addressing. Climate change has been known of since the early 1980's. Water quality has been allowed to deteriorate and little has been done to address air quality.

My rates should be spent on programmes that improve the environment not projects like powered wind turbines to improved air quality, as has been done in the past.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Justification for increased services has not been made. Traffic congestion is not a reason to provide additional services. I am not aware of residents increasing using the service because of congestion. Just because it may be environmentally prudent to increase services does not mean that they are justified or needed. Many residents are provided with company vehicles and they are unlikely to move onto buses. I am aware of an increasing number of "tour operators" placing clients on buses to travel around the Wakatipu basin. I have also been told that all seats on buses are taken up by tour groups at times. Travel cannot be solved by throwing ratepayer cash at bus transport and particularly electric buses. There may be more environmental benefit in ensuring people are able to live near the location of their employment. There is little point in looking at zero emission if the farming sector does not address their emissions. Perhaps a starting point to consider transport is a model in which the consumer of the service pays the full fare. This would ensure full transparency and perhaps competition. It is an easy option to charge ratepayers for a service they may never use.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number:** 5**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

The Council should never have run a deficit, this is poor public management.

**Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I am not aware of any work being done by the ORC in the Arrowtown River Catchment. If a general rate is to be applied age ORC should specifically specify how the rate will be spent. It is apparent to me that most catchment changes here are due to human activity in regard to tourism and building. Catchment damage should be paid for by those doing the damage.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

I am supportive of targeted environmental improvements, I am not supportive of project realed improvements that do not take into account the full environmental impact. For example, the use of Arrow River water to dilute the pollution in Lake Hayes. This is a poor approach to environmental management. The narrow Catchment should not be subject to a low river flow environmental management to correct historic pollution issues.

In regard to air quality in Arrowtown, apart from monitoring (and this is not always transparent) the ORC has done little to improve air quality. The reports on the web site are superficial and do not address the real issues. I have not been able to find PM 2.5 data although this is being addressed.

NIWA have not been fully transparent with the work they have conducted.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

Climate Change is not a specific issue it needs to be addressed as a part of the specific environmental aspects - not as a separate issue.

Land use needs to be managed and where communities are located need to be addressed. Land "change" needs to be managed and ask costs placed on developers.

The ORC needs to take into account the recent review of CD. CD is not something that communities can mange themselves without support.

In the distant past the Ministry of Works had a structure to address issues when emergencies occurred. Currently there isn a strong organisation structure to respond to emergency's.

Communications is key.



**Respondent: Michael Farrier**

**Submission Number:** 183

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 04:58

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: mr barrie leslie**

**Submission Number: 184**

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 05:00**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

orc need to have regional based staff instead of sending people all over the area .we need hands on people working alongside not a person giving a list of regulations in a dictatorial manner

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

I support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis only if all or most people in the District can access public transport easily and conveniently.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

If people in small rural communities were paying 20% of public transport that they cannot use, they also face the higher costs of needing to use a car and travel longer distances to access basic services.

#### **Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

#### **Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### **Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

I only support a uniform rate as outlined in page 23 of the consultation document.

#### **Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Respondent: Mr & Mrs DJ & Chris McIntosh**

**Submission Number: 185**

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 05:10**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I have watched ORC empire building and go from an affordable but unnecessary additional council cost to for instance i attended a meeting Owaka Community hal;l where I think there were possibly up to 10 ORC folk there and it seemed a vehicle for each of them How on earth is this seen as prudent fiscal expenditure and showing ORC in a positive light. BTW you got us a million buck fine aye ta not appreciated.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

it looks fab but at what cost.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**



**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 17****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Public transport should never have been allowed to fade away no doubt private investment will create profitable transport ratepayers should not be funding this I read your stuff re central govt pulling back well put energy into reversing that as we also pay central govts largess you know

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

What are you not thinking for goodness sakes Queenstown is relatively small private investors surely.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 9****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

If I had not read this. You think that by claiming only 50 or a 100 bucksd i clearly revcall my rates originally being less than 60 appalling.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 18****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

OMG who is making these calls. Some of you need ton resign immediately i just dont know whom

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

surely this is a CDC issue theyre the ones i see doing it so exactly what are you doing and WHY

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

who stated this was fair its [REDACTED]

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

the more i read the less impressed i am free spending seems an epidemic for ORC

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Why the local councils surely do this to my eyes you seem to be taking simply because you can and justifying it well not to us.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Yor just moving costs around surely inefficient .

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Dont cost us anymore we cant therefore youy cant afford it

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback**

I know your gonna say its central governments fault but theres no such thing as must do work its you8 wanna do work which is unsupported by us. Theres way top much of this and a lolly scrab]=mble of funding ive seen often go to utterluy usdeless or unworthy causes but a mates a mate

**~Environment****Comment Number: 12****Do you have any feedback**

I comprehend the power of communities funding things so all can have access to. Im unconvinced there requires two councils apparently funding exactly the same thing apart from one getting its own ratepayers fined which just appears not useful .

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback**

At present this appears a wishlist only so difficult to support until details known.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 16****Do you have any feedback**

I have attended a number of ORC meetings some staff are pure bliss however overall its underwhelming to date and apparently dogmatic in approach, Your fine if you go along with the agenda not so much if you want specific details or just disagree. Im very unimpressed so far and fear for our future if this is the best you have obtained.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

We sincerely hope you get this correct. We don't desire to be grinch

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 3****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Look i know im being negative but you do not fund your work the ratepayers do its little things like this that are very irritating praps employ some folk without degrees.

Neither do you pay for anything the ratepayers do. If your wordage simply acknowledged where the funds actually came from rather than hey look were finding money everywhere which you are; its ours.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 19****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

What revenue are you referring to when you talk of balancing the budget. Its fab you have revenue where it generated or is that us ratepayers again sorry but if had about enough of this nonsense.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Yes as Biden said "DON'T ! "

thankyou

**Respondent: Mr Gregory Kent****Submission Number:** 186**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 05:49**About You****Comment Number:** 16**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 17**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

One challenge for Otago is to reduce the size of the ORC head office to a small core and establish satellite depots throughout the region with local accountability.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 12**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Reduce the focus on compliance and increase the proportion of existing rates spent on practical initiatives.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 19**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 15**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### Any other feedback?

ratepayers should only contribute to the costs public transport if they can access public transport easily and conveniently in their local area.

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 20

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

#### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 11

#### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* Yes

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 18

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* No

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?

- \* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

I only support a uniform rate as outlined in page 25 of the consultation document.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 21****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

I couldn't devote as much time as necessary to comment.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback**

I couldn't devote as much time as necessary to comment.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 14****Do you have any feedback**

I couldn't devote as much time as necessary to comment.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**

Any public transport to small rural communities such as Owaka would need to be on a door to door basis otherwise many people would need a car to access public transport.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 7****Do you have any feedback**

The cost of regional leadership is too high and needs to be reduced. Further increases are not acceptable.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

I couldn't devote as much time as necessary to comment.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I couldn't devote as much time as necessary to comment.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I support targeted rates for the greatest transparency

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

ORC rates have increased massively over recent years and it is time resources were targeted more carefully and rate increases kept to a maximum of the rate of general inflation



**Respondent: Ms Sonja Mitchell**

**Submission Number: 187**

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 06:47**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 20**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

There seems to be a strong focus on the challenges but not on the opportunities.

Covid has provided us with an opportunity to reset our priorities, ie to prioritise our natural environment and our communities. I support a strong partnership with mana whenua. I support taking an ambitious approach to restoring our natural environment, water quality, air quality, soil quality, biodiversity, coastal environment etc - these things cannot be at the cost of the 'economy'. I also support our regional council taking a radical approach to addressing inequality and the extreme cost of housing. Otago region contains some of the richest and poorest households in the country. One-third of homes in Queenstown sit empty while families are living in cars. I'd like to see a tax on Air B and Bs and empty houses, and for the money raised to go towards community/social housing.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I mostly support the focus areas identified, but I question whether a better focus area than 'resilience' would be to focus on addressing inequality. We have an urgent inequality crisis in Otago. If poorer households have the means to be 'resilient' they generally will be: but they first need the resources to do so. I would like to see redistribution of wealth in Otago, so that we're not a district of billionaires and millionaires, and large numbers who are homeless, living in cars, bunking with family, or sleeping rough.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 12****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 9****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I strongly support improving public transport. As a regular bus user in Dunedin, I would like to see the bus service become more reliable and timely, including penalties for the bus companies if they drop scheduled bus services. I have occasionally experienced scheduled bus runs being abruptly cancelled - it leads to health and safety issues, especially if left waiting at a bus stop for an extra hour in Winter! Bus companies should be scheduling and staffing with contingency. Also, any investment in bus services should be conditional on bus companies committing to (1) paying all drivers at least the living wage (currently \$26 per hour), and more for experience; (2) guaranteeing bus-drivers at least 37 hours of work per week; and (3) safe and reliable staffing and rostering (including adequate contingency staffing).

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 18****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support better and more public transport in Queenstown - it's currently clogged with cars. I have one proviso, I think that council should make any investment in bus services provisional on the bus companies paying at least the living wage to their drivers (and more for experience) and guaranteeing them at least 37 hours work per week. ie the council and bus companies have a role to play in addressing inequality and poverty wages in our communities.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**Any other feedback?**

I support higher value properties paying more towards transport than lower value properties - this helps to address inequality. For example, I think millionaires and billionaires in Queenstown and Wanaka should be paying significantly more towards transport.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 13**

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I don't think there is enough context to respond to this proposal

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 11**

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 19**

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

I don't feel I have enough context and information to respond to this question

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

#### **Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I would like to see more funding from polluters, including farmers, for catchment management work.

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 21**

#### **Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

#### **Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

I'm not sure I have enough context to comment on this, but I would suggest that I support taxing boat-owners and shipping businesses directly for navigational safety work, rather than expecting all households to pay for it.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 4****Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

*I don't think there is enough context to respond to this proposal. I support ongoing work to control wilding pines - I think this should be funded by a tax on pine forestry companies, as presumably that is where the wilding pines are spreading from.*

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback**

I support the areas of focus ORC has identified, but I would also like to see them tackling inequality, as this is key to the other things getting addressed.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback**

I support the strongest possible measures to improve water quality, soil and air quality, and biodiversity. I'm tired of hearing farmers and others in the primary sector bleating about 'red tape': we all deserve a healthy, sustainable environment, and if they can't run a business without trashing the environment, they shouldn't be in business.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

I support the strongest possible measures to reduce climate change and reduce and mitigate its effects. I would like to see the council target resilience-building and support at low income households.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback**

I support as much investment as possible in active forms of transport, like walkways and cycle paths; and in public transport, like buses and trains.

I love the cycleways in Dunedin!

I would love love love to see a public train service that connects Dunedin to Christchurch - this would greatly encourage me to travel.

I support any measures aimed at reducing car use - cars are polluting, expensive, and dangerous. Bring on public transport!

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 22****Do you have any feedback**

I strongly support ORC honouring its Treaty partnership with mana whenua.

I appreciate the council's The Source newsletter - that's how I learnt it was time to submit on the long-term plan. The more public-facing the ORC can be, and the more it can reach out to communities traditionally under-represented, the better. The submission form could be made more user-friendly.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 8****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

In principle I am less in support of drainage and 'river control' infrastructure, and more in favour of working with the environment - eg creating wetlands and plantings that help soak up water, creating urban sponge environments etc. I strongly oppose the Government's Fast-Track Approvals Bill and it's prioritising of infrastructure over all other considerations, including over environmental sustainability.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 17****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I would like to see businesses charged at a higher rate than households for services like environmental protection, water, electricity, public transport, resilience building, community housing, etc. Businesses by definition make a profit - they can better afford to contribute than most households. This would help to address income inequality.

I would also like to see the ORC charge a tax on all Air B n Bs and empty houses, and use the money raised to pay for more social housing.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 15****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I would like to see the proportion of funding from central Government radically increase - there are a lot of expectations on local government and central government should be contributing more from its tax coffers (which has the added benefit of being based on progressive taxes, so higher income households pay more).

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I strongly support the ORC investing in things like restoring our natural environment and improve active and public transport options (like walkways, cycleways, buses, and trains), but I am also concerned by the impact of rates increases when we have an inequality crisis. I would like to see private businesses paying substantially more in rates than households. I would like to see more enforcement and penalties charged for environmental damage and breaching of consents. I would also like to see more central Government funding of local government. And I would like to see the ORC taxing owners of empty homes and Air B n Bs. ie I would like the ORC to seek to get funds from those most able to pay, including businesses, Government, and wealthy property owners, rather than just going after the lowest hanging fruit (ratepayers)

**Respondent: Matthew Sole**

**Submission Number: 188**

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 07:21**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Public transport is essential in reducing emissions, reducing individual vehicle use, reclaiming our roads for wider community use

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Unfortunately poor town planning and lack of appropriate infrastructure investment has resulted in very deficient transport network and difficulty in retrofitting public transport into pepper potted residential developments. Congestion has resulted

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 2****Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Drainage schemes are a dated response. Natural solutions such as absorption, wetland and wide scale landuse change needs to reinstating biodiversity that facilitates moisture absorption and retention with slow release characteristics. With massive so called development in to green plastic monoculture shallow ground covers degrading soil and humus moisture absorption and retention

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* No

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

But I need more information on specific detail on what is being proposed and the science and cost benefit analysis to ecological function and health to ecological services and social wellbeing.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Not at this stage. Transparency is needed to maintain the focus on this project until we confirmation that regeneration is controlled

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Rating need to be based on land and capital value

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

It is critical that these initiatives take a whole systems approach and avoid the reductionist approach. Vital is supporting policy, objective and rules for catchment wide approaches. Enduring ecological health and function of the biosphere is essential to our future survival. We have limited real understanding of our regional ecological function and its vital signs for determining and managing its vibrant health into the future and restoration where it has been mined and over abstracted. The link below details this well.

"Ecosystems are deeply interconnected – environmental research, policy and management should be too"  
—<https://theconversation.com/ecosystems-are-deeply-interconnected-environmental-research-policy-and-management-should-be-too-228371>

I am very wary about proposed Willow control work. The original work was by the catchment boards to contain rivers to protect private land which in reality is natural flood routes and plains. Any work needs to start the top of catchments and work down. The management of slash is critical as we are well aware of what that can do in these increasingly more intense flood events. Like wilding conifer work regen follow up is essential.

We need courageous leadership for the sake of our environment on which our futures are so entirely dependent on.



## Respondent: Sport Clutha

Submission Number: 189

Submission Date: 25/04/24 07:50

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 7

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 15

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

Please comment

As long as there's evidence to support the addition of extra services

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

No change: Keep running the same timetables and upgrade the fleet to electric.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

Be good to see public transport in the Clutha District.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Cut costs and don't spend money you don't have.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 17**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

Would like to see work carried out in Balclutha for engaging a community and assisting with connecting the community to the environment and each other. The Clutha District has a large number of Flood Banks surrounding the township that are under utilised. The river banks are used but they're not inclusive for all and particularly with the banks having grass, sheep tracks etc on top it puts people off utilising them. The floodbanks are used by many locals walking/running/biking and taking children with prams/push chairs. A surface on top of the floodbank such as a metal as seen in other areas such as Southland and Hawkes Bay would be of major benefit to the town. Balclutha is also a thoroughfare for tourists and a surface on top of the floodbanks would entice people to stop. The floodbanks are on the doorstep to many of the town's major assets, Balclutha Centennial Swimming Pool, Naish and Centennial Park, Te Pou O Matau Au (Town hall), Balclutha Showgrounds, Cross Recreation Centre and to a certain degree the CBD. There's also less children biking to schools and a cycle trail on top of the floodbank would give the potential for a safer journey for students at some schools. The increase in E Bikes has also seen an increase in older people wanting to access cycle trails that are safe and accessible, this would do that. Thanks

**~Environment****Comment Number: 11****Do you have any feedback**

Keep up the good work

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 12****~Transport****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**

Please see earlier comment re surface on the floodbanks around Balclutha

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 4**

**Respondent: Ms Sophie Chen****Submission Number: 190****Submission Date: 25/04/24 08:50****About You****Comment Number: 5****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 3****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I disagree that we will need buses arrive every 15 minutes as our long-term goal. I didn't see a well-research report showing its necessity. Firstly, the ratepayers are more likely to use the public transport in the peak hours, which means the service we pay for may not benefit us the most directly or indirectly. Secondly, we haven't validated how effective our strategy is to attract self drivers to become bus passengers. For certain groups of people, such as remotely workers like myself, tradies who need to carry their tools, or oversea travelers who rent a car anyway for flexibility, they won't easily move to use public transport. The goal for stage 2 (every 15min peak and 30min off-peak) is good enough to me as the final goal for this long term plan. The bigger challenge is how we can get more people use the service. Until we figure that out, I don't support investing more money on further improvement. We should achieve a balance between the ratepayer's cost, utilisation rate of the bus capacity and the benefits it brings to residents and travelers.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Tell us what you think****!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 4****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

As someone moved to Queenstown in June last year and works remotely, I didn't benefit from the investment during Covid-19 period. I'd rather to pay it slower with a lower cost with an expectation of having more future ratepayers to share the repayment of the deficit.

**Respondent: Mr Chris Saunders****Submission Number:** 191**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 09:19**About You****Comment Number:** 2**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 6**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

All of this proposal appears to relate to Queenstown and with absolutely no benefit to Wanaka (which is the area in which I live). Wanaka rates payers are however expected to pay for the Queenstown Bus service incurring the same increase in rates as Queenstown rate payers and not getting any benefit at all. This is totally unfair. Also given the current cost of living crisis, any increases in Otago Regional Council are not sustainable. My salary increase for the current financial year is averaging 1% yet your online rates assessment tool is indicating my rates for 2024/2025 will be 61.7% higher than 2023/2024. There is no way that this can be afforded. Please note my words NOT AFFORDABLE. I hope that ORC will both listen to and hear what I am saying. ORC needs to go with option 2

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 11**Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

There is absolutely no benefit to Wanaka area ratepayers in these proposals. Yet Wanaka residents are facing significant and unsustainable increases in rates, 61.7% in my case. This is over 15 times the current inflation rate. What does this say about the level of financial governance and stewardship at ORC. Given how difficult everything is currently and the cost of living crisis, the only sensible course of action is no change. I just hope you are both hearing and listening to what I am saying

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number:** 12**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

This is a difficult question to answer. Having debt that is not planned is not good and not sustainable. It does show however that public transport in the region is not paying its way. Indeed and following on from my previous comments, it appears tht the level of public transport needs to be reduced and not increased, especially in the more rural parts of the region. Surely public transport needs to be paying its way and supported by the correct level of fares. (Would this result in lower fares?) When I am in Queensstown, all the buses I see are virtually empty. This to me leads to the conclusion that most ratepayers rely on their own transport. Why pump even more ratepayers money into something that is not used?

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 7****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

No specific comment to make

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 15****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

No specific comment to make

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 3****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

It is vital to ensure that due to the ever-increasing level of climate change and global-warming, there are ever increasing deliverables to increase the rapid absorption of carbon in the atmosphere.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

As above it is vital to ensure that due to the ever-increasing level of climate change and global warming there are ever increasing deliverable to increase the rapid absorption of carbon in the atmosphere.

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback**

Overall commentary (repeated in specific areas below)

This long term plan is not affordable. I appreciate it is easy to spend ratepayers money and impose significant increases in rates (61.7% in my case from 2023/2024 to 2024/2025) and without checking if the increases are remotely affordable by the rate payers. For example my average salary increase over the last 4 years is 1% per annum. 61.7 divided by 1 is 61.7. Do you remotely see my issue. My challenge at a time of a cost of living crisis is to put food on the table. Is this unreasonable? There are many items and products that I would like to purchase. I know that my financial resources will not permit this. I need to concentrate on purchasing the necessities. Why can't council follow the same approach. Under your option 1 my 2024/2025 rates will be 385.48% of what I paid 4 years ago. This is truly scary and not sustainable. How is financial governance and stewardship demonstrated at ORC and who is accountable. I also note that the cost of regional leadership is projected to increase by 12.1% from 2023/2024 to 2024 to 2025 and by an incredible 46.56% over the 10 year period. It is also a serious concern on how ORC wants to increase the amount of ratepayers money going into public transport. This becomes even more concerning when Wanaka rate payers are being asked to pay for the provision of public transport in Queenstown. In addition, does the utilization of public transport really justify rather ratepayer money being pumped in. Is this really value for money?

ORC needs to consider what is affordable at the present time. The quality of life and feeling of wellbeing is plummeting downwards at an alarming rate. A proposed rates increase of 61.7% certainly does not help.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback**

No overall comment. The environment needs to be maintained and improved. No actions should be taken that contribute to climate change and global warming. A climate impact should be completed on each project and be publicly available. The control of rabbits in particular needs greater focus.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback**

It is vital that all plans are proactive in tackling climate change. For example, is a climate impact report completed for each new project. Are all the plans of council ensuring that the rate of carbon absorption from the environment continues to increase and no actions are taken that decreases the rate of carbon absorption by nature. I fear that this is not the case.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

It is also a serious concern on how ORC wants to increase the amount of ratepayers money going into public transport. This becomes even more concerning when Wanaka rate payers are being asked to pay for the provision of public transport in Queenstown. In addition, does the utilization of public transport really justify rather ratepayer money being pumped in. Is this really value for money?

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 1**



**Do you have any feedback**

I note that the cost of regional leadership is projected to increase by 12.1% from 2023/2024 to 2024 to 2025 and by an incredible 46.56% over the 10 year period.

Given the current financial environment, this appears excessive and needs to be revisited to ensure value for money.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 13****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

No specific comment

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 14****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

This long term plan is not affordable. I appreciate it is easy to spend ratepayers money and impose significant increases in rates (61.7% in my case from 2023/2024 to 2024/2025) and without checking if the increases are remotely affordable by the rate payers. For example my average salary increase over the last 4 years is 1% per annum. 61.7 divided by 1 is 61.7. Do you remotely see my issue. My challenge at a time of a cost of living crisis is to put food on the table. Is this unreasonable? There are many items and products that I would like to purchase. I know that my financial resources will not permit this. I need to concentrate on purchasing the necessities. Why can't council follow the same approach. Under your option 1 my 2024/2025 rates will be 385.48% of what I paid 4 years ago. This is truly scary and not sustainable. How is financial governance and stewardship demonstrated at ORC and who is accountable. I also note that the cost of regional leadership is projected to increase by 12.1% from 2023/2024 to 2024 to 2025 and by an incredible 46.56% over the 10 year period. It is also a serious concern on how ORC wants to increase the amount of ratepayers money going into public transport. This becomes even more concerning when Wanaka rate payers are being asked to pay for the provision of public transport in Queenstown. In addition, does the utilization of public transport really justify rather ratepayer money being pumped in. Is this really value for money?

ORC needs to consider what is affordable at the present time. The quality of life and feeling of wellbeing is plummeting downwards at an alarming rate. A proposed rates increase of 61.7% certainly does not help

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 16****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Council really does need to access what is affordable at the present moment in time. To me the issue is the level of expenditure. This need to be seriously reviewed and then consideration given to funding sources. For capital works that result in debt, what supporting schedule are available eg payback calculations, rate of return calculations etc.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

A proposed 61.7% increase in my rates from 2023/2024 to 2024/2025 is totally unacceptable. Also your option 1 will result in my rates in 2024/2025 being 385.48% of the rates I paid 4 years ago. I am really struggling to understand how this remotely represents value for money. I am also struggling to understand how financial governance and stewardship operates at the council and who is accountable and responsible.

**Respondent: Ms Melissa Rongen**

**Submission Number:** 192

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 09:57

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Why should I pay extra when the port Chalmers run doesn't benefit from electric buses due to the distance involved (I have had this confirmed by one of the bus companies. AND....Port Chalmers bus run has one of the crappiest time tables...it stops earlier in the evening on weekdays compared to other routes,...which makes it bloody hard to get home if you go to a concert at the stadium. Last time the council didn't even think to put on a shuttle for west Harbour for the pink concert. Not all of us can drive, and the council's are so keen to promote public transport... and then drops back to hourly on the weekends. It's very inconvenient ... especially if you miss a bus if it comes early! I'm sick of West Harbour being overlooked . Leave things as they are OR do some serious improvement on the bus schedule for West Harbour

## Respondent: Coastal Communities Cycle Connection

Submission Number: 193

Submission Date: 25/04/24 10:08

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

We support the new vision, 'For our environment and communities to be healthy and connected ki uta ki tai (from the mountains to the sea)' and we support these key focus areas and outcomes in particular:

Transport - Otago has an integrated transport system that contributes to the accessibility and connectivity of our community, reduces congestion and supports community wellbeing aspirations.

Communities - Otago has cohesive and engaged communities that are connected to the environment and each other.

Our project to connect the communities on the north coast of Dunedin City - the Coastal Communities Cycle Connection (CCCC) - satisfies these key focus areas, and more.

People who face transport barriers due to limited affordability, and/or a lack of available transport options that they are able to use, are transport disadvantaged. The residents of the north coast communities are currently unable to access essential services in the neighbouring villages without a vehicle, despite these communities being less than 6km apart (eg Karitane residents have no option other than travelling in a vehicle to visit the doctor or DCC service centre in nearby Waikouaiti. Similarly, residents in Warrington cannot travel to the 5.7km to the Waitati store or Blueskin Bay library without a vehicle. No footpath exists alongside SH1. There is a severe lack of transport options.

Since no improvements to the public transport service are planned or being considered for the North Coast (despite the targeted rate proposed), better walking and cycling options would allow connectivity for residents and value for money investment.

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you have any feedback

We support the work programme change to 'Develop regional public and active transport connectivity'.

I note in the Planned Work for years 1-3 in the Draft Long Term Plan's Regional Land Transport Programme, the council proposes to include a new piece of work: "Transport Planning - Regional Public and Active Transport Connectivity Strategy. A staged approach to the development of regional public and active transport connectivity."

I also understand that the Future Development Strategy must be used to inform the long-term plans and infrastructure strategies for the DCC and ORC, and the regional land transport plan. As such, I draw your attention to the decision report of the Joint Hearing Panel, just released, on submissions on transport infrastructure on the North Coast, which has amended the wording of the description of the "Coastal Communities Cycle Connection" in Table 24 of the FDS as follows: *Cycling safety and accessibility improvements (DCC) | Coastal Communities Cycle Connection | A shared commuter and tourism pathway to connect the communities of Waikouaiti, Karitane and Warrington/Evansdale-Waitati | 1 - 10 years. Unlikely to be delivered by DCC, but through a trust.*

Including the CCCC in the work programme will accelerate the significant progress already made. When completed, the north coast trail (CCCC) will open up the possibility of regional connection from Dunedin northwards, looking ahead to connecting through to Oamaru and the Alps 2 Ocean and fulfilling the vision of an integrated network of walking and cycle trails for Otago.

The full delivery of the project may not be dependent on the DCC, but, in anticipation of the inclusion of this project in the 9 year plan 2025-2034, I urge the council to consider how the requested support for this project now can really advance the project.

This project has made huge progress already and will not cost the council significantly if it can attract Waka Kotahi funding for the sections providing an alternative for SH1 pedestrian use. The budget put out in the feasibility study was \$21,000,000 for the full 35km of pathway. Almost 70% of that is for the section from Evansdale to Waitati, which will require Waka Kotahi funding. This could be 100%. That leaves only \$6.7m for the rest.

Costings for the CCCC are as per the feasibility study, which is publicly available. Updated details of the expected stages of construction and the progress per section are available to council staff any time.

However, the current expected stages of the project are outlined below. The construction start times are dependent on receiving expected funding and consents. Construction funding will be a combination of community trusts, community fundraising and government grants, depending on the section.

Stage 1: Section 5a - Waitati to Orokonui Ecosanctuary (2024) \$1,280,000

Stage 2: Section 1 - Waikouaiti to Karitane (2025) \$4,500,000

Stage 3: Section 3 - Warrington to Evansdale (2025) \$300,000

Stage 4: Section 5b - Orokonui Ecosanctuary to Port Chalmers (2026) \$1,600,000

Stage 5: Section 4 - Evansdale to Waitati (2027) \$14,300,000

Stage 6: Mountain Rd to create loop - Leith Saddle to Waikouaiti (2027) \$826,000

Uncosted:

Stage 7: Section 2 - Karitane to Warrington

With the route defined by a feasibility study, we have pressed on with Runaka consultation, Kiwirail approvals in principle and landowner easements. A major landowner between Waitati and Port Chalmers has signed an agreement to grant an easement, opening up a link to Te Ara Moana. Funds raised from the community and private funders are coming in as we work to get shovel ready. We are only \$9000 away from covering the \$25,875 cost of the preliminary design for the Waikouaiti river rail bridge clip-on. The ORC has provided fees-free consent processing, for which we are grateful.

We support the concept of the Dunedin Tracks Network Trust for a contestable fund for active transport as part of the Regional Public and Active Transport Connectivity Strategy.

Another option is a targeted rate per area, similar to what is being proposed for public transport.

54,429 Dunedin and Palmerston ratepayers paying \$10 per year each for active transport is \$544,290. 124,310 Otago ratepayers could contribute \$1,243,100.

Although Waikouaiti is mentioned in the introduction to the LTP as a 'population hotspot' along with Oamaru, Mosgiel etc. we note that no improvements to the public transport service are planned or being considered for the North Coast to Waikouaiti and Palmerston, despite the targeted public transport rate proposed for these households. Better walking and cycling options would allow connectivity for residents and address this funding imbalance.

**Respondent: Ms Sue Novell**

**Submission Number: 194**

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 11:52**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Challenge: with less resources (energy, materials and finance) available, the council has to plan to meet the basic needs of the population within planetary boundaries: clean air, water, enough food and shelter and community. It has to plan for a low energy future and local food resilience, while respecting nature.

I agree with the focus areas.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Council must increase public transport options. Also facilitate local living so transport is not needed so much: growing local food, local markets, and small scale industries that provide for the basics.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think**

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

If there are services, less should be charged.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 11****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 5****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 8****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 1****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback**

I like the focus on the environment, and am happy to spend money on rates that help this vital work.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

I endorse the programme - water is fundamental

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

Please also include a food resilience plan, the local population being able to feed itself from locally grown food, with no transport emissions and costs.



**Respondent: Mrs Loretta Bush**

**Submission Number:** 195

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 12:59

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number:** 5

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

No, just that there are a lot.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 12

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Need to spend monry on this, to help curb CO2 emissions

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 18

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Queenstown need to keep investing in public transport, as congestion is only going to get worse. It's great how the uptake of the buses has worked since the \$2 fares

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

##### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

##### Any other feedback?

Think that a uniform rate is unfair for lower value properties. Higher value properties and commercial properties should pay a higher amount. Happy with the 20% general rate funding.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 8

##### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

##### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

5 years is a more reasonable timeframe than paying it more quickly in 3 years, or letting it linger on, accruing even more interest, over 10years

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 16

##### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 2

##### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* Yes

##### Please comment on the proposed catchment rate

Yes, the rate should be determined by capital value

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Higher valued properties should pay more

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

Good you are looking at these areas

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

It's good you are spending money addressing these issues

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

Good you see these issues need addressing

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have any feedback**

Think it's an excellent idea to trial a bus service from Alex/Clyde to Cromwell and Queenstown. Is really needed.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

The figures seem very high to me, I mean increasing sharply each year. Think you should be very careful with spending extra money on this "regional leadership" and instead spend it on real outcomes, such as public transport, water quality, rather than just promoting the ORC as an entity.

#### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 14

#### **Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

You need to be mindful of allowing new settlements to be built on land that is not suitable, although this may not be decided by you, may be more a District Council decision.

#### Financial Strategy

Comment Number: 15

#### **Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

It is a good idea to be borrowing for longer for the infrastructure assets, as these will last for a lot longer than the 10 years you used to do. Means it is fairer for everyone

#### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 1

#### **Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Suppose it all has to be as you have stated. Presume there has been a lot of work in getting to this stage where you are proposing these funding models, so we should be supportive of them

#### **Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

It is inevitable, especially because our rates are very low when compared to other NZ Regional council rates

**Respondent: Mr Matt Love**

**Submission Number:** 196

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 19:43

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 10

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number:** 4

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Can't afford rate increases

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number:** 8

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Can't afford

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 9

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 5

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Can't afford rates increases

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Can't afford rates increasrs

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Any other feedback?**

Can't afford rates increases

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Can't afford rates increases

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Cannot afford rates increases

**Respondent: Graeme Anderson**

**Submission Number:** 197

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 20:32

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

This strategy is flawed or must

Reduce reliance on ratepayers funding and reduce expenditures by downsizing operations not increasing with no measurable result

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Absolutely outrageous increase well above inflation To fund glory projects and employ more useless bureaucrats

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Totally unacceptable

**Respondent: Anne Warrington Blair**

**Submission Number:** 198

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:43

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

PT services to Outram



**Respondent: Chardonnay Kyle**

**Submission Number:** 199

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:45

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Services to Outram, Highland Park, Gladstone Rd/Wingatui

**Respondent: George Alexander Hugh Kidd**

**Submission Number:** 200

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:45

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Want services to East Taieri

**Respondent: Helen Stead**

**Submission Number:** 201

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:45

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Suggests ORC:

- works with Sth Island Councils regarding passenger rail.
- study on Bio Fuel
- Council tour to discuss RMA

**Respondent: John Cant**

**Submission Number:** 202

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:46

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?\***

No Hearing - just a followup

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Muddy Creek (or Boundary Creek) on North side of Oamaru - Flood Hazard area to be confirmed as area depicted on map appears incorrect

Was a meeting approx 2 years ago with affected families ...no subsequent action

**Respondent: Lindsay Watt**

**Submission Number:** 203

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:46

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Consider introducing a programme of flood mitigation which involves slowing and storing water - then releasing. Especially on tributaries.

Ensure there is gravel mgmt in the Clutha.

**Respondent: Sue Broad**

**Submission Number:** 204

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:47

no comments

**Respondent: Tony Glassford**

**Submission Number:** 205

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:47

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Consider a role or investing in increasing the capacity of Falls Dam [instead of large scale Environ Projects]

Provides reasons for above

**Respondent: Lynne Stewart Clyde community & enviroschool's ecological Restoration group**

**Submission Number:** 206

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 21:51

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 5

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 4

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Public transport reduces congestion & is needed, especially Rail transport

**~Environment**

**Comment Number:** 2



**Do you have any feedback**

Our Manuherekia catchment needs the old (gold mining) water allocations, now being maximised, lessened a lot. We want our rivers alive, containing life with riparian planting along their natural sides.

The meeting of the Mata-au and Manuherekia Rivers, used to be a food collection place of tuna/eels and fish. We need fish ladders past both the Roxburgh and Clyde dams if eels are able to move past these huge concrete monsters. The very few eels now “helped” past is too minimal. Our river water needs to be both plentiful and clean.

Taking almost all the river water flowing past to pivot irrigate paddocks for dairy cows might be profitable for farmers but they leave the public and dogs poisoned by the polluted, minimal amount of water remaining in the river.

The Manuherekia River water under Shaky Bridge used to contain plenty of clean water. Now it’s unsafe for recreational uses.

We, The public, want to be able to safely swim in Manuherekia river water.

The Alexandra Blossom Festival kayak slalom paddlers now get violently sick if they imbibe water when they tip over, yet kids used to learn to kayak here. Finn Butcher, a Paris Olympic kayak team member, paddled the Manuherekia slalom for many years.

Bikers on the Otago Central Rail Trail after a cool dip in the Taieri River in the Maniototo, end up vomiting with ear infections.

Most community's want safely swimmable rivers again.

**Respondent: Destination Queenstown****Submission Number:** 207**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:30**About You****Comment Number:** 5**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 3**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Thank you for the opportunity for Destination Queenstown to attend a drop-in session and provide feedback on the Otago Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034.

Destination Queenstown (DQ) is the Regional Tourism Organisation responsible for both destination marketing and destination management in Queenstown. Our role is to position Queenstown in both international and domestic markets and to work collaboratively with our partners to deliver the region's destination management plan, focusing on regenerative tourism by 2030.

Destination Queenstown supports the focus areas outlined in Otago Regional Council's Long-Term Plan and our feedback is specifically related to Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment and Proposal 2: Investing in Public Transport (Queenstown Lakes).

Queenstown Lakes District's destination management plan commits to the goal of regenerative tourism and includes a keystone project to decarbonise the visitor economy by 2030.

Destination Queenstown believes there is significant opportunity to invest in the environment to support our aspirations, along with investment in Queenstown Lakes public transport.

We would also like to share feedback on the consultation process and submission form as it is not conducive to providing meaningful feedback. Our experience with the online form has been complicated, cumbersome and we feel it hasn't been developed with businesses and organisations in mind where more than one person needs to review the submission. The form provided in the back of the consultation booklet does provide a feedback section, however it does not provide enough room for anything constructive. We'd suggest either a free form online option for feedback in future, or an editable PDF document.

We would also like to provide related to the drop-in sessions. We appreciate the time ORC staff took to run these sessions in Queenstown Lakes District however the format and approach needs to be reviewed. In our experience, those leading the sessions weren't open or engaging and appeared to be defensive at times when asked questions.

Destination Queenstown has provided further comments in sections relating to Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment Proposal 2: Investing in Public Transport (Queenstown Lakes). Thank you for reviewing and considering this feedback.

#### **~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

##### **Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

##### **What level of total funding should be available?**

##### **How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

#### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

##### **Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

##### **Please comment**

Destination Queenstown does not support Otago Regional Council's proposed approach for investing in Queenstown public transport as we urge a rapid shift towards zero-emissions public transport. We feel a target of 2035 is not ambitious enough. To support Queenstown Lakes ambition for the visitor economy to reach carbon zero by 2030, the target milestone for electrification of Queenstown's public transport should be 2030. With Queenstown Lakes District's geographical challenges, it is difficult to simply build more roads, therefore it's important to consider alternative solutions to road transport including a zero-emissions ferry network and ropeways. Whilst increasing the bus service to start earlier, finish later and arrive every fifteen minutes within the next 10 years is one solution, Queenstown still has geographical challenges and limited roading infrastructure. Destination Queenstown encourages Otago Regional Council to think beyond simply retaining the existing ferry service and we recommend prioritising frequency and capacity whilst electrifying ferries and extending the service to surrounding suburbs of Lake Whakatipu (including Frankton, Hanley's Farm and Jacks Point). Plans are already underway at Queenstown's Frankton Marina for a widened berth to accommodate two electric boat chargers/browsers, following Queenstown Lakes District Council's recent endorsement of plans to electrify the marina. New Zealand's first electric hydro-foiling ferry coming to Lake Manapouri is a leading example of the possibility of a zero-emissions water ferry, and Queenstown will soon have the technology in place to support this type of transport. We strongly encourage Otago Regional Council to consider beyond the bus network, by introducing electric or hydrogen buses, electric or hydrogen ferries, and ropeways such as Gondolas or Whoosh. Moving residents and visitors from private vehicles to public transport can significantly improve wellbeing within the community, reduce road congestion and lower carbon emissions for the district.

**Respondent: mr Martin Cameron**

**Submission Number:** 208

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:43

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Respondent: Christine Hetherington****Submission Number:** 209**On-behalf of:** LINZ**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:44**~Environment****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback**

LINZ consider that the LTP does not fully cover or provide for ORC's statutory obligations relating to pest management under the Biosecurity Act or the ORC Biosecurity Strategy (from which the Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP) is derived, and which is specifically referenced in the Regional Pest Management Plan).

The submission requests the ORC:

- to fully support the monitoring of Lagarosiphon in the region and;
- provide significant long-term funding for controlling lagarosiphon within the lakes where there are current Lake Weed Management plans

The submission suggests/provides detail on expenditure options for managing 'lagarosiphon control. It also disputes the statement that ORC is the only agency with a remit across all of Otago to promote biodiversity protection and enhancement.

LINZ supports the proposed 'moderate' increase in staff capacity to undertake more education, engagement, and enforcement to manage pests. However, notes a lack of priorities to physically undertake pest management work.

LINZ dispute the statement that the ORC leads pest and biosecurity management in the Region. LINZ consider it a significant omission that it's biosecurity role in the region is not acknowledged in the proposed development of a regional partnership approach.

## Respondent: Destination Southern Lakes

Submission Number: 210

Submission Date: 25/04/24 22:46

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 3

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 2

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

- Thank you for the opportunity for Destination Southern Lakes to provide feedback on the Otago Draft Long Term Plan 2024-2034.
- Destination Southern Lakes (DSL) is the destination management organisation overseeing implementation of Queenstown Lakes region's Destination Management Plan (DMP), Travel to a Thriving Future.
- With a goal for Queenstown Lakes to achieve regenerative tourism by 2030, there are 19 projects underway with the keystone project outlining rapid decarbonisation of the visitor economy by 2030.
- As a region rich in natural beauty, culture, heritage and diversity, progress toward this vision will ensure Queenstown Lakes remains a special place for local communities, and one we can continue to be proud to share with visitors for years to come.
- Destination Southern Lakes supports the focus areas outlined in Otago Regional Council's Long-Term Plan however we have concerns specifically related to Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment and Proposal 2: Investing in Public Transport (Queenstown Lakes).
- Destination Southern Lakes believes there is significant opportunity to invest in the environment to support our aspirations, along with investment in Queenstown Lakes public transport.
- We have provided further comments about our concerns in sections relating to Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment Proposal 2: Investing in Public Transport (Queenstown Lakes).
- Thank you for reviewing and considering this feedback.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 4

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Destination Southern Lakes does not support Otago Regional Council's proposed approach for investing only in Queenstown Lakes buses and we urge a rapid shift towards zero- emissions public transport. We feel a target of 2035 is not ambitious enough. To support Queenstown Lakes ambition for the visitor economy to reach carbon zero by 2030, the target milestone for electrification of public transport should be 2030. With Queenstown Lakes District's geographical challenges, it is difficult to simply build more roads, therefore it's important to consider alternative solutions to road transport including zero-emissions ferry network and ropeways. Whilst increasing the bus service to start earlier, finish later and arrive every fifteen minutes within the next 10 years is one solution, Queenstown Lakes district still has geographical challenges and limited roading infrastructure. Destination Southern Lakes encourages Otago Regional Council to think beyond simply retaining the existing ferry service and we recommend prioritising frequency and capacity whilst electrifying ferries and extending the service to surrounding suburbs of Lake Whakatipu (including Frankton, Hanley's Farm and Jacks Point). Plans are already underway at Queenstown's Frankton Marina for a widened berth to accommodate two electric boat chargers/bowsers, following Queenstown Lakes District Council's recent endorsement of plans to electrify the marina. New Zealand's first electric hydro-foiling ferry coming to Lake Manapouri is a leading example of the possibility of a zero-emissions water ferry, and Queenstown will soon have the technology in place to support this type of transport. We strongly encourage Otago Regional Council to consider beyond the bus network, by introducing electric or hydrogen buses, electric or hydrogen ferries, and ropeways such as Gondolas or Whoosh. Moving residents and visitors from private vehicles to public transport can significantly improve wellbeing within the community, reduce road congestion and lower carbon emissions for the district.

**Respondent: Victoria van der Spek****Submission Number:** 211**On-behalf of:** Waitaki District Council**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:49**About You****Comment Number:** 1**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number:** 4**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Lower Waitaki River Control Scheme - WDC notes the proposed change to the rating system for the Lower Waitaki River Control Scheme including moving funding to be a district wide as opposed to a smaller defined area. - WDC understands the purpose of this scheme is to maintain the system of braided river channels and limit erosion. Recommendation: - WDC requests clarification around the rationale for this rating change which will impact every ratepayer in the Waitaki district.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number:** 5**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

WDC considers that the significant risks to the natural and built environment that wilding conifers pose warrant a separate rate to help manage these issues.

Recommendation:

- Retain the wilding tree rate.



**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

WDC supports the local public transport service trial in Ōamaru.

WDC requests further details around the public transport trial scheme for Ōamaru including its funding model and proposed length of trial

**Respondent: Gilbert and Judy Black**

**Submission Number:** 212

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:50

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Steam Channel/Gordon Road spillway to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Rd Sth are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey spilt water from the Gordon Rd spillway to teh Upper Ponding Area as designed.

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed

**Respondent: Brian Bennett**

**Submission Number:** 213

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:51

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Steam Channel/Gordon Road spillway to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Rd Sth are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey spilt water from the Gordon Rd spillway to teh Upper Ponding Area as designed.

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed

**Respondent: Greg and Melinda Stevenson-Wright**

**Submission Number:** 214

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:52

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed.

**Respondent: Jim McQuillan**

**Submission Number:** 215

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:53

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Regarding proposal 1 - would like to see a project to Darwins barberry and sycamore throughout the West Harbour region, including Burns Park Scenic Reserve, that has been unchecked for decades.

**Respondent: Vivienne Seaton**

**Submission Number:** 216

**On-behalf of:** Otago Southland Rescue Helicopter

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:55

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Thank you for your ongoing support. We greatly appreciate the commitment to a long-term contribution from the Otago Regional Council towards this challenging community funding requirement. We look forward to presenting to Council later this year.

## Respondent: Barry Williams

Submission Number: 217

On-behalf of: Strath Taieri Community Board

Submission Date: 25/04/24 22:58

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 6

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### Please comment

As a minimum service to ratepayers, a twice weekly return service should be available on a prescribed timetable so as they can make firm commitments to attend appointments and be assured that transport will be available to achieve that. recommended that service be contracted locally in the Strath Taieri to minimise unnecessary travel and costs. An appropriate sized vehicle could leave Middlemarch at a specified time, collect residents enroute and return later that day.

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 5

### Do you have any feedback

As a Community Board our long term aspirational objective is to ensure that the quality of water leaving our area is of a higher standard than when it enters.

Accordingly we urge Council to instigate regular water quality measurements at key points along the length of the Taieri River with an initial minimum of four sampling points spaced at strategic sites within the Strath Taieri area

Additionally we seek opportunities to be better briefed by Council staff on the wider range of issues associated with the Taieri river and catchment within the Strath Taieri area so as a Board we can be better informed on matters that are of

local interest and concern.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

With 46% of the city's emissions being assessed as agriculturally based there is potentially significant impacts on our community in reaching published reduction levels by 2030 especially given the current lack of viable "clean energy" farm vehicle alternatives. That along with proposed biogenic emission reduction targets continues to set a very high hurdle for our community

While we support some farm forestry mitigation approaches **we caution against wholesale farm conversion to achieve those reductions**

The Board would also **encourage further work being done in the area of carbon sequestration** through acceptance that both large scale riparian and other planting of long-lived native plant species as is being undertaken locally by the likes of the Mid Taieri Wai group and various private landowners is a viable and effective tool to reduce carbon

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

1. Security and integrity of infrastructure from flooding.

As previously highlighted there is an ongoing absolute need to resolve – as a matter of urgency – issues within and adjacent to the Middlemarch township with regard to flooding.



**Respondent: Craig and Julie Struthers**

**Submission Number:** 218

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 22:59

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity.

That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs

That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed

**Respondent: Alan Scurr**

**Submission Number:** 219

---

**Submission Date:** 25/04/24 23:12

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**Respondent: Diana Evans**

**Submission Number: 220**

---

**Submission Date: 25/04/24 23:17**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 10**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Through Dunedin city and Palmerston paying for it

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I live in Clutha, I should not have to pay anything to bus or ferry services in Queenstown

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

I live in Clutha and should not be paying for bus services that are not available to me

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 8**

<b>~Environment</b>	<b>Comment Number: 12</b>
<b>~Climate change and Resilience</b>	<b>Comment Number: 3</b>
<b>~Transport</b>	<b>Comment Number: 9</b>
<b>Infrastructure Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 17</b>
<b>How we fund our work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 4</b>

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Prioritise what is actually needed without increasing rates significantly, not every project needs to be done or needs to be done now.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

A

**Respondent: Michael Thompson****Submission Number: 221****Submission Date: 25/04/24 23:22****About You****Comment Number: 2****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

- A significant challenge, particularly in the Queenstown/Wanaka area is the huge amount of private profit gained by companies benefiting from public assets such as infrastructure and the environment we live in. We need a way to get some of these companies more on board to improve the resources that they have relied on and will continue to do so.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 3****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Getting people out of their cars is such a huge challenge and a huge opportunity here. And especially in the short term public transport to me seems like the only option. So it is really really important. And our bus drivers are key to this. Their recent pay rise was great, more would be better. Maybe this would encourage more people into the profession so we can provide better services. Transitioning to an electric fleet is a fantastic long term goal but I think now we need to focus on more buses so that routes can be improved. So yes we should be getting electric buses but not yet taking the diesel ones off the road.

**Respondent: Mr Dave Johnson****Submission Number: 222****Submission Date: 25/04/24 23:35****About You****Comment Number: 4****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Do not agree with rating to include areas that don't get bus services. A lower level of rating might be justifiable but not the same as those receiving services. Those in the rural area don't venture into town. A congestion tax would be fairer.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 2****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 3****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

The East taieri drainage area needs a complete review as many areas that drain into the area are not covered by the scheme. Mosgiel residential does not pay there share as they contribute a large portion of the runoff that creates the flooding in the lower ponding area. The proposal mean most of the larger blocks have a doubling of the drainage rates without getting any benefit. The rating level is unaffordable.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Need to reinstate the liason with rate payers to see if proposed work is necessary.

**Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes



**Respondent: Mr Martin Cameron****Submission Number: 223****Submission Date: 25/04/24 23:42****About You****Comment Number: 4****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 3****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 6****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We have a family farm in Hyde Tiroiti the furthest property from the Octagon. We object to paying for a bus service that we will not be using at all. When in Dunedin getting farm supplies and services, using a bus is not an option. Rates should be fair and equitable. User pays.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

As a Wanaka resident we will be paying increasing amounts for a service that isn't available to us. The rates must be fair and equitable in this time of a cost of living crisis and high interest rates. What happened to user pays. A small contribution would be more acceptable in the Wanaka area.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Being rated on our capital value for the Leith Stream Flood Zone when we live 120 km away seems extremely unreasonable.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

We would like to see a change to charges on 'Miles charged costs' for when ORC feel they need to visit properties doing audit checks etc. There should be a one standard charge amount to cover the whole Otago Area.

**Respondent: Mr Glenn Dawson**

**Submission Number: 224**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 00:18**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Tell us what you think**  
**Any other feedback?**

As we live in a rural area (Cardrona), we have to use our own transport options out of necessity & we would NEVER have to use public transport in Queenstown. As such, myself & my household are totally against having to pay ANY rate for public transport in Queenstown. It should be a targeted rate applicable only to those in the areas where the public transport options are available for daily use. Completely unfair for a household located in Cardrona to pay a rate for Queenstown public transport. As always, it should be user pays & we won't be users of the service.

**Respondent: Mr James Barclay**

**Submission Number: 225**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 00:21**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Be very mindful of the Emphasis of Matters comments in the Deloitte Report

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Partnership is a very difficult concept to articulate as policy.

The public perception is the when the manu whenua is consulted it is another added cost for a consent application, but it is usually resolved if money is paid.

Recently, an application for resource consent for mining near Millers Flat was declined because of sacred burial sites, and other matters.

To give this advice credence these sites need to be located and identified.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Administration rates would be higher and less adaptive to local requirements.

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

User pays and administration costs are not being charged to those people who do not use navigational services.  
Boat owners who use council supplied boat ramps pay a fee

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

The "environment" needs to be defined. I quote:-

**He Tangata Principal**

He aha te mea nui? Māku e kii atu, he tāngata, he tāngata, he tāngata.

What is the most important thing in the world? Well, let me tell you, it is people, it is people, it is people.

The environment is for communities and ecosystems and a flourishing biodiversity must be given consideration but not at the expense of people.

Our environment is being damaged by a massive rabbit infestation. The worst I've seen for many years. The constraints on effective control, such as Health and Safety; gun control; Fish and Game; and DoC are making it difficult for land owners.

Reinstate Rabbit boards with delegated powers to navigate the restraints and control this environmental pest.

Invermay could be approached to use as research unit for genetic and other ways of controlling rabbits and possums.

Combine the venture with other Regional Councils such as Southland and Canterbury as they all have the same problems with pests.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

Climate has always changed, and the best solution is the evolutionary process that follows naturally.

Prescription in Policy will fail as global warming may be something that cannot be controlled by mankind. However, we will adapt

Scientists are divided over the effects of methane in the atmosphere, as well as the effect of grass species in sequestering carbon.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

The LTP must continually be reviewed.

Public buses will have to be constructed in a way to cope with the weight of the batteries and the passengers. This may require twin axle vehicles or floatation tyres.

EV and PHEV are still evolving and will get cheaper over time.

Charging stations will offer greater mobility and distance in travel

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback**

The RMA is going to be amended by the new Government.

The Otago Regional Council has been told Land and Water plans for the region does not need to be completed till 2027. Ignoring this advice is not good leadership or good governance.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 5****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Assets that are not producing a good return to the stakeholders (ie ratepayers) should be sold. Port Otago has not produced a satisfactory return to the stakeholders for many years. The return has averaged about \$7 million per year over the last 35+ years

Development of vacant land around the Otago Harbour should be sold for residential or commercial purposes.

The operational arm of Port Otago is not an efficiently run enterprise. According to the World Bank Container Port Efficiency Index it is 276 out of 348 ports in the survey. However, it is better than Lyttelton, Auckland and Tauranga.

The Otago Harbour is one of only two deep water ports in NZ and this should be capitalized on. NZ needs efficiently run ports as we are mainly an exporting country. Big ships need deep water. Big ships can carry more freight and people at a lower cost per item.

Owning and developing land should not be the function of Regional Councils.

At the moment the only shareholders in Port Otago and Chalmers Properties is the ORC. The ORC appoints the directors. There is no accountability of the directors to the stakeholders.

Sell non profitable assets and consider Public Private Partnerships as a means of Capital Fund raising. Alternatively, sell the shares of Port Otago and let the market determine their value.



**Respondent: Central Otago Wilding Conifer Control Group****Submission Number:** 226**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 00:53**About You****Comment Number:** 5**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 4**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The Central Otago Wilding Conifer Control Group (CWG) supports the ORC vision for Otago.

The spread of wilding conifers has the potential to devastate our economy and is an imminent threat to Central Otago. There are well established substantial benefits to controlling wilding conifers now rather than later. The CWG is grateful for the support ORC has given it in funding in the past but believes that a significant increase in funding from ORC, particularly in light of a reduction in funding from central government, is both necessary and justifiable in terms of cost/benefit to the region. We believe funding of community groups such as ours in delivering public funded control programs provides good value for money in terms of outcomes.

The effective control of wilding conifers, in addition to carrying out control operations, requires a Paradyme shift in the community's understanding of the appropriate use of conifers in our landscapes and an understanding of the threat they pose to factors the community values such as fresh water and landscapes. Community groups who speak on behalf of the community are well placed to work in this space. Supporting effective models for the long-term delivery of weed and pest control will be one of the major challenges for the council in the long-term plan.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 6**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

CWG supports the areas of focus identified, however without a clear understanding of the relationships between these factors, the underlying problems may not be made specific and addressed.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 7



**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

CWG is opposed to the proposed change to funding wilding tree control funding and prefers the current model for the following reasons;

-The current system guarantees funds are specifically for wilding conifer control and is not contestable for other pest control issues.

- The clear identification on rates demands of a rate for wilding tree control helps maintain public consciousness of the significance of this particular pest plant problem over and above others.

- It identifies for the public how small a contribution each property currently makes to what they will come to realise with the current level of funding is an inadequate amount.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

CWG believe the projected level of rating into the future does not truly reflect what we believe will be the level of investment required to control wilding conifers given the current level of investment and to avoid the severe environmental and economic impact that will result.

**Respondent: Dr Liana Machado**

**Submission Number: 227**

---

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 01:48**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Respondent: Andrew Millar****Submission Number: 228****Submission Date: 26/04/24 03:05****About You****Comment Number: 6****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

There would appear to be many challenges emanating from the new government's minimalist approach to the environment, water quality, biodiversity etc. This worries me as there will be pressure on yourselves to accept much lower standards in these areas, which presents long term risks to our ecosystems and our communities.

Aside from these concerns, as an Upper Clutha resident I wish to note that the Central Otago region in general continues to experience ongoing plagues of rabbits, which the current policy of individual landowner responsibility has failed miserably to address. It only takes a few neglectful owners to render more responsive owner efforts totally fruitless. The previous method of collective management and control produced much better outcomes of effectiveness and cost distribution.

With respect to invasive weed species (eg, old mans beard, broom etc), whatever is being done would appear to be either insufficient or ineffective as infestations are widespread and appear to be increasing.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 15****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 11****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I am generally in favour of a provision that properly meets the needs of the community it serves, and if we are to increase to usage of public transport (which is very important in the highly congested Queenstown area), then the service has to be provided in advance of encouraging people to use it. The challenge after that is advancing the incentives to use the service and reduce commuter car usage.

#### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Tell us what you think Any other feedback?**

As an Upper Clutha resident I am strongly opposed to those in Wanaka Albert Town and Hawea etc paying for the 80% contribution for Queenstown public transport. The 20% general rate contribution is more than sufficient to provide for any spill-over benefit which Upper Clutha residents might derive.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 12**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 16**

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 2**

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

no view on this topic

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

#### **Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I object to the cost of rural quality water programmes being transferred from rural property owners to largely urban properties. The issues of rural water quality ought to belong to those who live in rural areas.

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

#### **Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

no view on this.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 5**

#### **Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

I do have some doubts about whether the funding for this essential work is allocated fairly either under the current or the proposed arrangements. The problem is essentially a rural one, and is growing one because in my view certain land owners do not take responsibility for dealing with the issue in its early stages.

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 4**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

The rabbit management strategy of recent years has been a complete failure. The Upper Clutha/Central Otago region experiences ongoing plagues of rabbits which the current strategy of individual property owner responsibility has failed to contain. It only takes a few neglectful property owners to render the more responsive landowner efforts totally fruitless. The earlier method of rabbit board control produced much better outcomes of effectiveness and cost distribution.

More effort is needed in respect of invasive weed species . eg old mans beard, broom, etc.

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 14**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

There is no mention within the plan document of whether you are involved in encouraging/facilitating "letting the river run" in some catchments, as opposed to controlling/containing river systems. There is increasing evidence that giving rivers more space is the better long term option, particularly in the face of increasing flood frequency under climate change.

#### **~Transport**

**Comment Number: 10**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

Living in Wanaka, and being well aware that we have no public transport to speak of, and aware also that economic provision of it is very problematic in our relatively sparsely numbered and widespread communities, should the ORC be involved in some kind of assistance provision with active transport opportunities and infrastructure within this area?

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 13****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

May I comment on the current funding arrangements whereby Capital Value is used to generate your broad funding model.

It is my view that lumping all the regions together and then calculating rates based upon absolute CV is not a fair mechanism. The outcome is that the Wanaka/Queenstown area with by far the highest CV's has shouldered an ever greater portion of the general rate funding. This is not really fair because this discrete region has a spread of CV's which represent a range of "ability to pay" situations from the lower end of valuations through to the top end of them. Just in the same way as Dunedin City for example has a bottom end of lesser ability to pay situations and then the top end has the greater "ability to pay". Using CV's can be a fair way to spread the rates burden when looking at discrete localities, but is not at all a fair and equitable method if used across the Otago region as a single entity.

I acknowledge at the same time that there is no perfect solution, and perhaps this matter can come up for discussion prior to the next plan consultation.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 7****Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Rates increases are never welcome, but I believe there is plenty of catch up space within our environment particularly that mean rates increases are inevitable if we are to prepare for a liveable future.

Having said that, I feel it is rather misleading to say that ORC rates are low compared to other regions, given that the Otago region is blessed with contribution from its investment in Port Otago, something which other regions do not have.

**Respondent: mrs Gillian MAcleod****Submission Number: 229****Submission Date: 26/04/24 04:45****About You****Comment Number: 10****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 4****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I fundamentally agree tht public transport services are increased. I do not understand why air travel is not included in public transport. Location of airports is directly linked to public transport and in Queenstown the cause of our constant gridlock. Failure by ORC and QLDC to acknowledge the role of the airport as a transport option and a direct and major effect consigns ORC and QLDC to their current siloed mentality. Until we truly consider major issues such as unlocking the QLDC airport land by moving the airport to a more central location we will continue to play catch up with the past and not the future. Eventually the airport will move and public transport will be a whole new and better ball game district wide. On demand and smaller electric buses sound like a move in the right direction. I hope the buses are smaller, especially for movement on our narrow roads in some of the suburbs and steeper parts of Queenstown. Waka Kotahi have in the past mentioned a gondola for linkages. Has the ORC considered this in their PT planning While I agree fundamentally on the 80-20 cost allocation I do not agree on uag charging for this. In the absence of any tourist tax or return of GST generated by tourists, rates particularly in QLDC, and possibly other areas should be taxed according to value of the asset. Ie a proportion of CV, not a universal annual charge. QLDC has to cater for a population far bigger than its resident population and the users of public transport are often tourists. A universal annual charge does not properly cover users from sources such as hotels or Airbnb patrons. owners of less valuable properties may end up paying a disproportionate amount of their property's worth compared to owners of more valuable properties. This can be particularly burdensome for low-income homeowners who are more likely to be elderly and first home buyers. Overall, a tax system based

on the value of the property is more equitable, stable, and reflective of the true economic value of the land, and taxes higher those who are more able to pay, regardless of whether they choose to patronise a bus service. I feel this system should apply universally across ORC. Wanaka may feel it should not be part of this rate but it is part of the future PT plan, so surely should be one of the funders> It also relies on tourists who use PT.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 1

##### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

##### Any other feedback?

Support the rate being linked to capital value of property. QLDC has to cater for a population far bigger than its resident population and the users of public transport are often tourists. A universal annual charge does not properly cover users from sources such as hotels or Airbnb patrons. owners of less valuable properties may end up paying a disproportionate amount of their property's worth compared to owners of more valuable properties. This can be particularly burdensome for low-income homeowners who are more likely to be elderly and first home buyers. Overall, a tax system based on the value of the property is more equitable, stable, and reflective of the true economic value of the land, and taxes higher those who can afford to pay, regardless of patronage.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 11

##### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

##### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

I dont understand difference between class a and b

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 3

##### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* Yes

##### Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?

I would like to know how this relates to a climate resilience strategy- we wont be able to cover all floods- but what is the plan for flooding?

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 6

##### Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?

- \* Yes

##### Please comment on the navigational safety rate



I would like QLDC included. Not that happy with our harbourmaster being under control of a security firm

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

I want the wilding pine targeted rate to remain. Its a line that people understand and can see benefits. All conservation work like this should be line funded through a targeted rate.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

I would like to know more about a climate change strategy- why has it taken to long?

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

The document is well set out and I commend the councillors who have made themselves available for consultation, especially by way of public stall at the market- well done Alexa.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Are some of the future events unstoppable and is it time for managed retreat?

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The average price of a house in qldc is now 1.9m so I dont think you have used the correct example

**Respondent: Ms Sue Ross**

**Submission Number:** 230

**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 05:17

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

The bus service changes do not take into account the practicalities of running a bus service. ORC expects everyone in Queenstown to either be going along Frankton Rd, shopping, Arrowtown (only as a tourist!) or the airport. The service is currently, open to the vagaries of driver shortages and the timetable is not adhered to. Instead of continuing with the same old service that isn't getting MOST people into public transport, ORC is insisting on retaining the same policies that are not working.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I would have liked to READ the draft financial strategy however, the website is not set up for phones so I am unable to comment specifically on the details. I would ask that ORC attempt to justify the proposed increase in my ORC rates by 35%! This is based on a very outdated valuation which means that I will probably end up with a 100% or greater increase which no amount of local government speak can justify.

**Respondent: Central Otago Environmental Society****Submission Number:** 231**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 06:18**About You****Comment Number:** 6**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 2**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 5**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

COES supports the council's vision for Otago.

However, while the LTP identifies the challenges, there is little recognition of the fundamental conflict between continuing to grow the economy, the environmental and thermodynamic limits to growth and the council's vision. The council is simply dealing with the symptoms of this predicament rather than dealing with the causes. We acknowledge that the council may have limited ability to deal with the causes when population growth through immigration is in the hands of central government. Hence the treadmill of needing more labour units to grow the economy which in turn needs more built environment which in turn stresses and eventually overtops the capacity of the natural environment to absorb it which leads to loss of water quality, biodiversity, air quality, healthy living environments and climate change. It is from the bottom up that the demand for a transition to a sustainable economy (as opposed to one based on sustainable growth) will be heard and the council has a part to play in communicating that.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 7**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

COES supports these as the importance focuses for council, however the way they appear to be framed is to balance these focuses against each other. Without clear environmental standards and limits which protect environmental function and health of such as rivers and streams, biodiversity and soil health, the climate, the environment will always tend to lose out to economic growth. We again acknowledge the constraints put on council by National Environmental Standards.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 4

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

COES supports the council subsidising public transport as a way of gradually changing behavior to use less fossil fuels and more energy efficient transport.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

COES sees wilding pines as one of the most significant threats to our environment in Central Otago, second to climate change. Funding this threat through a general biosecurity rate risks the deserved focus on wilding conifers being diminished. The current wilding tree rate identifies for the public that the council believes this is a standout biosecurity issue and not just one of many of equal importance.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 12****Do you have any feedback**

COES supports community partnerships as a good way of delivering environmental outcomes. However, the council has an important role in monitoring environmental outcomes and reporting these back to the community. Monitoring should include both landowner real time monitoring and independent regulatory monitoring, each of which have different purposes.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback**

COES would like to see the council dealing with matters such as urban design and encouraging energy efficient patterns of settlement which deal with reducing the cause of climate change as well as improving adaptation to climate change.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback**

COES strongly supports the council investing in community engagement and regional planning as essential components in moving the community and economy toward a sustainable economy. A strong regulatory framework that includes environmental bottom lines working in tandem with community engagement and supporting community groups working for the environment are essential components.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 13****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

COES supports rates rises where those rates go toward mitigating the effects of growing an economy which this generation benefits from. We oppose borrowing where the effect is to move the cost to future generations who will inherit an environment with less capacity to achieve the council's vision.

## Respondent: Dr Marilyn Duxson

Submission Number: 232

Submission Date: 26/04/24 09:10

### About You

Comment Number: 11

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 6

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Support in general. Fingers crossed the Fresh Water Farm Plans can continue to be implemented, despite this current governments apparent lack of enthusiasm

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

Support

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback**

Support

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Support

**Respondent: Ann Wood**

**Submission Number: 233**

---

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 09:39**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

One thing that would be very good on a Sunday is later buses. As it stands at the moment it is impossible to go to a late afternoon movie or out for an early meal because the buses do not run much after 5:30 or 6pm. Very limiting indeed.



**Respondent: Mr Barry Gray**

**Submission Number: 234**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 10:00**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Unsustainable rating burden. I believe the priority is essential services in my local district. I can't afford an increase in my rates.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Under The Treaty of Waitangi all New Zealanders are equal therefore there is no partnership with mana whenua who are equal to but not better than other people in the Otago communities. I prefer my rates to be paid towards essential services.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

Bus services should be decided by those who are able to utilise bus services in their area and are paying for them under a targeted rate.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

All public transport options should be decided and paid for by those who live in an area serviced by reliable public transport and pay a targeted public transport rate to reflect that fact.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Under the proposal 635 Lower Clutha ratepayers would have an increase in rates of \$632.22 which is a huge rate rise.

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Proposed change was for a uniform rate of \$10.85 per rating unit which I support. The question refers to it as being based on a capital value which I don't support.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

I support targeted rates for clarity and transparency.

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

If the cost of Regional Leadership could be reduced by 10% then the approximate \$2 million saved could be dedicated to funding large scale environmental projects .

## Respondent: Mrs Nicole Huddleston

Submission Number: 235

Submission Date: 26/04/24 10:45

### About You

Comment Number: 3

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

#### Tell us what you think

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### Any other feedback?

Do not support costs being spread across areas not directly served by the proposals. DND should pay for DND, QT pay for QT. No comment on whether services should be expanded etc as not used/relevant to areas not paying for them - let the paying ratepayers decide as to their benefit/improvements not the wider area. Wanaka does not benefit from any public transport services, so, should not pay for them.

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you have any feedback

Wanaka needs a public transport system. A system like  
Also better connections with QT airport.

**Respondent: Mary Ann Baxter****Submission Number:** 236**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 11:04**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 14**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

It is so reassuring and refreshing to see these being articulated so clearly and specifically. We desperately need ORC's courageous leadership here, as we see our government coalition in denial and in real danger of sending us so far backwards. Never lose sight of the fact we are stewards only of our land and water and must ensure we leave this place in a better state than what it is now and has become. Ngā mihi nui.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 16**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

It is imperative we address all of these areas as a whole, no matter how complex that seems. We cannot silo off some of them without risking the planet and our precious part of the world here.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 11**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I like the idea of all of us contributing (I live in Alexandra). We need to shift to thinking collectively to make the difference we must make now for sustainability and to aim to make the biggest difference we can around addressing how we get to carbon zero.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 17**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We need to be planning deliberately so that there is access to more public transport and fewer cars on the road for our environment. What planning and thinking is being done about how we reduce the number of trucks on the road wherever it is possible in the region?

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 18****Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**

Please continue the leadership needed here to assist us all to become more collective about our responsibility across our region to do all we can to endorse and support public transport wherever we can, for a cleaner, more climate friendly future.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 2****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 3****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 13****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

- \* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 15

**Do you have any feedback**

This is all essential work as we take responsibility for what we can and plan to save our planet.

Continue to be advocates with government to get more funding for this work locally, and also for them to show the national leadership sadly lacking at the moment.

### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 6

**Do you have any feedback**

What happened in the North Island in particular in 2023 (e.g. Cyclone Gabrielle and the Auckland floods) show us how imperative all this planning is - and more. We must be really vigilant around each of the areas outlined under climate change and resilience for the sake of our region and our children/grandchildren.

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 4

**Do you have any feedback**

Continue to develop this one very proactively. Thanks for the commitments made here - let's see them become our region's realities, wherever possible and viable, asap.

### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 9

**Do you have any feedback**

Thank you for the leadership shown here throughout the clean water debate. It will continue to be complex and we need councillors who know they are there for the region's health long-term including the ability to survive and thrive sustainably.

It's a timely opportunity to remind councillors to ensure they are continuing to listen to their constituents as a whole and not just those who think the same way as them - especially the ones elected from Central Otago who seem to think they only are there to represent those in the farming lobby who don't seem to accept there need to be sustainable practices there too.



**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 19****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

It's helpful to see how much is being done in this sphere. Thanks for all of this work as we need to be ever mindful of how much climate change is impacting on us here and at any stage we could be very much affected by it.

Anything ORC can do to assist our coalition government to support this work and provide you with more income would be very much appreciated so that you can accelerate and add to all you are already doing in this space.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 7****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The section where the rubber meets the road so to speak!

While any increases are tough right now, especially for any ratepayers who are on low wages or fixed incomes, and/or who are finding insurance has skyrocketed and now rates both at district and regional council level are rising, what is reassuring is the effort being made to mitigate or minimise the severe risks that the likes of our North Island whanau had last year with the Auckland floods and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Please continue to communicate well with all your ratepayers so that they do appreciate what a difference you want to make and are determined to make for the good of our planet. Maybe more visits to schools where our inspiring young people are so concerned about what the world is now like would assist you to get more information (rather than mis- or dis-information) into their homes, and they too could 1) become your advocates and 2) become ready to join such councils and assist all of us to be doing all we can to keep us carbon neutral and sustainable in all our practices.

Ngā mihi nui for this document, all the thinking and advocacy that has gone into it, and for the science it is so keenly based on.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

We must do this! Continue to see if we can encourage our government to become more open to working for our future in a way that is ever in line with the values and mission that underpin this document. You are demonstrating it can happen - thank you!

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We do have to consider how to support those who simply cannot afford the increases in rates that will arise out of your decisions. I trust that is also part of your agenda so that such decisions avoid exacerbating the social divide we are seeing being exposed all around us today in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The creativity that has been involved in developing the concepts and proposals in this document shows that there are people who wish to present this as a document about humanity: please continue to keep that to the fore, for all of us, no matter what our financial circumstances.

If that does mean some of us do have to pay more so that others can pay less, that too has to be something we're invited to consider as ratepayers.

Many of us can feel helpless as we worry about the social divide: providing such options may well be seen as a way we can 'pay it forward'. Try us out: from my conversations among friends, family and colleagues I'm sure I'm not on my own when I suggest many of us want to be part of a collective which does show such empathy and practical support for all to be able to live with dignity and equity in our region.

**Respondent: Ellen Walters**

**Submission Number: 237**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 11:15**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Tautoko

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Bus services are essential and a huge aspect of their viability is their reliability and regularity - how easy it is to use them. I also think an extra bus on the #3 route to finish later than 9pm ish. I highly support the Balcultha service providing an airport bus service and wider PT throughout the region. I know it costs and this government are less likely to help fund but I believe these are essential services with widespread benefits to communities

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

As above, I believe in the benefits of increased PT and that services need a stronger commitment.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Wilding pines really need to be managed to reduce their control over our environment

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

P

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

YES YES YES YES

The bus to the airport in particular please

**Respondent: Mrs J Baumgren**

**Submission Number: 238**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 19:32**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Only people who have access to public transport should be charged. NO Wānaka residents should be made to pay when there is no public service available for us. The overall rate increases of about 40% is ridiculous. Restructure/ redistribute money better within ORC, before asking rate payers for such a large increase!!!

**Respondent: Miss Jeanine McKenzie**

**Submission Number: 239**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 20:08**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Whilst I appreciate that buses need replacing, I do not agree to paying for the increase of bus services for an area that I do not live in. There are other bus services that should be increased namely the number 18 that collects all the school children from the Peninsula and takes them to and from school. This service is usually overcrowded and some children have been unable to get on the bus as it is full. There is no other bus that runs the same route so they are left with having to make other arrangements to get home. An additional bus should run at the same time to facilitate the transport of school children to and from school.

**Respondent: Te Kākano Aotearoa Trust**

**Submission Number:** 240

**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 21:02

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**Respondent: Mr Tim Robinson**

**Submission Number:** 241

---

**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 22:06

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)



**Respondent: Mr Paul Millis**

**Submission Number: 242**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 22:17**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Respondent: Ms Chris Kjelgaard**

**Submission Number:** 243

---

**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 22:18

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

We need to do more to enhance and protect our environment, for example we need to support large scale environmental projects with sustained funding. This encourages other donors to support such projects as well, and leads to a long-lasting positive change for the environment. Projects to maintain a healthy environment would prepare now for natural hazards and changing climate such as by reducing emissions, improving public transport, and supporting communities that work to enhance and protect our environment.

## Respondent: mrs Catherine Watson

Submission Number: 244

Submission Date: 26/04/24 22:27

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I believe the decision to futureproof needs to be made now.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

Just get on with it!

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 2

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Property size has no impact on this rate and is a problem for all. The fairest way is to charge a set rate to cover this as is currently done.

**Respondent: Lesley Anerson**

**Submission Number: 245**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 22:48**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

looking after the environment and heritage of Central Otago

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

## Respondent: Ms Chris Kjelgaard

Submission Number: 246

Submission Date: 26/04/24 22:52

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 3

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

### ~ORC's must-do work

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you have any feedback

I support proposals that maximise protecting the environment, reducing emissions preparing for natural and climate change hazards.

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback

I support projects that maximise water quality protection.

### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you have any feedback

I support all projects that support waterways protection , air quality protection and soil quality protection.

### Financial Strategy

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?

I accept that climate change resilience in all areas will cost. We all contribute to the effects of climate change and we are all responsible for the quality of the air, water and soil that we pass on to succeeding generations. Therefore I understand that increased rates are unavoidable so that we may act urgently to maximise preparations now for both natural hazards and the effects of climate change.

**Respondent: Mrs Dianne Trethewey**

**Submission Number:** 247

---

**Submission Date:** 26/04/24 22:59

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**Respondent: Mrs Dianne Trethewey**

**Submission Number: 248**

**Submission Date: 26/04/24 23:08**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I live in Wanaka. Am not in support of paying for additional services for Queenstown when there is no confirmed public service offerings for Wanaka



**Respondent: Mrs Natasha Hopping**

**Submission Number:** 249

---

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 00:06

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Cost of living crisis and unaffordable rising rate costs for families . Lack of help rates rebate for low to middle income families struggling. Constant rising rates isn't helping. Because you want a fancy new building and electric buses . We vote no change option 2!! No rate increase

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Option 2 no rate increases in a cost of living crisis

**Respondent: Mrs Jose Cranfield**

**Submission Number: 250**

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 01:10**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I do not think these cost should come from Wānaka rates unless we are going to see the same level of investment in the Upper Clutha

## Respondent: Ms Deborah Robb

Submission Number: 251

Submission Date: 27/04/24 01:38

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 3

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We urgently need provision of public transport everywhere and to shift public perception on the consequences of private car use. Climate change needs to be acted on NOW.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I am extremely worried about climate change so any move that invests in reducing carbon gets my support. Do not listen to people whose reasoning is that they can't afford rate rises. They are large because we didn't act sooner and delaying now will cost us more.

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 4

**Do you have any feedback**

Any policies that reduce carbon emissions gets my support.

Water quality must not be allowed to worsen but only improve. As regulator, it is the ORC's duty to protect the commons - not be manipulated by the loud voices of commercial, or agricultural interests. Most people don't know what's at stake until it's too late. And it's always public money that cleans up the environment after private

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

I am more supportive of rates being used to reduce carbon emissions by whatever means, than mitigate effects. Let the effects be educational tools

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

I live in Clyde and have a flat in Dunedin. We would love to use public transport between the 2. We are often juggling how to get grandkids for example up or down and better public transport options would be wonderful. We need to reduce reliance on private vehicles urgently

**Respondent: Dr Lynley Hood**

**Submission Number:** 252

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 01:43

**About You** **Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: Mr Tim Walsh****Submission Number: 253****Submission Date: 27/04/24 01:55****About You****Comment Number: 2****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 1****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I am worried about the out of control spending by the ORC. This is not the time to implement new services! Stick to the basics monitoring, compliance, maintaining, to a high standard, the assets we the rate payers own via the ORC that's it simple eh! In case you haven't heard, there is a cost of living crises. The Reserve Bank has said a major contributor to New Zealand's inflation (which is keeping interest rates very high) is non-tradable inflation. This rate rise will directly contribute to New Zealand's non-tradable inflation especially at the proposed rate increases indicated. This proposal isn't only going to affect Otago but New Zealand its truly outrageous. Rates for me last year was \$1,058 proposed under this is \$1,356 that is a 28.16% increase! Its a shame the long term plan doesn't provide the true increases for the rate payers, very misleading. For our student population, which is a significant part of Otago's economy, this is only going to mean rental increases. For the property owners, it's another cost we have to manage amongst many others.

I think you as councillors, need to step up and represent your constituents be fiscally prudent until such a time that lower interest rates can offset most of your proposed cost increases. Now is not the time to implement new costs and initiatives now is the time to be prudent and look after the population of Otago.

**Respondent: Mrs Woodhouse**

**Submission Number:** 254

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 02:25

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 14

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number:** 11

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number:** 5

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 15

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 10

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

User pays. Increase cost of bus service

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 2

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

User pays so rates not affected. Not everyone else's fault that people use the bus

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 8****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

I don't have the bus service in clutha.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 9****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**Please comment**

Charge the people using the service. Not rate payers fault it was not increased years ago. We have been dealing with covid for years now. Time to stop playing on the 'covid' excuses.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 6****Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 3****!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 7****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 1****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 4**



**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

There is already a bus that goes through balclutha, airportlrt, Dunedin etc. Not sure why you would fund another. Seems a waste

**Respondent: Dr Ian Turnbull****Submission Number:** 255**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 02:30**About You****Comment Number:** 11**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

We have a lot of challenges; meeting these will cost money, in part due to under-investment in the past. As a ratepayer, I am prepared to see my rates increase, so we can get things done.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 6**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 12**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

The more public transport that is available the better. You will face opposition in asking Wanaka-Hawea citizens to subsidise Queenstown buses, when they have no public transport at all and little likelihood if any turning up any time soon. But any cars taken off the road, no matter where, are better than none.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 8**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 4**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I would rather see debt paid off sooner than keep paying interest for longer.

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

#### **Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I think this system would be cheaper to run, thereby putting more funds into work rather than administration.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

#### **Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* No

#### **Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

This option risks diluting the effort going into wilding pine control. Wilding work needs a dedicated fund and tight focus; otherwise all the work done to date will be for nothing. I would boost the funds going into it, as well.

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 10**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

Any increase in effort going into biodiversity monitoring and enhancement is to be applauded. Excellent.

#### **~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

#### **Do you have any feedback**

Climate change and its disastrous effects will never be addressed by writing strategies. If it could be, we'd not have this crisis; strategies have been written ever years since the Rio Summit in 1992. If your next strategy has concrete and meaningful actions, great: but they must be enforced. Good luck with that, especially in the rural sector. Can the ORC enforce the societal changes needed to get people out of cars and aircraft?

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

Much of the work Council is doing, and intends to do, is going to be picking up the pieces after the current government has walked away from, broken, or deliberately sabotaged attempts to improve or even stabilise our environment. This will not be easy, in the face of comments like "Goodbye Freddy".

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Respondent: Fiona Turnbull****Submission Number:** 256**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 02:47**About You****Comment Number:** 2**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 6**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Yes - public transit makes the area accessible, reduces carbon emissions, and reduces traffic congestion. It is especially critical for those who cannot drive/do not own a vehicle, such as children, seniors, those with medical conditions or disabilities that impair driving ability, and many tertiary students.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 4**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

It would be great to have a bus running from Dunedin to the Dunedin Airport.

**Respondent: Mr Colin Goldthorpe**

**Submission Number:** 257

---

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 02:59

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Respondent: Beatriz Boucinhas****Submission Number: 258****Submission Date: 27/04/24 03:55****!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I understand Queenstown has a higher demand for public transportation and I believe Queenstown rate payers would benefit from investing in it. However, Wanaka, Lugatze and Hawea residents SHOULD NOT have to pay more for this to happen. We have NO public transport available in these areas and therefore DO NOT BENEFIT AT ALL from this rate increase. Meanwhile, as a community, we in Wanaka, Hawea and Lugatze are already struggling with the rapid growth of this area, but I can see that there are no plans to invest in this area in the long term plans, apart from a possibility of a trial (which according to our conversation at the Q&A session is unlikely to happen as there has been no need for it). Why should we pay more rates for something we won't see? We have no need to go into Queenstown and there is not even a public transport that takes us to Queenstown. If investment in this area was foreseen, I'd more than happily support the rate increase. HOWEVER, THAT IS NOT THE CASE!! For example, I live in Hawea and find it hard to get flatmates because of the lack of transportation into Wanaka. Most people moving down here prefer to live in Wanaka due to the lack of alternative transport, the high cost of fuel and the lack of transport after social evenings in town. There is a cycleway, but it takes 45min to get into town, and even longer on the way back. This is the only alternative to driving at the moment. The traffic jams have become visibly worse in the last year. Longview in Hawea has 400+ houses being built. Thinking each house will have a minimum of two cars (most likely 3 or 4, if not more), we are talking at least 800 cars a day more going into town. The emissions and traffic increase are already apparent. And it is only going to get worse once those 400 houses are built. That is not even considering the many other subdivisions which are bound to happen between Wanaka and Hawea. There is obviously no long term planning in this area, just plain ignoring this fact. A bus service enabling bikes so that running errands in town would become more efficient would certainly lead to more people willing to take the bus into town. It would be important that the buses leave Hawea early to allow people to get into town for work and return at later times, also allowing for evening activities into town (fitness, leisure, dinners, even a drink or two - so many people in Hawea would love to have a couple of beers in town and not have to pay a fortune to get a taxi home). The trials that have happened in the past were not suitable for working residents of Hawea (with running hours being suitable for retired or non-working residents) and they did not run long enough (only 3 months) to gather the viability of a public transport system, hence the low numbers encountered. I am not expecting the above to happen, but I cannot agree to a raise in rates when there is no benefit at all to this area.



**Respondent: Mr Blair Howell**

**Submission Number:** 259

---

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 04:46

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The current focus areas are great but you seem to be completely blind to the context in which we now live in. That is your proposed rate increases are going to add significant costs to families who are already struggling. My question to you is will it be worth it if no one can afford to live here. Are rates are going up 30% which is absolutely ridiculous. You also seem to be missing the actual issues we face here, which is building infrastructure within budget and in a timely manner.

**Respondent: Mr Phillip Bradfield**

**Submission Number:** 260

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 04:56

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number:** 8

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Under the Treaty of Waitangi, we are all equal and the Treaty is not a partnership therefore is no reason for a separate focus on partnership with mana whenua.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 9

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Ideally under a targeted public transport rate, the effected areas should decide.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 6

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 2

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 15

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* No

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

#### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* No

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 11

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* No

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?

- \* No

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 14

#### Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

\* No

---

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

Under a targeted transport rate i believe that the community funding the public transport services should decide on the level of service required.

---

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

If a 10% cost reduction can be achieved in regional leadership that would free up 2\$ million in funds that could be used for enviromental projects.

---

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I cannot afford any ORC rate increase this year or in foreseeable future. Also I don't support any further borrowing.

**Respondent: Dr William (Nick) Brown**

**Submission Number:** 261

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 05:18

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Whether the level of service for Queenstown bus services should be increased or not is a question solely for Queenstown ratepayers. I object to a targeted rate being levied across all of the QL when we (in Wanaka) do not benefit at all from changes to the level of services in Queenstown itself. Likewise, any increase in the level of service for Wanaka should be paid for by a targeted rate across Wanaka only.

**Respondent: Eve Young****Submission Number: 262****Submission Date: 27/04/24 05:39****About You****Comment Number: 3****Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 2****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

A stronger future for Otago is a sound financial advisor and accountant to control spending and borrowing, and a practical planner who can keep to the basic necessities instead of a dreamer who wants every possible fancy upgrades that we cannot afford. A stronger future for Otago is also bringing in and developing various productive industries. Only then with better jobs and pays, then maybe we could afford these fancy upgrades in future. In short, I'm against anymore rate increases/changes.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Have you actually read these graphs? Tell us how are these increases sustainable against tiny yearly wage rise (if any)? My ORC rates are almost double in the last few years. And this is not the only rates we have to pay. Spend within your means, not keep trying to find ways to increase debts. I'd say cut out all the fancy upgrades you think you want, and just do well on the basics and necessities is a better long term plan.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

██████████ "We're acutely aware that although ORC's rates are among the lowest per head of regional councils" - this does not mean ORC has the liberty to almost double our rates in under 5 years, and thinking that people can afford this. ORC rates is just one of the taxes/rates we have to pay. I'm aware ORC want to do and have this and that, however, the reality is we can't afford it. These increases are simply unsustainable. I recall similar proposal for rate changes was only a few short years ago. Keeping to the affordable basics/necessities is a better sustainable long term plan for both ORC and the rate payers.

**Respondent: Mr Andrtew Penniket**

**Submission Number: 263**

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 05:41**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

In general I support them all but I firmly believe that a healthy environment is the foundation to a healthy society.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Public transport is essential for the future

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

We must fight wilding pine spread or else we will look like a boring American state.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Stop wilding pines before they exist by controlling plantation plans much more tightly

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

All of those are important focus areas



**Respondent: Ms Kathryn van Beek**

**Submission Number:** 264

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 06:04

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Yes but we need passenger trains for port chalmers please. They could just run at peak work and school times.

**Respondent: ms Diane Yeldon**

**Submission Number: 265**

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 06:31**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

public transport should aim at connecting all Otago communities as a network. It should not be designed as commuter 9 to 5 in and out to city centre from 'dormitory' suburbs as historically. Nor should expenditure be focused on the two main urban centres, Dunedin and Queenstown but rather having a goal of enabling any resident to travel from anywhere to anywhere. this almost certainly involves transfers between services. good public transport planning should create demand rather than attempt to satisfy what is perceived to already exist. a person not using a private car but rather public transport ought to be able to get to anywhere in the region that a person using a car can. it is bound to take longer but it should cost the same or less.

**Respondent: Michelle Greenaway****Submission Number:** 266**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 06:55**About You****Comment Number:** 1**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 7**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

While I acknowledge the varied requirements of Otago this is all fluffy wording, I would rather see some action being taken to protect those in the area's needing increased flood protection I would like to see in writing what exactly you are proposing in my area on the Taieri and an actual breakdown of what my flood protection levy has been spent on is is going to be spent on in my specific area! I believe you should be communicating directly to the rate payers with a quarterly update budget versus actual cost and what has been achieved posted to every household. There needs to be more accountability by the ORC.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 3**How should this initiative be funded?**

- \* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 11**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

- \* Yes

**Please comment**

The way the school bus services suddenly ended was appalling there was no consultation and no warning! The lack of school bus services from the city to Mosgiel and Outram now is extremely disappointing. Many pupils have been disadvantaged by this. As there is no public transport to Outram I should not have to pay this levy.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 14**Tell us what you think**

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 5****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

This is due to your own financial mismanagement. Rates rises need to be kept to a minimum in this current economic climate.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 13****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

I am one of the 600 households who have a significant rise in rates under the targeted system! The rates rise to significant and unaffordable for most. It does not reflect the current economic environment. Also I may not be living here in three years time when the rates rises are proposed to reduce. The reason I purchased in Outram was it was affordable. There is a very strong chance I won't be able to afford to live out here anymore due to the rates rises you propose. I could be living in the city and have paid for someone else to have the benefit of better flood protection. People move in and out of the Taieri District all the time. The cost should be spread over the whole of Dunedin City. I have a friend living two minutes along State Highway 87 in Woodside and she is not subject to this levy however she will also benefit from the increased protection I can't understand how this can be! If the council had been maintaining the flood banks and river beds of the Silverstream and the Taieri River through reducing silt and gravel build up as local contractors have advised you to do over the past 20 to 30 years then both the Silverstream and Taieri River would have the capacity to carry water at the level's they were modelled at originally and we would be protected. This also would have spread the cost over 20 to 30 years! Stop funding consultants, building new buildings, and producing politically correct nice reports that say nothing and actually do some major work. People who have dared to stand up to you have been bullied by your management marginalised and had their very good reputations sullied by your chief executives and management staff. They have watched their properties be rezoned therefore devalued with no consultation when all you needed to do was actually maintain the Silverstream! The fees you have paid your lawyers to make this residents lives hell could have been spent on fixing the situation. Shame on you ORC for what you are doing to hard working community minded good people.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 8****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 10****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 15****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 6****~Environment****Comment Number: 9****Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 12****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

See earlier comments

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 4****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I strongly disagree with the targeted rates increase and the way it is being applied. The 18% plus increase this year is at significant odds to the current economic environment we are living in. It is significantly over the current inflation rate and CPI. The next two years increases are also at odds with current economic outlooks. Since moving to Outram three years ago my ORC rates in particular the flood protection levy have increased significantly. This cost is putting incredible pressure on my single owner occupied with a mortgage household. At this time I really do not know how I am going to afford this! The increases you are proposing reflects the ORC's own lack of investment in flood protection over many many years including maintenance of existing flood banks. Now at a time of financial crisis for many you expect to pass your own financial mismanagement onto those who can least afford it!

**Respondent: Brian Grant****Submission Number: 267****Submission Date: 27/04/24 07:15****About You****Comment Number: 2****-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 1****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 3****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

This is surly a joke. While we live in the Dunedin City rating area, there is no way we could even remotely be considered living in Dunedin City. You are proposing that people like us who live over 30km away from the nearest bus route subsidise those who choose to travel by bus. This proposal would see my rates increase by nearly 75% to subsidise a few bus users on a couple of bus routes. How on earth could you even think that this is fair? If you want to target a rate to a specific group of people then you need to do a far better job to identify the people that will use the service, rather than the broad brush approach you have used. It seems to me that you are treating the people who live in the country as an endless source of money that you can tap to make your life more comfortable. I would certainly hope that this is not a case of councilors or council employees attempting to make life a little easier by taxing the rural population.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 4****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

If you want to charge people for flood protection, then charge those who choose to live in those areas. How do you think it is fair to charge people in the Maniototo for the Leith flood protection? Be more precise in your targeting of rates.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

People should pay based on their own circumstances. Some properties will be unaffordable but that is life. Why should the poor subsidise the rich?

**Respondent: Mrs Leanne Shaw****Submission Number: 268****Submission Date: 27/04/24 07:33****About You****Comment Number: 6****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 1****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Presently, the buses are busy only at peak times. The Hub has not worked apart from being a place where druggies and undesirables gather. Unbelievable right outside the police station. If the cost of buses reflected the cost of running them we might have nicer clientele and less need for Allied security to travel on the buses as support for the drivers. Instead of making it easier for my family, the lower cost of buses, has meant that i need to drive my daughter to and from school, because space is a premium for travel to and from Mosgiel. As many of us, responded, the express bus did not work as it was too restrictive in its pickup and drop off points.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 7****Tell us what you think**

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**



Improvements need to be made in bus driver wages and in adequate seating in the buses. the larger capacity buses could be used on the further away suburbs. It is disappointing that so much of Otago regional rates goes on transport, that is not used adequately. Better publicity and tickets reflecting cost. i used to pay for 5 zones from Mosgiel \$8 15 years ago. Still cheaper than driving.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

of course, debt should be paid back. Look how badly the coutry is affected by overspending with covid measures. What you should be looking at is who has done this 52 page document, why are you paying statisticians? It is fine to pay the workers, the bus drivers and the people doing environmental cleanup, but do you really need someone to review the water plan of a tome of a document. Incredibly time consuming presumably for elite pay too.

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

Areas of need in must do list are important, but it seems that building a new office space for 900 staff seems very excessive. maybe pull back on so much office work and get more hands on work done.

**Respondent: Mrs Kirsty Sharpe**

**Submission Number: 269**

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 08:03**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support option1

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: Mr Richard Pears**

**Submission Number:** 270

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 08:11

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Respondent: ms Geraldine Tait****Submission Number:** 271**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 09:13**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 2**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Transport****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback**

For many years I have talked about (been slightly obsessed with) the idea of a much better bus service for the North Coast, Dunedin to Palmerston. We are fortunate to now have a weekend service which may or may not be running at the ideal times. But we need a more regular week day service of five runs each way rather than three and one which comes down Coast Road and picks up passengers from Warrington and maybe even Seacliff. A lot of new houses have been built in Warrington in the last few years and are more on the way, I see no good reason to exclude us from the bus route. But any further improvements to the service have been completely ruled out by the Otago Regional Council. In a recent joint planning document of the DCC and ORC, The Draft Dunedin Future Development Strategy, the issue of extra services for outlying areas was denied in favor of more regular services for city suburbs (more, mostly empty busses buzzing around Dunedin in the middle of the day?). Page 63, *"there are no plans to extend coverage (busses) to unserved areas and limited changes to services that run to outlying areas"*.

Why do I want more bus runs and who would use them? Currently there is one early bus for workers and school kids which leaves Palmerston very early and not another one until late morning. I am sure there are many people who have shopping or appointments in town who would like to get to Dunedin before lunchtime but do not want to use the early service. Likewise coming back from town apart from the very popular 3.35pm bus there is not another one leaving Dunedin until after 6pm. I am sure there are people who would love to see a 5pm bus which would allow young people to do activities in Dunedin after school or be much appreciated by workers who finish work late afternoon, allowing them to get home at a reasonable hour.

There are many reasons for a better bus service: to get more people out of cars, better for the environment and our carbon footprint. To provide a better service for both the young and old who are transport disadvantaged (too young or too old or too poor to drive). This is often a reason people move away from Blueskin Bay, they have teenagers who want to spend more time in town or they are older people who are worried about maintaining their independence both are hampered by a very poor, irregular bus service.

I was shocked to discover that nearly 100 years ago we had a pretty good (but slow) bus service which included Seacliff and Warrington. If the ORC is to stick to its intentions of creating "an integrated transport system that contributes to the accessibility and connectivity of our community, reduces congestion and supports community well being aspirations", then they need to acknowledge how poor the bus service is to the North Coast communities and make a commitment to fix it.

I support the proposed trail of bus services for Oamaru, Balclutha including Dunedin Airport, and Queenstown. Although the high infrastructure spend proposed for the Queenstown bus hub is excessive.

**Respondent: ms Geraldine Tait****Submission Number:** 272**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 09:17**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 2**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**~Transport****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback**

For many years I have talked about (been slightly obsessed with) the idea of a much better bus service for the North Coast, Dunedin to Palmerston. We are fortunate to now have a weekend service which may or may not be running at the ideal times. But we need a more regular week day service of five runs each way rather than three and one which comes down Coast Road and picks up passengers from Warrington and maybe even Seacliff. A lot of new houses have been built in Warrington in the last few years and are more on the way, I see no good reason to exclude us from the bus route. But any further improvements to the service have been completely ruled out by the Otago Regional Council. In a recent joint planning document of the DCC and ORC, The Draft Dunedin Future Development Strategy, the issue of extra services for outlying areas was denied in favor of more regular services for city suburbs (more, mostly empty busses buzzing around Dunedin in the middle of the day?). Page 63, *“there are no plans to extend coverage (busses) to unserved areas and limited changes to services that run to outlying areas”*.

Why do I want more bus runs and who would use them? Currently there is one early bus for workers and school kids which leaves Palmerston very early and not another one until late morning. I am sure there are many people who have shopping or appointments in town who would like to get to Dunedin before lunchtime but do not want to use the early service. Likewise coming back from town apart from the very popular 3.35pm bus there is not another one leaving Dunedin until after 6pm. I am sure there are people who would love to see a 5pm bus which would allow young people to do activities in Dunedin after school or be much appreciated by workers who finish work late afternoon, allowing them to get home at a reasonable hour.

There are many reasons for a better bus service: to get more people out of cars, better for the environment and our carbon footprint. To provide a better service for both the young and old who are transport disadvantaged (too young or too old or too poor to drive). This is often a reason people move away from Blueskin Bay, they have teenagers who want to spend more time in town or they are older people who are worried about maintaining their independence both are hampered by a very poor, irregular bus service.

I was shocked to discover that nearly 100 years ago we had a pretty good (but slow) bus service which included Seacliff and Warrington. If the ORC is to stick to it's intentions of creating "an integrated transport system that contributes to the accessibility and connectivity of our community, reduces congestion and supports community well being aspirations", then they need to acknowledge how poor the bus service is to the North Coast communities and make a commitment to fix it.

I support the proposed trail of bus services for Oamaru, Balclutha including Dunedin Airport, and Queenstown. Although the high infrastructure spend proposed for the Queenstown bus hub is excessive.

**Respondent: Ms Charlotte Young****Submission Number: 273****Submission Date: 27/04/24 10:02****About You****Comment Number: 3****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 14****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 12****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The outrageous growth in ORC as a beaurocracy. You are creating yourselves a job under the guise of 'the environment' both for now and well into the future.

The challenge is how to rein you in! STOP! Dunedin city & its residents are some of the poorest in NZ. STOP! Our farmers can't continue to fund your projects. I own a small uneconomic block of land on the Taieri. Currently paying an extortionate \$4857.19 Pa ..... set to increase to \$7640.45pa in the coming year!! Are you kidding?? we are salary earners. The dcc rates are currently \$6065.45 but set to increase to \$6804.40.

No services. No water. No sewage. No rubbish collection .....oh & ORC, no protection from flooding either! I spent \$200k doing that for myself which you threatened to fine me \$20k for!!

So I pay \$14,444.85 for nothing but it's nice to know that you have a big long term plan of how to make sure my land has no future as a viable block.

I know the contractors you employ to undertake 'flood protection' maintenance. Ask them honestly if they think what they're doing is making a blind bit of difference. You should be taken to court for incompetency next time it floods.

The ORC should NEVER have been given the responsibility of flood protection in the early 80's. Well beyond your abilities.

I actually don't know why I'm bothering to fill this out. The orc don't care about what I (or anyone else) think. You have an 'green' agenda & will do whatever you want because you BELIEVE we are all stupid.

Opportunities?? Queenstown & Wanaka have hope. They are international towns with breast

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 16****Do you support this proposal?**

\* No



**What level of total funding should be available?****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 1****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

How many empty buses are driving around?? Who's taking buses? Stick to the main routes that have demand. Scrap the ones that don't. How bizarre that the ORC look after buses?!!

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 15****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Are you mad???? Or just stupid?? Upgrade to Electric buses?? Another vanity project at the ratepayer's expense. QT has major infrastructure problems - roading congestion, water, waste, rubbish..... But no! The orc are proposing electric buses and want my opinion on timetables Un believable!! I'm surprised you haven't tried to ban the Earnslaw puffing out all that coal smoke. How about you focus on the fleet you have and how to make that more efficient?? Try using a business idea where bus users pay for the service. Just an idea.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 18****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

Oh yes. I am one of those rate payers who have seen an increase of not \$500 but an extortionate \$2783.26 on our home. Apparently for 'flood control'. Can I say, the ORC are so incompetent in their duties, they should be in court. Those of us who point this out are bullied, ostracised, threatened & labeled as trouble makers. For years I've been telling staff that the taieri flood channels are well below capacity. I don't need a scientist or mathematician to work that out - just look, it's obvious. Seems now others have worked it out. I'm really impressed at how good orc staff are at dividing communities!! Goes against the cuddly marketing you put out. I think it's called gaslighting

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 4****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**Please comment**

So you will build a building (sorry Port Otago) for \$60 mil which costs will blow out.....BUT, ratepayers will pay for your incompetence at running a bus service. OMG.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Run a commercial model. Sack everyone who is currently in charge & employ people who are responsible for the bottom line

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 11****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

I think flood protection should be taken off the orc who have proved to be completely incompetent. I have lived this for over 20 years. Watched staff come & go. I have watched communities ripped apart & peoples lives devastated. Absolutely NOTHING has changed and the next flood will be worse. No doubt its severity will be blamed on 'climate change'. Truth is, Taieri flood protection is an absolute joke

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

I don't think ORC are up to the job. Giving you \$\$ for flood protection is a complete waste of any way forward.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 19****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

It just keeps going! No you're incompetent

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

This is such a vital and important issue that the orc have PROVED it is incapable of managing. When data shows they've done a shit job, it disappears.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 8****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

T

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

At last!! Something you do that has real life practical benefits. I had no idea you were responsible for harbourmaster services. Absolutely brilliant and a worthwhile investment

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 20**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

This is so ironic!!

just as our farmers are selling out food producing properties to international carbon credit farmers! Destroying our country for some ridiculous goal of saving the planet.....we think planting pines is a great idea....kinda like planting gorse aye!?? But surely even the Greens have worked that out?? Have you worked that out ORC?? If pines are planted, they'll shed seeds which will take root wherever it suits. This might not be convenient if it's on

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 13****Do you have any feedback**

Environment: put rules & perimeters in place. Base on science & enforce them.

'Climate Change': Good god. NZ has extremes of climate - always has!! Upgrade existing flood protection which has been woeful!! Even get back to 1984 levels and then just maintain capacity. How hard is it?? When a family home is flooded, think about how well maintained the drains nearby are. I assure you, it's been very poor.

Transport: your ratepayers are shareholders. This needs to be a commercial model. Public transport will be profitable in our cities if commuters are offered a service that works. Otherwise, forget it. Keep parking - people will drive

Regional Leadership:

**~Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

Who is mana whenua? Why is this important? Isn't water quality important to all NZ'ers?

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 5**

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

This is actually bollocks.

From my experience you need to add your lawyers to your partnership group! They are very well paid with my rates. They can't wait to wade in!! And I don't see a budget for them??

If you want to be taken seriously then sit with DCC and work together on plans.  
The left hand doesn't know what the right is doing.

Leadership

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

From my 20plus years of lived experience on the Taieri, I have absolutely ZERO faith or confidence that the ORC can achieve flood protection above 3rd world standard. I don't even think ORC could achieve anything 'liveable' with an open chequebook. Every bit of real practical improvement to our property has been provided by the DCC. Even repairs to ORC drains

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Your spending is out of control and ORC should be put under statutory management and dissolved. Your responsibilities can be distributed

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

How about cutting your staff?? 10 years ago you had staff in the field who did things.....now??? Lots of marketing to tell me how much we need you

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Put ALL your projects on hold! Your ratepayers can't afford these outrageous increases. Just STOP!!

Your rates used to be a novel fun wee payment that made me feel I was 'doing my bit' for the environment. Now it's a looming burden. I fear October because I know the accounts are unmanageable & will get tacked onto the mortgage. Add this to DCC & insurance - it costs us \$35k pa just to wake up in our own home. I get NO value from the ORC - nothing! Where is this flood protection you speak of?? What a joke.

We're just so lucky not to have had a flood event since 2017. So haven't had to bare the costs of that clean up too. But the flooding will come again and ORC will be less prepared than 7 years ago.



**Respondent: Dr Amir Levy****Submission Number: 274****Submission Date: 27/04/24 10:17****About You****Comment Number: 8****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

part of the environment but changes in land use across Otago and how to manage it (e.g. urban growth, forestry)

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 3****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I think it'd be better to prioritise increasing capacity, extended timetables for buses, and potentially lower fares for under 24 (what was previously covered by central gov't) over electric buses. I think it's more important to make the buses as accessible as possible in order to have as many people using them. I usually bike to work but use the bus when not almost all the time (unless need the car), and they are generally good, reliable, and run until late. I think it'd be worth consulting with large employers in town (e.g. hospital, university, ORC, DCC, Aurora) and engage how to make the bus more attractive to workers, especially those who live in more remote parts like the Peninsula. For instance, have earlier buses for hospital workers that live on the Peninsula.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Would the University of Otago pay for the flood scheme that relates to it?

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Is there allocation for working with forestry and ensuring forestry doesn't increase the problem of wilding pines

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

-look into providing seasonal services to ski fields & Snow Farm from Q'town & Wanaka (maybe collaborate with the operators for a bus to drop/pick up passengers at bottom of ski fields and then the ski field provides buses up/down to the sites. Can maybe also run during summer to popular swimming spots outside the main towns?

-Would be good to have PT services for commuters between Alexandra, Cromwell, & Q'town

-would be good to have bus service to Dunedin Airport

-Any scope for looking at trains, especially for freight? Bike paths? Liaison with TLAs also key to this work



**Respondent: Mr Brendon Storer**

**Submission Number:** 275

---

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 10:26

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: NR Murray****Submission Number: 276****Submission Date: 27/04/24 10:39****About You****Comment Number: 9****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 13****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 14****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The environment determines the quality of our lives, and should be the priority for the ORC's focus. Te Tiriti informs the way in which partnership has been agreed and should be protected and respected. Climate change is the most significant environmental challenge and should be the priority for ORC's action. The health of the people in our community comes before business development.

These should be the tools for the ORC to meet the challenges of the next 10 years.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I support this vision and would ask the Environment and Climate challenges be prioritised.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 10****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

- \* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

#### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

- \* Yes

#### Please comment

Public transport has direct benefits for the climate and for the environment and for people and these multiple benefits projects should be increased to affect the lowest income population first.

#### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

- \* Yes

#### Please comment

Public transport has direct benefits for the climate and for the environment and for people and these multiple benefits projects should be increased to affect the lowest income population first.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 1

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

#### Any other feedback?

Rates should be based on CV so that those with more valueable assets pay proportionally. Areas with NO public transport provisions should pay a 10% regionwide rate.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* No

#### What period should deficits be repaid over?

- \* 10 years

#### Please comment

Reducing the rate value per annum at this time is more affordable.

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 11

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Drainage scheme rating should be the user only payments, and review of schemes should be undertaken to determine the benefit to the community or landowners, and the damage to the environment. A priority should be given to the environment.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Drainage scheme rating should be the user only payments, and review of schemes should be undertaken to determine the benefit to the community or landowners, and the damage to the environment. A priority should be given to the environment.

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Flood affected land should be separated from drainage affected land (if possible) and rates examined to determine the benefit to the community or landowners, and the damage to the environment. A priority should be given to the environment.

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

We are ALL dependent on the waters life both upstream and down from our location. A region wide rate will allow value downstream to contribute to upstream protection and improvement where smaller populations couldnt fund such a proportion of the improvement.

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

All districts benefit from the safe navigation of vessels in our ports.

Alternatively Central Otago has its own harbourmaster service so why is it not separated as QLDC ?

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Although this rate makes it obvious that the ORC is committed to Wilding Control it is not proportionately more important than species loss, predator control, or other plant pests control. Where that fund gets spent may well be better applied elsewhere.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Rates should be based on CV rather than Land value only, so that people who have more total asset value should pay more rates.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Public transport should be provided to all communities, and be a joined up service managed as a whole, not split into district or private hands. ALL public transport options should be integrated with low-carbon systems and active travel options. Public transport includes, buses, trains, planes, taxis and active travel routes.

**Respondent: Ms Stephanie Brunton**

**Submission Number: 277**

---

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 20:52**

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

In regards to the ORC's must-do work, Transport. I'd like to support the option of a bus service between Balclutha and Dunedin.

**Respondent: Mr Chris Naylor****Submission Number: 278****Submission Date: 27/04/24 21:15****About You****Comment Number: 1****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Although I have put a few comments further through this submission, the most important thing I would like Councillors to take on board is:

Otago, (and the world,) faces an existential crisis because of the degradation of our environment. The climate crisis, loss of biodiversity, freshwater contamination and depletion. We have been ignoring, denying or, at best, kicking the can down the road with these issues for too long. Bold and immediate action is needed NOW.

Your Long Term Plan has clearly identified the issues and tentatively recommended solutions.

I wish to see the Otago Regional Council implement the most bold actions to address these issues. From an economic viewpoint, it will never be cheaper to take action now. Any delay in implementing radical action only pushes higher costs onto future ratepayers/generations and would continue the sort of short-term, blinkered, selfish thinking that has put us on our current path to environmental disaster.

The Otago Regional Council's statutory mission is to ensure a sustainable environment for all.

GET ON WITH IT.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

A good summation of the appropriate areas for the ORC to focus on.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

There is continual complaints about congestion and parking. The only solution that is sustainable for the long-term is better public transport.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Public transport is a key enabler of sustainability so it must be funded.



**Respondent: Ms Mary Furnari**

**Submission Number: 279**

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 21:48**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 10**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This is a crucial area for investment. I think the trials to look at public transport between cities within Otago (e.g. Oamaru-Dunedin, Dunedin-Invercargil) are important. I'd like to see development of business case to bring train services back to Otago-Canterbury regions.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* No

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

- \* No

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

I would like to see the ORC develop a business case to bring train services back to Otago beginning with potentially high usage areas (eg. Mosgiel-Dunedin, Dunedin-Invercargill, etc.) Once established in Otago, we could look at train service between Christchurch and Dunedin.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

This remains a high need (must do) area with the impact of climate change on infrastructure. Improving our infrastructure is crucial for resilience over the next 10 years.

**Respondent: Mrs Sue Walker**

**Submission Number:** 280

---

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 21:51

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**-Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Rate rises for orc totally unnecessary as only an extra to council rates which are increasing also. Ratepayers are paying twice for the same thing.

**Respondent: Mr Dale Anderson**

**Submission Number:** 281

**Submission Date:** 27/04/24 23:24

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 2

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Would love to see a Balclutha - Dunedin service thats costs effective - while parking for shopping in Dunedin is great, its not so good for those commuting for work frequently. Caveats would be scheduling and cost, similar options in Canterbury have failed due to minimal scheduling and cost per trip making it not worth using over taking own vehicle.

**Respondent: Mrs Barbara Sloan**

**Submission Number: 282**

---

**Submission Date: 27/04/24 23:32**

**Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

It should be 100% Uniform Charge. I have a section on a separate title and I dont think the transport rate should be charged on this. I feel I am paying twice for the buses which I dont use. I have been asking this to be a Uniform Charge for years as it is fairer on everyone.

**Respondent: Mrs Barbara Sloan****Submission Number: 283****Submission Date: 27/04/24 23:55****!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 6****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Maybe put smaller buses on at low peak times. Put off buying more electric buses - we cannot afford these rates increases. Maybe user pays as the fares are so ridiculously low. I'm paying a lot for the buses and never use them as I live in Waikouaiti and doesn't suit to get the bus to Dunedin to get bags of groceries. I think if you live out of Dunedin we should not have to pay as much.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

Should be 100% Uniform Rate. People living out of Dunedin should not have to pay as much for the buses as most residents it does not suit them to get a bus to Dunedin to get their groceries. I should also not have to pay for this rate on my empty section as I am being charged twice.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 2****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 7****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

If there is a change it needs to be a Uniform Charge.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Increase bus fares and lower rates to the public.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

ORC have wasted millions on getting a new building and we the ratepayers are suffering from your mistakes.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

ORC are out of control. This cannot keep happening each year with the huge rise in rates. Maybe forget about new buses and projects and look at where you are overstaffed. We are in a recession and people will not be able to afford the rates!



**Respondent: WAI Wānaka****Submission Number: 284****Submission Date: 28/04/24 00:42****About You****Comment Number: 3****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 4****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Resources are scarce across the board. Decades of environmental impact and neglect have created a level of urgency in the Upper Lakes Rohe that may be difficult to meet. Our submission deliberately focusses on the Upper Lakes Rohe, as we believe that this is the area in Otago that has the largest gulf between actual and possible environmental, economic, social and cultural outcomes. By working with groups already established across the region, existing expertise, connections, knowledge and work programmes can be leveraged to make best use of what we collectively have, and generate maximum value for communities. This is particularly true of smaller communities where resources are often stretched but links are tight, and networks are strong.

Across the Upper Lakes Rohe, there are a range of environmentally focussed community groups including WAI Wānaka, who already work well together and can lean into the work that is required - ORC doesn't need to do this alone, and in fact done well, ORC's processes and systems can support, strengthen and deepen these existing connections.

A proposal such as the Large Scale Environmental Fund would begin essential support if this was to occur across the Otago Upper Lakes Rohe. We should not be complacent as to the use of the term "Large Scale" Environmental Fund. While \$2 million per year may be an excellent starting level, it is by no means an adequate level to provide evidence-based management for the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems under significant threat in the Upper Lakes Rohe. Consider for example the \$226 million assigned to attempt to repair the damaged Lake Taupo and Rotorua-Te Arawa Lakes.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The focus areas talk about Partnership with mana whenua and also talk about Communities being connected to each other, but they don't touch on the role of ORC as a connector of mana whenua and communities. Effective and meaningful partnership with mana whenua is critical for ORC, and WAI Wānaka suggests that it should form a base for extending this partnership approach to communities more broadly. Many communities are seeking ways to work in harmony with the aspirations of mana whenua and ORC has the ability to provide leadership in this through their role as a Tiriti Partner. WAI Wānaka sees that community organisations focussed on environmental outcomes in the Otago Upper Lakes Rohe could clearly benefit from the support of the proposed Large Scale Environmental Fund in strengthening the communities' connection with mana whenua.

#### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 6

##### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

##### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

##### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

#### ~Environment

Comment Number: 2

##### Do you have any feedback

ORC's resources will always be stretched as the environmental imperatives faced continue to increase. However, WAI Wānaka sees that ORC's resources can go further through working with existing groups, and leveraging their knowledge, networks and expertise effectively, which often includes extensive volunteer communities. ORC can be a more impactful organisation by focussing on those elements of the required work that are best suited to their connections and expertise. Local communities and associated groups often offer greater agility, deep local knowledge, ability to raise funds and other resources through means not available to government organisations, and have commitment, connection, and a deep sense of connection to place that drives their local action. We see the proposed Large Scale Environmental Fund as further strengthening the links between regional government and local groups and supporting more impactful outcomes overall.

Ultimately, to enact significant change and make meaningful environmental gains, WAI Wānaka sees that we need to pursue a shift in the system, a fundamental change to the way we currently work. By setting up ways of working that enable mana whenua, local government, regional government, and community groups to jointly contribute to meaningful outcomes, we can maximise our collective impact and better position ourselves to respond to a changing operating environment over time. At this time of unprecedented environmental degradation and new threats, WAI Wānaka sees that the funding proposed for Large Scale Environmental Projects can be a catalyst, bringing together multiple parties in partnership to work towards common goals, and grow the significant environmental gains made over the last 8 years.

WAI Wānaka is pleased to work closely with the Guardians of Lake Wānaka, (appointed by the Minister of Conservation), the Guardians of Lake Hāwea (a subcommittee of the Hāwea Community Association Incorporated, Southern Lakes Sanctuary, Mana Tāhuna, WAO, ORC, QLDC and others across our rohe, and we are committed to continued partnership in ways that amplify our collective effort and investment for the benefit of this rohe, and the greater Otago region.

**Respondent: Otago University Students' Association****Submission Number:** 285**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 01:30**About You****Comment Number:** 4**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 10**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 9**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The Otago University Students' Association (OUSA) agrees with the Council's indication of the region's key challenges and opportunities.

In alignment with the Future for Local Government Report it is critical that the ORC continue to build relationships and further empower local hapū and iwi across the region. This dynamic will allow a more inclusive local democracy that embraces te ao Māori and allows all members of the Otago region to contribute to its management and future.

The past five years have demonstrated the need for adaptability in a globalising world as the COVID-19 pandemic changed the way we all lived our lives, worked and engaged with our communities. Further change is just over the horizon with central government reform of local government responsibilities, the impact of a deteriorating climate crisis and a more volatile economic environment. That is why it is important that this long term plan prepare to meet these challenges head on with a robust response.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 13**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

As detailed in previous answer, the OUSA endorses the ORC's proposed focus areas as valuable and consistent with its goal of preserving the health and connectivity of its environment and communities.

Each area is of substantial interests to the council, concerning many stakeholders across the region. However, if the Council can make meaningful progress in these six areas it can count itself extremely successful in its contribution to the region and its inhabitants.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 8****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 16****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

As indicated by previous OUSA submissions to the ORC, the student population is absolutely in favour of more accessible, and environmentally friendly public transport. Public transport provides tremendous economic benefits to communities, allowing riders greater access to work, education, healthcare, and recreational activities. For students in particular, who are spending ever more of their income on rent and groceries, many would be happy to see their fares and rates go further. However, this is true of everyone who uses public transport across the entire region. The world is advancing closer and closer to climate catastrophe and while it might feel very "doom and gloom," at times there is certainly work that can be done to reduce emissions. The further electrification and decarbonisation of Otago's buses through the \$289 million investment is of significant value to the health of the wider community and environment. Option 1, would further make more buses available and accessible to residents and students across Dunedin, allowing them safe transport home.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 6****Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 11****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

The OUSA supports the creation of the catchment management rate as it increases transparency for ratepayers and has a minimal effect on rates.

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

The OUSA supports the Council's efforts to maintain its flood and drainage infrastructure. While it does come with a hefty price tag, the regions ability to deal and protect property and lives from extreme weather events far outweighs this cost across thirty years.

Acknowledging the risk of the strategy being more expensive, my initial thought is that the cost of investing in this key infrastructure far outweighs the cost of relying on obsolete infrastructure in the event of a freak weather event.

#### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 12

#### Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?

The OUSA supports the proposed increase in rates. While I acknowledge that the increases are comparatively high in a time of economic austerity and a timid market.

However much of the investment detailed throughout this long-term plan is long overdue and over the next ten to twenty years will provide value back to the community and I believe will be of considerable value to the community.

Further, where the council seeks to exceed its 10% rates increase limit it mainly concerns large projects that have in the OUSA's opinion have received underfunding such as public transport and infrastructure investment.

To provide numbers indicating student support of the proposals discussed throughout this submission in an informal survey of 40 people on the University of Otago campus conducted by the OUSA, I have attached the results below. This data was collected by OUSA during the Otago Regional Council informal pop-up consultation event on the Long Term Plan on the 12th of April.

Students were invited to answer the question "What should be the priorities of the Otago Regional Council over the next three years?" and given three chips to deposit in seven glass jars with numerous answers to indicate what they believed the priorities of the regional council should be. The answers were taken largely from this report and are described below with the final numbers of tokens in the jars.

"Improve regional climate resilience" - 23

"Large scale Environmental Fund \$500,000" - 3

"Large scale Environmental Fund \$1,000,000" - 9

"Large scale Environmental Fund \$2,000,00" - 23

"Public Transport Investment" - 36

"Regional Bus Trials" - 18

"Service Reduction and Rates Reduction." - 5

While not a perfect survey, it allowed Elliot Weir, Alan Somerville, ORC staff and I to explain (with the aid of the fabulous LTP consultation guide) the finer points of each priority as it related to the Long Term Plan.

From this survey, it is clear that priorities for students include large scale environmental community funding and public transport investment. Students were largely not in support of service reduction or lower council rates.

**Respondent: PHILL HUNT**

**Submission Number: 286**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 01:59**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I agree with focus areas

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

upgrade to electricity, more frequent services and expansion of services to include airport and to Palmerston. no mention of farebox ratio either current or proposed in LTP is information lacking

#### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 12

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I support option 1 but not the funding of it using the Upper Clutha households as cash cows. I support the upgrade to electric fleet and increase services where required. I often see large empty buses in the streets of Frankton and Queenstown and wonder if the vehicle size and requirements are matched. No farebox ratio is declared for the past or projected future of Queenstown transportation.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

#### Any other feedback?

I do object that Upper Clutha residents are being asked to pay for Queenstown services when they are not receiving any services in return. It is good practice that targeted rates should reflect the service available not be just a revenue collecting method. I would be happy to pay this targeted rate when a full-time, not another trial, public transportation system was introduced for the Upper Clutha area. My question is why just the Upper Clutha area that is being unfairly targeted? Why not Central Otago which also has trials planned as does Balclutha and Oamaru? Asking that Upper Clutha residents pay for Queenstown buses breaks two of the four guiding principals set by the Auditor General's Office in setting fees and Levies as quoted below. First principle: Equity 2.10 Equity is about ensuring that you administer and manage fees and levies in a way that is administratively fair. 2.11 When implementing and reviewing fees or levies, it is important that you consider equity matters so that the recovery of costs from fee and levy payers is fair. This means that you do not seek to recover costs from one group that could benefit a previous or future group. Third principle: Justifiability 2.19 Justifiability means that the costs you recover through fees or levies reasonably relate to the goods or services you are charging the fees or levies for. Where possible, it means eliminating cross-subsidisation . 2.20 To justify fees or levies, you need to have an accurate understanding of both the direct and indirect costs of the goods or services. When charging for a service, you also need be clear about what the service is and the standard your public organisation delivers it to, so that the costs reflect the service quality the recipient requires. I note that Waka Kotahi co-funding is at risk which puts all public transportation in Otago at risk and this risk should be shared by all of Otago. The proposed change in the table has opposing statements in bullet point 1 and 3. Bullet point 1 states "where public transport services exist" whereas point 3 includes the whole targeted area to the entire QLDC, some of which no services exist.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

\* Yes

#### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

No to the Upper Clutha subsidising Queenstown



**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

I support this in part. I support the new catchment management rate but not the method of collection. This should not be done on a valuation basis as it unfairly penalizes those that live in high capital value areas.

Catchment management does not cost more to implement in Queenstown lakes than in South Otago or Central Otago.

If it was capped or done on a more equitable basis e.g. per ha then I would fully support.

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

This unfairly penalizes areas with higher capital values. A targeted rate per property should be kept as we all benefit from wilding pine control. Having a targeted rate also focuses everyone to get this job finished.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 8**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 13**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Wanaka and the Upper Clutha have had enough transport trials. The time has come to put the rubber to the road and introduce a public transport system that a community with a population of almost 20,000 people deserve.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Increasing debt is not balancing the budget.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Debt should be kept at a minimum as it will limit the work that council can do in the future. With debt increasing it shows that council is still underfunding itself or doing projects that it cannot afford to do at this stage.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

ORC has traditionally been under funded so an increase in rates is to be expected. However, it is important that any rating system is fair and transparent. The proposed inclusion of the Upper Clutha area to pay for Queenstown's public transport system is very transparent but certainly not fair.

**Respondent: Mx Maihana Pōtiki-Grayling**

**Submission Number: 287**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 02:28**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

## Respondent: Tui Griffiths

Submission Number: 288

Submission Date: 28/04/24 02:28

### About You

Comment Number: 7

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I want longer running schedules so I can finish my late afternoon/night shifts and catch a bus home.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 1

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**

People should pay rates that are equal to their property(ies) worth

**Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

I would love all these!! Especially the dunedin airport bus. Continue public transport in Wānaka

**Respondent: Bruce Bissett**

**Submission Number: 289**

---

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 03:08**

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

I have been trapping Predators in the Makarora area since 2016 as a Volunteer with the Upper Clutha Forest and Bird. In that time we have only broken even with our Mohua population in small sections of the area. In a past year as we have just experienced, bird numbers appear to have declined, even though trap and Bait station numbers have significantly increased, along with the number of Volunteers.

Southern Lake Sanctuary group have been a "God send" in a year as we have just experienced, providing leadership, tools and knowledge. Without that help our efforts would have been marginal at best.

The Southern Lakes Sanctuary concept provides the best long term solution to get on top of introduced Predators by linking all individual groups and reducing the chance of reinvasion from an adjacent area. New technologies can be introduced to more effectively reduce or eliminate Predators.

I would strongly support the targeted rate at the highest level, ie #3 to provide some surety that SLS can continue and that our group of Volunteers can continue to stop the decline of our native birds, Mohua in particular and as a large Sanctuary develops, increase our bird numbers.

**Respondent: Jenn Shulzitski**

**Submission Number: 290**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 03:10**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We need North Coast buses to Palmerston late in the day and on weekends. I am shocked to live somewhere with such meagre public services.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

Tax the rich. The poor are skipping meals. There are no holidays. There are no after school activities. There is no heat. We are soulless if we keep wasting resources on those who are already hoard more than their share of resources.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 13**

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Capital value Yes! Uniform/flat rates NO. Create equity not hardship. We are supposed to be community after all.

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

#### **~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 7**

#### **~Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have any feedback**



Be the best treaty partners possible, granting Tino Rangatiratanga to Mana Whenua. We should have Exotic Plant Management Teams for flora and fauna fully funded with priorities towards climate change, clean rivers, healthy soils and native taonga.

#### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 14

##### **Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

I support removing obstructions/small dams, backing off of waterways, restoring natural flows, protecting the rights of the river and the native species. We are not going to win against a river, and we need to adapt asap....

#### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 11

##### **Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

We need to tax wealth. Our communities are hurting. The only way to invest in public infrastructure and needs are to tax the rich and to invest in our struggling ecosystems, public transit, public jobs, etc.

##### **Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Increase rates based on capital rather than uniform/flat rates.

## Respondent: Mr Connor Marshall

Submission Number: 291

Submission Date: 28/04/24 03:26

### About You

Comment Number: 4

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 3

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 6

Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?

N/A

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 2

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

Please comment

I think what has been proposed should happen, I also think there should be timetable changes on some routes

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 5

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I think this will be an interesting idea but I will support it as it means people can get home late at night after work

**Respondent: Mrs Lynelle Barrett**

**Submission Number: 292**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 03:46**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

I believe it should be a shared cost up to the first 50% then the remainder shared across the region

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Only if the rate is used for pest control with the same quality of service across the land. So large land owner pays more for their pest control than the smaller land owner.

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 10

**Do you have any feedback**

Information and Education is key for public. Keen to see less money on assessment and maybe some on a type of annual or bi-annual drill in each area to test how services work together and make public aware of things they can do at the same time. Maybe \$400 per area.

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 13

**Do you have any feedback**

I am concerned that my rates may fund a bus service in an area I may not use. If one was running, with profit then maybe another could start. Otherwise I think keep it away from council business and support private enterprise to run one.

## Financial Strategy

Comment Number: 5

### Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?

spend on compliance infrastructure, let go of public transport increases in lieu of supporting private enterprise, maybe could save 75% costs.

Try not to borrow as much, pull back on borrowing and cut the costs for this next at least 3 years

## How we fund our work

Comment Number: 7

### Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?

Wonderful to get rid of internal debt, financial leveraging no good, but if needed a little later to help external in the short term could use. Must pull back on costs, stop borrowing. Look at funding 50% or 25% of initiatives rather than all.

### Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?

I would cope with 10% and knowing Council is mindful of cost cutting and some services may not happen. If it has to go higher because of compliance costs, I only agree as long as ORC is showing it is making an effort with its costs, looking outside the square to other funding and not debt. People can go without for a time if they know it is making a difference. Maybe some areas with staff could be reduced 30% with work higher hours over peak times and less and non peak times or seasons. Ensure you are following the govt initiatives and not overcompensating if things are repealed

**Respondent: mrs lorraine Davis**

**Submission Number: 293**

---

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 03:51**

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We live in Milton and paid nearly \$300 for what, yes it has what it is used for but we do not use the bus its really money for jam that you are taking from us and we get nothing. Now with the rates increase you are going to scam us again sick of it

**Respondent: Fraser Leslie****Submission Number: 294****Submission Date: 28/04/24 04:02****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

ORC needs to get serious about balage wrap that litters the district.

I've been on about this for years . But we continue to let it happen with absolutely no rules in place . Currently a farmer can quite literally cover his or her farm in balage wrap with nothing to stop them. Unless it gets in the water way .

I drive tractors for a living and at the start of one season I thought I'd keep track of contaminated paddocks and the 1st 10 paddocks all had loose balage wrap flapping about in them.

I roller drilled a paddock that was just over 2 ha I proceeded to count the bits of plastic in there. There was 283 pieces of plastic in there. The thing is there is not one rule against that. The entire country stopped using plastic super market bags but there isn't a single rule to stop a farmer polluting a paddock with plastic. Does not any one thing this is just [REDACTED] crazy.

This stuff is [REDACTED] every where. Drive to Queenstown its hooked in the fence . Drive to clydvale vis blackbridge road its on the side of the road. Have a look along the banks of the clutha River its hooked in the trees . Where does that end up? Yeah the ocean.

I do work for one client who doesn't have a single paddock that isn't contaminated by the stuff. Literally every single paddock ,lane way ,tree block has loose balage wrap flapping about.

Should I mention animals . Usually cows try to eat it. Yeah they get affected to. Calves will [REDACTED] till the cows come home. Guess what it does not brake down in their stomach just like it doesn't in the environment . Animals get slaughtered at the freezing works then plastic ends up in the super dirt they sell to Gardners who then plant their vegetables in it.[REDACTED]

I recently brought a block of land that I've looked over for over 10 years . Never seen a single bale of balage fed out on it . I ploughed up 5 ha. Yeah you guessed it balage wrap. 8 inches down . This is not going away . It is building up in our soil , our oceans , our river, our animals , our food source, our environment. Enough is [REDACTED] enough.



**Respondent: Mr Brendon Storer**

**Submission Number:** 295

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 04:10

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

## Respondent: Briar Mills

Submission Number: 296

Submission Date: 28/04/24 04:37

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 14

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I love using the buses in Dunedin, and think investing in public transport is a great way to help mitigate the climate crisis. People complain that the buses aren't good so they don't use them so frequencies are decreased, but I think we need to invest to make them better and the people will come. I really benefited from the half price fares and was disappointed to see them be discontinued, but I am prepared to pay a higher fare for the greater good. I think longer hours and more frequent buses on popular routes is a fantastic use of rates. I also support the move to electric buses.

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I'm not a Queenstown local, but I do like to visit, and to use public transport while I am there. I think improving the infrastructure and the public transport system will really help the town.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 4

##### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 15

##### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 11

##### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 1

##### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* Yes

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 13

##### Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?

- \* Yes

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 8

##### Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

- \* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

I think funding the control of wilding trees is important. I think it makes sense to have a single rate, as long as it doesn't take funding away and there is still support allocated for the control of wilding pines.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

I don't support moving to a uniform rates rate and think that capital value is good, or even better if it was somehow based on income. I think that those with more wealth should support those with less, and one way they can do this is by helping fund regional services so our region can thrive.

<b>~ORC's must-do work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 3</b>
<b>~Environment</b>	<b>Comment Number: 7</b>
<b>~Transport</b>	<b>Comment Number: 12</b>

**Do you have any feedback**

I am in strong support of more climate-friendly transport solutions, particularly those based around active transport. I would love to see greater investment in and promotion of walking and cycling routes. I also strongly support a Balclutha to Dunedin bus service, especially if it stops at the airport. I think it would be utilised by many people and very beneficial. I think public transport in Wānaka and Ōamaru would also be fantastic, as well as throughout Central Otago.

<b>~Regional Leadership</b>	<b>Comment Number: 5</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

**Do you have any feedback**

I think there should be continued and increased investment in relationships and consultation with mana whenua and being a Te Tiriti-led region.

<b>How we fund our work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 6</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

This isn't related to this question, but I couldn't see a general feedback box (maybe it's on the next page), but this web page was a bit niggly to use. The top half of the page was taken up by the title and it didn't move away when you scrolled down, meaning there was only a small window where you could read the proposal and it wasn't super user friendly.

## Respondent: Mrs Liz ANGELO CO-FOUNDER

Submission Number: 297

On-behalf of: Liz ANGELO on behalf of CITY RISE UP CITY RISE UP

Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:05

### About You

Comment Number: 5

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 4

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 2

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 3

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

APPLAud having public transport as a special focus

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Respondent: Mr Utter Corruption!!**

**Submission Number:** 298

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 05:12

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: Mrs Karen McAnally****Submission Number: 299****Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:15****About You****Comment Number: 6****Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I believe your focus needs to change about the Transport options.

The climate change scenario is not an emergency. You all need to do some study instead of listening to science. The climate is doing what the climate does. It goes around in cycles, i remember learning that at Primary school many years ago.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

I feel you need to look at the entire fleet of buses. Too many times i am witnessing buses running with only one or two people on them. Why not invest in some bus vans instead of big buses. As for running electric buses, forget it they contribute more to emmissions that any petrol or diesel vehicles. Have you all taken notice of how these electric vehicles are made and what happens to the batteries when they expire. They are a massive fire risk, just ask the Fenz people. Dunedin is mostly hills and your electric buses will struggle to go up hills in the winter. Have seen the results from overseas with electric vehicles in the winter.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

I am not a user of the buses for my own health reasons. I simply do not support my ORC rates being used for transport. I do not support these increases to fund the buses.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

There is no climate emergency. Stop listening to the money makers of this quote. The climate is doing what the climate does. It goes around in cycles.

No matter what any one does it will not change the climate. Stop throwing money at it. Money is not going to solve anything.

#### Financial Strategy

Comment Number: 1

#### **Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The ORC needs to be very carefull about how much it is spending on vanity projects. The ORC needs to tighten it's belt like the residents of Dunedin and surrounding areas.



**Respondent: Gail Unkovich**

**Submission Number: 300**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:18**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Any other feedback?**

REDUCE EXPENDITURE REDUCE STAFFING LEVELS KEEP RATE INCREASES AT 6.5% REDUCE DEBT

**Respondent: Ms Francesca Bolgar**

**Submission Number: 301**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:24**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I consider these 6 areas are a fair assessment of what Otago faces

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

These are great focus areas

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Busy routes need more buses. Electrification of buses is the most practical sustainable way forward.

#### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

#### **Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 9**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

#### **Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I consider 5 years to be a reasonable time frame as it doesn't put too much pressure on rate payers but will ensure that this debt is repaid in a timely fashion, leaving the region prepared for any future debts that may need to be incurred in the foreseeable future

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 10**

#### **Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

- \* No

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 20**

#### **Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 7**

#### **Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback**

I'm concerned about the vulnerability of the Otago Peninsula to the effects of climate change on our access (both via Portobello Road & via Highcliff Road), as well as on our properties.

I'm also concerned that eg Broad Bay now appears to be the focus of developers who wish to build multiple dwellings without cognisance of

**~Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

We need to future-proof the Otago Peninsula

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback**

Climate change makes living on the Peninsula at risk long term due to threats to housing & reading infrastructure

**~Transport****Comment Number: 18****Do you have any feedback**

Having

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

Partnership with Kai Tahu & consultation with the wider community are vital to successful planning & implementation

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 17****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

This work will become more vital as climate change effects increase. Here on the Otago Peninsula we have properties threatened by sea level rise, which is also impacting on our main access via Portobello Road.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 15****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Not the strategy per se, but as far as I'm aware, ratepayers still have to pay ORC in lump sums. As someone on a limited income (primarily NZ Super), I find this a struggle. I would be much happier if the ORC rating system could be applied on an eg fortnightly basis, similar to how DCC's rating payments work. I can pay small regular amounts but finding a large sum occasionally is challenging for me when there are many demands on my modest income

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 16****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I approve of the mix of general & targeted rates

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

If these remediations & future-proofing are necessary, I'm supportive despite the increased demand in ratepayers for funding

**Respondent: Ian Bryant**

**Submission Number: 302**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:40**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

No access to bus services for us

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Service running well with good patronage

**Respondent: Dr Kate Stephens**

**Submission Number: 303**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 05:40**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Public transport is essential to equity - freedom for everyone including those who don't drive, protecting the environment, and making our city more pleasant and liveable by reducing traffic. It must be reliable, frequent and affordable or free, and certainly cheaper than using cars. I support all increase in public transport funding. There should also be light rail to Mosgiel.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**



As above public transport is essential for equity, the environment and making our cities more livable and pleasant by reducing cars. It will also benefit tourism. Queenstown has a huge traffic problem we must reduce this. There also needs to be regular reliable bus services between towns in Otago.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

##### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

##### Any other feedback?

I support otago wide rates as improvements in public transport benefit everyone. I do not support a fixed rate - larger properties and businesses have more people so should pay more. Poorer people with smaller houses should pay less.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 2

##### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 13

##### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

##### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 12

##### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 6

##### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* Yes

Please comment on the proposed catchment rate

|

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 1

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 3

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

|

#### ~ORC's must-do work

Comment Number: 14

**Do you have any feedback**

Transport - particularly improving public transport and infrastructure for active travel are the highest priority. I would not support spending on roads unless it is to make areas safer for cycling and pedestrians. Agree re environment and climate change.

#### ~Environment

Comment Number: 17

**Do you have any feedback**

Protecting the environment for the future must take priority over short

#### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 10

**Do you have any feedback**

Resilience is important

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 8

**Do you have any feedback**

Totally agree this is highest priority. As well as improved buses we need light rail to Mosgiel and regular reliable long distance buses Dunedin-Queenstown via Alexandra, Cromwell, etc.,

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

N

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I

**Respondent: Mr Shane Forgie**

**Submission Number:** 304

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 06:20

**About You**

**Comment Number:** 3

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number:** 2

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number:** 6

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Any changes should be funded by the people that use them. You wouldn't run a business to loose more money.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number:** 4

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Fund it by fares the people who use it.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

Should be working on new builds and developments insuring they are paying for protection and ensuring that they are not affecting current houses

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

User pays please

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

ORC need to control costs , not add more and more layers of people and consultants

**Respondent: Trevor Hewson**

**Submission Number: 305**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 06:29**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

The benefit to residents in the catlins are nil when there is no bus to access. No one will drive to Balclutha to hop on a bus to go to Dunedin, timetables will never be suitable to get you to say a specialist appointment at Dunedin hospital mid morning.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

If I haven't got any benefit from public transport don't rate me to pay for someone who has.

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

No flood protection schemes in the catlins. No benefit no rate.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Same as previous

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Many get no benefit. The cost should fall to those that benefit. Rating those in the lower Taieri flood diversion zone should be reconsidered. As an example Simon Parks and those nearby who are impacted when the Taieri river rises and water spills onto their properties to keep the Dunedin airport and lower Taieri dairy farms should have total rates remission and not be contributing to upgrades of the areas flood protection system. Charge rates on land that the ORC uses to reduce the likelihood of flooding elsewhere and then have them pay for resilience upgrades that continue to protect others and regularly inundate their properties.

#### **!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### **!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

#### **!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

No benefit no rate.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

No where else to comment.

I have concerns about the misconception perpetuated by some councilors that is often in the media with regards the new ORC offices being constructed in the old warehouse building. The ORC does not own the building! My understanding is that Chalmers properties ltd, a subsidiary of CCO Port Otago may own the building and is doing the development. Fitout is being paid for by the ORC having sold their potential build site in the upper harbour precinct to Port Otago. The ORC then leases the building and its lease essentially returns as part of its dividend from Port Otago, via Chalmers properties. Good business strategy, and the lease payed stays in Otago. Am I correct? So councilors the cost to the ratepayer is; we dont own the building=zero cost; sold some land to get cash for the fit out= neutral cost; pay a lease to our own CCO via a subsidiary = we've paid ourselves.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Be mindfull that many ratepayers are being impacted on many fronts financially currently and anything the ORC could do to lessen the impact would be appreciated. I believe the ORC should review its intentions and hold off on some of its grandiose ideas. As an example, hold off adding a bus services to Balclutha and Oamaru. If you dont provide it we dont get charged for it.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

ORC should look at other areas it can save money.

Perhaps Port Otagos CCO, Chalmers properties ltd could sell a property for the benefit of the ratepayers.



**Respondent: Ms Bridie Lonie****Submission Number: 306****Submission Date: 28/04/24 06:41****About You****Comment Number: 3****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 12****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Otago Regional Council plays a significant and frequently under-recognized role in ensuring the ongoing sustainability of the environment in the face of the many manifestations of climate change that are increasingly obvious. The ORC should be congratulated on its ongoing work on measuring and understanding these impacts. ORC rates are often seen as an unnecessary addition, but they underpin our future. Partnership with mana whenua is highly significant in this scenario. Understandings of the significance of the environment as a taonga comprised of biodiversity underpinned by specific cultural narrative can only assist in ensuring that resources are not siphoned off permanently for short-term profit. The long view, both backwards and forwards, is vital.

The ORC through its hazard identification and climate change research has demonstrated its capacity to see Otago's ecological systems as a connected, networked whole. I hope that the criteria for larger projects will include a priority for the regeneration of existing but depleted water systems.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

These are the indicators of a healthy, connected environment located specifically in Otago. Can the ORC strategize its proposed grants for projects by consulting mana whenua, community and scientists to help rebuild the damage that has been done to the connections ki uta ki tai?

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 13****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 7****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Increased provision of public transport services is the only way to reduce the damaging impact of the use of the private car. While electric and hybrid cars in some ways reduce emissions, the use of public transport has wider positive impacts, such as the reduction of congestion, cleaner air, and safer options for travel. The private car is often understood as an indicator of freedom and individual choice, yet it constrains wider relationships within the community, and occupies urban space without adding any value to it (save parking costs) for much of the time. Frequent, reliable and extensive bus services are normal in most cities. A bus service that connects with Momona and the airport seems logical.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 14****!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 4****Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 9****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 15****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 16****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Otago's systems are connected. As a ratepayer, I consider I should contribute to the wider region of which my own property is a dependent part.

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 17****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 5****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

If this approach means that wilding pine work can be combined with other biodiversity approaches rather than treated separately I support it. The impact of this decision should be monitored.

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 8****~Transport****Comment Number: 11****Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 10****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I believe that the work required to ensure the region's resilience in the face of ongoing climate change and the impacts of specific weather events have in general been underestimated. This plan is cautious but sustainable. Increases in rates are justifiable: we are not simply maintaining the status quo. The budget balances strategies of repayment with those of borrowing, while extending the reach of its activities.

**Respondent: Miriam Barnett**

**Submission Number: 307**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 07:06**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I support these

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

In a time of climate change we need to increase sustainable energy powered public transport

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This will reduce the environmental impact and reduce traffic jams on roads.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**Any other feedback?**

We all benefit from public transport

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

<b>~Environment</b>	<b>Comment Number: 16</b>
---------------------	---------------------------

**Do you have any feedback**

I support paqying tax to fund the good work done regionally

<b>~Climate change and Resilience</b>	<b>Comment Number: 14</b>
<b>~Regional Leadership</b>	<b>Comment Number: 9</b>
<b>Infrastructure Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 10</b>
<b>Financial Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 15</b>

**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Popperwell**

**Submission Number:** 308

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 07:27

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

But..... it is grossly unfair to expect ratepayers living outside the Queenstown area e.g. Wanaka, Hawea, Makarora etc to contribute to Queenstown's bus services which will have no benefit to these residents.

**Respondent: Mr Ian Craven**

**Submission Number:** 309

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 07:29

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Bus service to and from the airport is essential.



**Respondent: Mr Stephen Popperwell**

**Submission Number:** 310

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 07:38

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

It seems to me obvious that public transport in the greater QLDC should be improved, NOT just in Queenstown but in other centres such as Wanaka, Hawea and Luggate. Why should QLDC ratepayers who live outside Queenstown be expected to pay for better public transport within Queenstown? The suggestion that there is significant benefit for all QLDC rate payers is absurd! I, like many other Wanaka residents, rarely visit Queenstown . I would feel much more comfortable in paying increased rates if there was a clear plan to implement a local public transport service in the Wanaka region.

**Respondent: Bonny Gray Thompson****Submission Number:** 311**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 08:06**About You****Comment Number:** 7**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I agree that Mana Whenua deserve collaboration on all aspects of work pertaining to conservation and management of our environment. I believe this will similarly promote better outcomes for everybody by utilising matauraka Māori.

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 8**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I would like to see the #18 bus to/from Peninsula have more frequent detours to accommodate the Bayfield High School, Musselburgh Primary and Tahuna Normal Intermediate School communities. Currently there is overcrowding on the individual morning and afternoon bus option and students have limited flexibility for arrival to and departure from their schools. If students have after-school or before-school commitments, they do not have a bus service they can reasonably access. The bus stops located on Musselburgh Rise frequently used by the Tahuna Intermediate School in the afternoon do not have bus shelters, and students are prone to waiting considerably long waits in all weather. These students would benefit from installation of a bus shelter at either 79 Musselburgh Rise (ID: 618)/Musselburgh Rise, opp Wardlaw St (ID: 616), or have a bus stop positioned closer to them that is serviced by the #18D & #18C bus service. I support the transition toward an electric bus fleet, however there needs to be transparency regarding seating capacity given the floorplan and seating arrangements onboard the new buses. We trend toward an ageing population and we recognise the prevalence of disability (visible and invisible) in our communities. Onboard seating plays a part in creating equitable, accessible services for those with mobility needs now and into the future. Increasing frequency of popular routes to 15 minute intervals would be a game-changer in our network, and something that would be readily welcomed in our community. Extending the service hours to include later evening options would improve options for our tertiary student community, and improve road safety overall by offering a sensible, affordable alternative to Taxis/Rideshare services. I would be highly in support of a bus service connecting Balclutha and Dunedin, particularly if this should connect the airport with Dunedin city. For 3 years my partner commuted from Dunedin to Balclutha for work, accumulating significant mileage, and avoidable driving fatigue. It would be important that the service is rapid enough to prevent unnecessary travel times for those swapping their car trip for the bus. I would like to see more timely improvements when safety concerns are raised on the existing bus network. I understand there is a collaboration between Dunedin City Council

and ORC for maintaining the bus shelters, bus stops, and enforcing road rules around these spaces. I feel the 6 month turn around to apply yellow lines around an existing bus stop (i.e. opposite Abbotsford primary school) is excessive. This is even when it has been identified that the bus stop is regularly parked over by general public, preventing the bus from seeing passengers waiting to board. If it were an amendment to a bus stop location or changing existing rules, that's fair enough to go through the proper processes. However for a quick fix involving simply marking out lines to clarify an existing road rule, 6 months is a long time for passengers who use the bus stop daily to be placed at risk, or the inconvenience of having to use another bus stop. I would love to see the ORC adopt a uniform change to fees-free buses. i.e. \$0 tag-on charge for any bus passenger. Given this would only cost the ORC/Ratepayer when a passenger actually boards the bus, it would only benefit the city. Those who still won't use the bus service but travel by car will benefit from reduced traffic demands on the streets. The city would find some of its parking demand alleviated, and it would overall offer the greatest incentive for those able to catch public transport to make the switch. We're already paying a significant portion toward the bus service through our rates. Why not ensure the buses are running closer to capacity? I would love to see ongoing support for ORC to work on internal attitudes toward travel habits, particularly over-reliance on cars for everyday commuting. With the Dunedin branch looking to be centred at a well-serviced location for the bus service, employees (new and old) need to constantly have public transport and active transport modes offered, promoted and celebrated in order to role model and normalise this mentality shift for our city. I support the transition toward an electric bus fleet, however there needs to be transparency regarding seating capacity given the floorplan and seating arrangements onboard the new buses. We trend toward an ageing population and we recognise the prevalence of disability (visible and invisible) in our communities. Onboard seating plays a part in creating equitable, accessible services. I would like to see ongoing attention applied to the central city bus hub in Dunedin Central, as this remains a barrier to use by children and teenage school students. Either the student themselves feels unsafe waiting at the bus hub for their connection, or their parents/guardians are uncomfortable with their child spending time in a notoriously antisocial part of the city.

#### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I feel that uniform rates are not the most equitable option, especially in areas where the wealth disparity is so vast.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

#### Tell us what you think

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

#### Any other feedback?

I think in principle the existing basis for rates (linked to property value) is a more equitable system. Those with high value properties would be expected to have greater wealth available to contribute. Those in low value properties would not be expected to have the same wealth available to contribute. I understand there will be members within our communities who are asset-rich while also cash-poor (i.e. some pensioner aged individuals). In these circumstances, I believe an exemption process could be established.

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

\* Yes

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

I would love to see public transport options reach regional communities including parts of Central Otago and Oamaru. As our population ages, we need to ensure our community is accessible, especially in townships that are established with the idea of everybody owning and driving a car. It would be great for buses to fill more of the void for people who don't drive and those who just want more options to be connected.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

While I understand there needs to be regulation and enforcement of non-compliant activities relation to te taiao, especially concerning our rivers and waterways, I believe fines are not always adequate disincentives. We know the proposed 3 Waters Reform was well accepted by smaller councils without the financial means of updating their existing infrastructure to support compliance with more contemporary measures. I suspect that placing fines against Councils where the main barrier to achieving compliance is the sheer cost of upgrading an asset, would be counter-productive.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I don't support moving from capital value to a uniform/flat rate.  
I believe this is not an equitable approach.

**Respondent: Mr Keiran Medel**

**Submission Number:** 312

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 08:07

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support additional funding on top of the amount proposed to make bus fares free for all passengers.

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

I disagree with the proposed change from a capital value basis to a uniform charge.

**Respondent: Mrs Valerie Weir**

**Submission Number: 313**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 08:18**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Providing Balclutha/Dunedin bus service has been proven in the past to be a waste of time and have run at a loss. Most people go to Dunedin for hospital appointments or to shop. If it was a viable venture a private contractor would be doing it

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Ratepayers are struggling financially, ORC need to cut back unnecessary spending. Central government have told departments to make savings, it's time local government do the same. Ratepayers can no longer fund the wasteful spending of this council and neither we should.

**Respondent: Gwylfa Moore**

**Submission Number:** 314

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 08:34

**About You**

**Comment Number: 3**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

## Respondent: West Harbour Community Board

Submission Number: 315

Submission Date: 28/04/24 08:51

### About You

Comment Number: 3

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 2

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

The Chief Executive  
Otago Regional Council  
Private Bag 1954  
Dunedin 9054  
New Zealand

28th April 2024

RE: West Harbour Community Board (WHCB) Submission to the ORC Long Term Plan Review 2024/34

### Basis for submission

West Harbour is a coastal Dunedin community where most residents live within easy walking distance of the Otago Harbour and the ocean. Proximity to healthy land and water is one of the most precious resources for our community, and the intrinsic, aesthetic, spiritual and mental health benefits value that comes with living adjacent to nature.



The West Harbour community value access to kai moana, the recreational and commercial opportunities afforded due to living adjacent to Otago Harbour, and the conservation and recreation value of Orokonui Ecosanctuary among others.

Our community feel deep affinity with the Otago Harbour and the marine area that surrounds us, however our community are conscious of and concerned that **Climate Change** is placing considerable and increasing pressures on the outlying coastal communities such as the precious environments of Osbourne, Pūrākaunui, Long Beach/Warauwerawera, and Aramoana. In addition, West Harbour has the added pressure through Port Otago and the annual influx of Cruise Ship Passengers.

West Harbour residents are proud to offer manaaki to our visitors, and we ask that the Otago Regional Council (ORC) help us to maintain our piece of paradise as the wonderful place it is to grow up, live, work, play, and visit, whilst maintaining West Harbour as the priceless piece of Otago's historic and wild environment that it is.

### **West Harbour Community Board Position**

- 1 The West Harbour Community Board (WHCB) are strongly supportive of the ORC's proposed 2024/ 2034 Long Term Plan review to be effective and meaning full treaty partners, to raise Otago's environmental standards, increase pest management, support communities, be more resilient in the face of climate change (especially for low-lying communities), improve and restore land and water quality and resilience, and improve public transport.

- 2 **The WHCB support the ORC Proposal 1 Investing in the Environment Option 3.**

*Increasing the ORC dedicated funding for Large-Scale Environmental projects to \$2million.*

- 3 **The WHCB support the ORC Proposal 2 Investing in Public Transport Option 1.**

*Increasing extra services and moving towards electric buses in the Greater Dunedin area.*

- 4 **The WHCB support the ORC's proposed Changes to our Rating System.**

*The proposed changes represent a fairer allocation of rates across the region with most of the community paying less or less than \$100 more in rates.*

### **Investing in Public Transport across West Harbour**

- 5 The WHCB share the ORC goals for improving uptake of public transport. Our community is eminently suited to switch to public transport with the largely linear nature of West Harbour and the existing train track from Port Chalmers to Dunedin City. School children, commuters, elderly, those with disabilities and non-driving residents of West Harbour all value and rely on public transport in their daily life.
- 6 The WHCB strongly advocate for the reinstatement of commuter trains along West Harbour. Lines and a passenger train exist, and Dunedin Railways Ltd run an infrequent tourist train (the Seaside).
- 7 The WHCB on behalf of our residents would like to thank the ORC staff for their increased attention to public transport during the 2023/24 Cruise Ship Season. However, the return of cruise ships to Otago Harbour has highlighted the extreme need for public transport options along West Harbour and the inability of the current system to handle the demand.
- 8 For six months the daily life for our community is made extremely difficult through buses overloaded with cruise ship passengers being unable to cope with the demand. WH residents, elderly, disabled, students, hospital workers, commuting residents are still missing appointments, jobs, classes, missing buses that leave before the scheduled time, or are already full as they arrive to the stop.
- 9 West Harbour community now have a deep distrust of the public transport system. Restoring trust in the public transport system requires a sea change towards a more flexible (e.g., trains, and buses), frequent, dependable, and resilient, public transport system which will support the Otago Regional Council and Dunedin's Carbon Emission reduction goals.

10 WHCB request ORC improvements in the following areas:

- Peak hour capacity.
- *Communication* and advanced planning to cater for the Impact of cruise ship passengers on the local community and public transport system.
- Passenger Train options for Commuters and Cruise Ship Passengers to provide *resilience* to the public transport system.
- *Reliability* of buses, capacity for buses to pick up passengers at all stops.
- Low/reduced fares for Otago Residents.
- Timetable adherence, tracking and real-time updates, leave stops on time not before time.

### **Investing in the Environment**

11 As kaitiaki/guardians of te taiao/the environment that surrounds us, we value and commend ORC for their current efforts to maintain and their stated intention to increase environmental monitoring throughout Otago.

12 WHCB appreciate the continued monitoring of the environmental and health impacts of the existing industry along West Harbour (e.g., Ravensdown and Port Otago).

13 West Harbour borders Orokonui Ecosanctuary in the West, and Otago Harbour in the East. Is home to many native and endangered birds, reptiles, invertebrates and plants, including migratory marine mammals, and sea/coastal birds. West Harbour is a vital link in Otago's efforts to protect native and endemic flora and fauna.

14 WHCB supports efforts by the ORC to implement Large-scale Environmental projects.

15 **Aramoana Ecological Area (AEA)** is an extensive protected wetland ecosystem. The existing board walk provides easy access and is frequently visited by school groups from across Otago. Highly prized by the NZ ecological and the local community for its aesthetic and conservation values, the AEA has been the focus of many scientific papers. The area is host to special saltmarsh plants. It is a vital feeding spot for a large number of birds, including godwits, banded dotterels, pied stilts, plovers, herons, kingfishers and oyster catchers.

16 **The Long Mac Groyne** structure in Otago Harbour created the AEA and long-term lack of maintenance to this existing structure now puts this nationally significant Ecological Area, the historic pilot houses, and important native species breeding and feeding grounds at serious risk. We ask that the ORC support calls to provide this much needed maintenance.

17 **Pest Management:** WHCB are strongly in favour of the ORC's efforts through the implementation of the Otago Pest Management Plan(External link) (PMP) to better manage and eradicate the pest plants and animals doing the most damage in Otago. Site-Led Programmes for "West Harbour – Mt Cargill", and "Quarantine and Goat Islands / Kamau Taurua" areas (Page 59, ORC Pest Management Plan) are in place. WHCB encourage and request more active monitoring, management, and eradication across West Harbour for noxious weeds, especially those named in the ORC PMP (Banana Passionfruit, Darwin's Barberry, Sycamore, Gunnera, and Tradescantia) and pest animal species such as feral cats, feral rabbits, mustilids, rats, hedgehogs, and possums).

-

18 **Otago Harbour User Working Group:** Increasing recreational and commercial use of the Otago Harbour is placing strain on the natural environment and brings with it many Health and Safety considerations. Both recreational and commercial use across Otago Harbour and adjacent communities will continue to increase. WHCB would like to remind ORC of their commitment to form an 'Otago Harbour User Working Group' and request that the West Harbour Community Board be included in the formation of this User Group.

**Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission to the 2024/2034 Long Term Plan Review.**

**We would appreciate the opportunity to speak to this submission.**

Regards,

Dr Barbara Anderson

Angela McErlane (Chair WHCB)

Kristina Goldsmith (Deputy Chair WHCB)

Duncan Eddy

Jarrold Hodgson

Wayne Sefton

**Respondent: Mr John Heaton****Submission Number: 316****Submission Date: 28/04/24 08:54****!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

There are 4 options presented here. 3 supporting the change and 1 supporting no change. This is nuts. There are other options. Only those areas that directly benefit from Public Transport should pay towards it. This means that if there are villages/suburbs that do not benefit then they should not pay. Makarora for example. And Hawea. Indeed all of the Wanaka district. Not only must there not be a targeted rate for QLDC area, there must not be the 20% Otago wide Public Transport contribution. Those areas that benefit should pay. Nowhere else. I found the document hard to follow. But I am sure there was a suggestion that there would be a Public Transport Trial in Wanaka. If we assume that covers 6 months, then the areas of Wanaka where the trial is conducted should pay. And nowhere else. For example, If you do not include Luggate, or Cardrona then those folk must not pay towards the trial. If the trial does cover 6 months then those that benefit would pay half the annual public transport rate for that year. Wider regional Public Transport benefit. The amount of this is so negligible outside of the public transport areas that suggesting everyone should pay is unreasonable. Especially at 20% of the total public transport rate. If you want to target everyone then you need to be able define the benefit that will be received. Just saying it exists doesn't make it so. Do I think Wanaka and surrounding areas would benefit from Public Transport? Yes I do. The Wanaka Community has already run 2 trials. Because no one else would. When you arrive to do the trials, please show respect for all those that took part and who already have a stake. If you do decide to have a trial in Wanaka and or surrounds, then there must be comprehensive public consultation. It must consider all forms of public transport and may need to go through several iterations. Uniform annual charge is a regressive tax. Poorer folk pay more proportionately. This must not happen. Capital value cannot be used Region wide at the same rate. Different areas have differing needs and have differing values. Rates need to be tailored to each area.

**Respondent: Mr Murray Neilson**

**Submission Number:** 317

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 08:55

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Respondent: Ian Bryant**

**Submission Number:** 318

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 08:57

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Tell us what you think Any other feedback?**

no access to buses

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Respondent: Mr Don McKinnon**

**Submission Number: 319**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 08:57**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Most of these focii are admirable for a regional council. However, I urge a cautious approach to implementing Central Government ideologies in areas such as Climate Change remedies, Partnerships based on ethnicity and wholesale Transport conversion to EV's.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

While I agree that efficient public transport is desirable I don't think increased services to 15 minute intervals in Dunedin City such as Pine Hill are warranted. I've observed the bus passengers at most times of the day and they are never any where near full, most times less than a dozen passengers. Maybe smaller buses run more often is a solution. Outram has no bus service yet Council propose increasing Dunedin Central routes.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I don't agree with us as Outram residents contributing to Queenstown transport

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 2****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

Because I'm an Outram resident I'm up for a 37% increase in ORC rates if ORC adopt all the wish list that's on the 10 year plan. This is simply unacceptable.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Because I'm an Outram resident I'm up for a 37% increase in ORC rates if ORC adopt all the wish list that's on the 10 year plan. This is simply unacceptable.

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**Please comment on the general rate allocation**

Because I'm an Outram resident I'm up for a 37% increase in ORC rates if ORC adopt all the wish list that's on the 10 year plan. This is simply unacceptable.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Because I'm an Outram resident I'm up for a 37% increase in ORC rates if ORC adopt all the wish list that's on the 10 year plan. This is simply unacceptable.

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 3****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No



**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

The navigation issue has nothing to do with my property in Outram.

Because I'm an Outram resident I'm up for a 37% increase in ORC rates if ORC adopt all the wish list that's on the 10 year plan. This is simply unacceptable.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 12**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 10**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

it's my contention that climate change is not entirely attributable to human activity. New Zealand contributes about 0.15% of the World's gross emissions. I think we should be very cautious about mandating severe restrictions on farmers and the nationwide use of fossil fuel vehicles. A slow and steady approach to implementing changes to improve the environment is preferable to create less stress in society.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

I have great difficulty with 20% of my transport rates going to Queenstown or Dunedin city for that matter when my own community has no public transport. Outram is off the radar as far as ORC are concerned on this matter.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

I have difficulty facing a 37% rate rise so that some of that money can go towards the Leith Flood Protection. I'd rather Option 2 was adopted rather than the expensive Option 1

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I think ORC need to lower their rates about funding new transport innovations. Borrowing and increasing debt is always a major concern to rate payers. As an Outram resident I am faced with a 37% increase for the 2024/2025 period. ORC state an average rate increase of 18% for the region. Why do we in Outram bear the brunt of the Lower Taieri Flood Zone at \$979.58? This doesn't seem fair to me.

**Respondent: Southern Lakes Swim Club****Submission Number:** 320**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 09:02**About You****Comment Number:** 6**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Southern Lakes Swim Club endorses the healthy environment, thriving ecosystem and flourishing biodiversity in particular in relation to our lakes and rivers. We actively swim in many of the lakes - the Whakatipu, Lake Wanaka, Lake Dunstan, Moke Lake and Lake Hayes. We'd love it if all the Southern Lakes had high quality of water so they were all swimmable but sadly this is not the case. Poor and polluted run-off after rain; polluted storm water straight into the lakes; sewerage leaks and overflows; farm effluent and run-off, and, pollution degrade the water quality and can make it dangerous and a health risk to swim in what should be pristine waters. We are concerned about the levels of localised pollution events and would like to see more monitoring of water quality, and projects to improve the water quality. We are also concerned about invasive weeds and invasive species and would advocate for more removal of invasive species and protection of our native fauna and flora.

We would endorse education around what storm drains go into the lakes and we'd actively endorse "adopt a drain".

With regards to powered vessels we note there are a lot of beaches in the area with (fossil fuel) powered vessel emphasis e.g. ski lanes right on the beach. We'd like to see more emphasis on swimming and kayaking taking priority on our lakes rather than writing policies with emphasis on boating and jet ski-ing. Human powered endeavors should take priority on our lakes rather than fossil fuel based activities.

We'd like to see recognition and provision of swim lanes in the lakes.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 1**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 7**Please comment**

SLSC has no view on Dunedin specific bus services, however we endorse investment in public transport to take single occupancy cars off the roads.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Better public transport will help our members get to swim club - some of our members don't have cars and so we'd like better services to help them get to where they need to be. This applies to other sporting activities as well. A more regular bus and public transport system would be greatly appreciated and better for the environment. Better alignment through the Otago district would help us reduce our on-road carbon emissions if there were reliable and regular services available.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**~Environment****Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

We strongly advocate for monitoring water quality in our lakes, and would like to see more monitoring. We would like to see better management of localised pollution events. We'd like to see a better level of understanding of where drains go, within the community, so people understand that storm water drains go into our lakes and rivers.

**Respondent: Craig McGeady**

**Submission Number: 321**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 09:07**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Communities? Farmers need to grow diverse crops, moving away from mono-culture. Farmers need to be encouraged to sell local, supply to local shops and have stalls in a growing network of market days, market days centred on areas no larger than one in every suburb if within the city boundary, then in every village, township or gathering of homes if in urban areas. This will help build community when you are able to encounter and support local artisans and growers. Build community through real connectivity and problems like a lack of resilience becomes that much easier to solve.

This also improves the environment and takes us in the right direction when it comes to climate action.

Build Community Through Communities.

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

There was a lot of damage done to image of taking a bus throughout the 70's and 80's. To address that damage there needs to be a concerted effort made to promote those who take the bus as climate leaders. The image needs to be vastly improved and it's not just about converting to an electric fleet. Thought needs to be given about how we want those who take the bus portrayed. The bus hub in the CBD is a reinforcement of those negative stereotypes. Enforce the no vaping/no smoking signs that once adorned the footpaths. Bring in kiosks for food. Shape it into an extension of the new George St. Make it something the George St. redevelopment can't be. To ensure busing is a ready option, apps won't do it, real time information won't do it, hitting that threshold of stress free journey planning will be by ensuring the frequency is getting closer to that 15 - 7 minute mark. Once it's there then wait times will be a non-issue. The passenger will go at a time of their convenience and only have a few minutes to wait until the next bus. Until you get to that point then any progress you make will be hard fought.

**Respondent: John Parker**

**Submission Number: 322**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 09:21**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

In favour of more services, more frequent services, and especially a bus service to the airport. In strong support of rapid transport bus services (10 min frequencies, turn up and go)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Respondent: Mr Paul Meehan**

**Submission Number: 323**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 09:23**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 11**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Tell us what you think**

\* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

The greater community benefits from flood protection. i.e local roads & State Highways 1 & 87 i.e airport

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

The proportion should be 50% - 50% The wider community benefits generally from drainage schemes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 19**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**



**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

<b>~ORC's must-do work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 20</b>
<b>~Environment</b>	<b>Comment Number: 5</b>
<b>~Transport</b>	<b>Comment Number: 13</b>
<b>~Regional Leadership</b>	<b>Comment Number: 3</b>
<b>Infrastructure Strategy</b>	<b>Comment Number: 2</b>

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

The existing system works very well.

There is no need to waste money on more consultants conservative opinions.

<b>How we fund our work</b>	<b>Comment Number: 9</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

The current system should remain: Rates (Estimated 2) The rates for Outram residents increase between 35% and 88% which is totally unfair. Flood control & drainage on the Taieri Plain benefit the wider community. For example - Dunedin Airport, SH1 & SH87 and other local roads are all used by the wider Otago community and the protection of this infrastructure should be contributed on a more fair basis. I would suggest 50% targeted and 50% regional.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Rates (Estimated 2) option should be adopted

**Respondent: Ms Chloe Humphreys****Submission Number: 324****Submission Date: 28/04/24 09:26****About You****Comment Number: 13****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

As a resident who lives on the Otago Peninsula, I am concerned about the potential ecological impact of larger-scale development, as allowed under the new 2GP regulations. I wish to express my strong support for the protection of our coastal/marine reserves and our distinctive “township and settlement” areas against higher-density development. I recognise the urgent need for more housing, but as a concerned resident I hope to advocate for sustainable development, and believe it’s critical to balance growth with the preservation of our natural ecosystems. The coastal and marine environments in our region are not just natural assets; they are vital to our community’s ecological, economic, and social health. I hope that the ORC and DCC will work together to review infrastructure and develop tighter regulations to protect these sensitive areas.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 15****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I wholeheartedly support continued work on these focus areas, and believe they are spot on in targeting the most vital areas that need to be addressed in the long term plan.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 2****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 14**

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 6**

## Respondent: Dunedin Tracks Network Trust

Submission Number: 325

Submission Date: 28/04/24 10:04

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

### Otago's challenges and opportunities

Comment Number: 4

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

- 1 Looking at the challenges and opportunities identified on page 4 of the consultation document, we note the absence of the opportunity that exists to build on the strength of character that exists in our communities. This could read 'Our communities are strong and local identities prominent; the opportunity exists to collaborate with these communities, building on their strengths so they are able to support our region into the future.'

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 3

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The ORC's vision is "Our environment and communities are healthy and connected. Ki uta ki tai – From the Mountains to the Sea".

This is a commendable vision and, as we've said before, the 6 focus areas provide a strong foundation for strategic directions.

However, looking at the three areas of significant focus, we believe there is a lack of emphasis across:

#### a) active transport

As detailed above, active transport and recreational opportunities afford not only the potential of reduced carbon emissions, but a multitude of environment, health, and wellbeing benefits.

#### b) Initiatives promoting access to the environment

The concept of the environmental fund is a good idea, however there is potential for groups to enhance pockets of our environment without considering accessibility to the area by the general public.

**Respondent: Mr Terry Wilson**

**Submission Number: 326**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 10:10**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Your vision is wrong: please focus on:

- providing services of good quality at the minimum cost to ratepayers.
- be open and honest with the people of Otago and treat us all equally without regard to race, gender and religion.

Be reminded that the Treaty Of Waitangi has not established a partnership. Apart from your own delusions there is no partnership, no co-governance and no power sharing. There are supporters of Maori Nationalism and you should not be part of that - since we expect you to be non-political.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Do not increase the level of service. Increase the bus fares to reduce the ratepayer burden of subsidizing bus travel. Do not require the use of electric busses and do not fund the move to electric busses. If the passengers or central government want electric busses, then they can pay for it themselves. Do not target an 8% PT mode share - a level this high has undesirable consequences. Do not expect the DCC to do your dirty-work to achieve your misguided 8% PT mode share. By expecting the DCC to be manipulative and dishonest with the people, you are also being manipulative and dishonest - as well as being anti-democratic and disrespectful.

#### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

#### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

I do not understand your description of this proposal.

#### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

There is no need to repay any public transport deficit. The poor financial position is a result of un-disciplined spending across several departments and severe cost cutting is the cure for this.

#### **!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

The ORC flood protection systems seem to have been neglected, with poor performance and a large backlog of renewals work needed. Your plan includes healthy levels of renewals capex, but you have told us this same story before, and the work was not done. I think you have no intention of spending the indicated amounts. I believe that the renewals deficits will continue to increase - and it looks like your auditor shares this view.

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 11****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 6****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

The cost of this work is excessive. The work on harbour and navigational safety should be abandoned unless it can be done for a much lower cost. Currently the cost outweighs the benefit.

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**

Prioritize the renewals backlog and improvements to the various flood protection schemes. Decrease spending on your environmental and climate change obsessions. Do not fund electric busses.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 15****Do you have any feedback**

There is no partnership with mana whenua. The business interests of Ngai Tahu should not have priority over everyone else.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback**

- Do not increase spending on Public Transport
- Do not increase the level of service
- Increase the bus fares to reduce the ratepayer burden of subsidizing bus travel
- Do not require the use of electric busses and do not fund the move to electric busses. If the passengers or central government want electric busses, then they can pay for it them themselves
- Do not target an 8% PT mode share - a level this high has undesirable consequences
- Do not expect the DCC to do your dirty-work to achieve your misguided 8% PT mode share. By expecting the DCC to be manipulative and dishonest with the people, you are also being manipulative and dishonest - as well as being anti-democratic and disrespectful.
- Learn to respect the wishes of the people. We choose cars - you need to adjust your authoritarian attitude.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 7**



**Do you have any feedback**

Costs are too high: reduce staff numbers and abandon the move to the new HQ building in MacLaggan St. The move is unjustified.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 17****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

The ORC flood protection systems seem to have been neglected, with poor performance and a large backlog of renewals work needed. Your plan includes healthy levels of renewals capex, but you have told us this same story before, and the work was not done. I think you have no intention of spending the indicated amounts. I believe that the renewals deficits will continue to increase - and it looks like your auditor shares this view.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 9****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The financial mismanagement of the ORC is becoming evident with the struggle to balance the budget (net profit after tax) and the new need to borrow money every year - previously the ORC has had no debt.

The desperation [REDACTED] to balance the budget has led [REDACTED] to create an imaginary source of funding. The plan says you will use "reserves" to smooth out the bad years - but these reserves are not cash and cannot be used to fund deficits. Reserves are used to transfer surpluses and deficits between departments. It is dishonest to describe these reserves as a ready supply of funding.

You say, "We're working to balance the budget" - but obviously you expect to fail to achieve this: for five of the next six years you are forecasting an unbalanced budget (a deficit). Losses will be significant over this period and it is obvious that you will be borrowing to fund your operating expenses. This is the path to financial disaster - ask any budgeting service.

Any budgeting advisor would quickly spot the problem - its your out of control increases in spending (opex). This has tripled from FY2016 to FY2023 and your plan is to keep increasing it at a rapid rate: up 41% in the next 5 years. This is unacceptable.

Councillors should refuse to approve this plan because of the many years that are forecast to be in deficit. The LGA requires a balanced budget and you have no excuses to be exempt from this requirement.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Your deficit budgets in the next 6 years will add significantly to your debt - you should not borrow to fund operating expenses, instead you should reduce your operating expenses. You should not own, and add to, your sharemarket investment fund (\$750,000 per year). This is an improper use of ratepayer money and contributes to the very painful planned rates increases. Councillors seem to be unaware of this fund and need to be asked if it should continue. You plan to increase the allowable annual rates increases to 10%. This should be set to 0% for the next 10 years to counteract the enormous increases in the last 7 years: +249% (2017 to 2024) . Note: this is not a miscalculation, rates are now 3½ times higher now than 7 years ago.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Your obscenely high proposed rates increases, 60% in the next 5 years, on top of +249% for the previous 7 years, shows a reckless disregard for the well-being of Otago citizens. Your behavior in imposing this penalty on us cannot be pure incompetence, I think there must be a degree of hatred towards ratepayers. The risk to citizens and the productive sector of Otago of your continuing to behave in this way, ought-weighs the modest benefits that you provide. You should not exist.

**Respondent: Mr Steve Moss**

**Submission Number: 327**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 10:17**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

There must be no charge to wanaka ward ratepayers for Queenstown ward public transport. This should only be considered if you make the Wānaka ward have its own public transport which has to be more than wanaka - Albert town- Hawea and return. What about Luggate? Cardrona?

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

**Any other feedback?**

Public transport funding should come from the wards that are supplied with public transport only!!!

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Our orc rates and our Qldc rates are much too high already.

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Wilding pines exist and must be funded until eradication

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

There have already been 2 trials for Wānaka - Hawea . Why the need for another one? And you don't

**Respondent: Elliot Blyth****Submission Number:** 328**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 10:29**About You****Comment Number:** 15**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 7**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 16**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I think that out of all of these, climate change will have the biggest impact on our region, so this needs to be a primary consideration. Also, I think it's really important that we consider how all of this impacts young people – Many young people, myself included, would like to live in Otago because of it's beautiful characteristics, but there is just not enough opportunities post-university for many.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 11**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 13**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Keep the busses coming! I particularly support the regional bus proposals that have been spoken about. I don't often use the busses as I choose to cycle whenever I can, but the more people on busses the better for everyone. I really love cycling around the electric busses, with their lack of tailpipe emissions.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 14****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Getting transit right in Queenstown is absolutely critical!! Traffic is such a nightmare at the moment, and more, better busses are clearly the only way to fix this. It would be great if there was integration with the NZSki busses, as post-ride transport is an absolute nightmare, and their private busses are prohibitively expensive for many.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 6****Tell us what you think**

\* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 4****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 1****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 12****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you have any feedback**

There is no investment too small in our environment. It's everything we have, and we need to treat it as so

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

We need to keep funding climate adaptation and mitigation measures like there's no tomorrow – because there might not be!

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback**

Absolutely – I think that I would have previously thought that these types of longer-distance busses were a little extreme, but having been to Europe recently and ridden on many of these busses, it's totally normal and it would be a huge benefit to us in Otago. I think a Wanaka to Queenstown bus would also be super great! The existing options there are not so good.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Sounds good!

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Borrow, borrow, borrow! It's an investment in our future, and we need to spend up now to mitigate climate change later.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Things are expensive, but the cost of not paying for them now will be much greater.

**Respondent: Cat Prunty**

**Submission Number: 329**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 10:50**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Here is my general feedback.

Environment (also including water, farm monitoring and wilding pines, etc.): Okay to pay more rates for these initiatives, as long as there is accountability. Can you tell us more about how this will happen.

Can we please do more about erosion? For example, additional rock-armouring in Oamaru, out to the North End, it's scary to see how the erosion has sped up recently. Short-term cost for long-term preservation.

Transport:

Glad to see some efforts to introduce public transport in Oamaru. And that you are looking at an on-demand service like in Timaru. Scheduled services will not work unless they are really frequent. Plan should include a HUGE amount of promo to reach all of those people who always complain "I didn't know about that" after something goes away.

We would prefer not to pay for public transport in either Queenstown or Dunedin, which we will never use. Get some extra funds from visitors and/or international students on overseas work experience.

Debt management approach sounds reasonable.

Thank you.



**Respondent: Tim McMullen****Submission Number: 330****Submission Date: 28/04/24 11:03****About You****Comment Number: 1****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

- 1 More integrated transport is going to be essential when it comes to meeting the challenges of climate change. We also need more considered planning for flood events, including, but not limited to, reforestation of native plants.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

- 1 In addition to managing the wilding pine population, we need to move to reforest native plants in suitable areas. This will be a critical part of making us truly climate resilient.
- 2 I do also feel that involvement of mana whenua is very important to ensure fair and just changes under te Tiriti.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 4****Do you support this proposal?**

- \* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

- \* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

- \* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 7****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

- \* Yes

**Please comment**

I support option 1 without reservation.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 13****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support option 1 without reservation.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 5****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

I do not support uniform basis rating. I think it's more reasonable to have the rates proportional to the value of the property, particularly for commercial properties. Given the heavy emphasis on tourism in the district, tourism businesses in particular need to be helping support the changes we need to the transport system. In principle, if they make clients aware of such transport and encourage it, our tourism industry can become a model of sustainability.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 9****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**Please comment**

It should be repaid as soon as possible to minimise interest costs.

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I don't support uniform rating. The burden of rates should be proportional to property values. I support buses every 15mins during the day for routes 5/6 and 10/11 in Dunedin (in addition to route 8), new routes and higher frequencies for Queenstown buses and a bus to Dunedin Airport as part of a Dunedin-Balclutha route.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 6****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 11****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Honestly, I don't think anything near enough will be done in advance to anticipate the flooding catastrophes that are coming. If storms anything similar to what happened in Auckland or Te Tairāwhiti were to strike the Tokomairiro or Taieri Rivers, the scale of destruction would be simply extraordinary. And this is what we should be planning for.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 14****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 10****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

I see nothing about replanting native forests. If that were done in large enough numbers, the wilding pine problem goes away eventually.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 3****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I cannot find anywhere else to say this, so I'm going to say it here: This form was an utter abomination to fill out. In addition to a lot of confusing language about rates (uniform/targeted versus capital value) where terms are thrown around interchangeably throughout the document. Pick a term and stick with it. Also, doing the feedback online alongside the document was stunningly confusing. In the initial read through of the document the questions were all conveniently numbered. I created my own word document with my answers all numbered. Then I get to the feedback document online and there are NO QUESTION NUMBERS. And the questions are often (but not always) worded differently or simply ask me which option number I want. But I've written out my answers.

Really, it would be hard to have made it more confusing. In future I will leave myself more time and just print the document and write the answers with a pen. Really shocking in 2024 that that make more sense than whatever this online abomination was.

**Respondent: Mr Duncan Davidson****Submission Number:** 331**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 11:11**About You****Comment Number:** 3**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I fully support proposals to expand the bus service. I also believe the ORC should investigate more park and ride options and also "ride and ride" set ups. This would entail having buses set up to carry not just one or two bikes but rather a dozen or more bikes in a shuttle bus+bike trailer arrangement. These buses could then pick up a dozen or more rural bike commuters from centralised pick up locations, for example in Waitati, before driving over the hill into central Dunedin, from where the cyclists would disperse in different directions.

**~Transport****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback**

Now that the Dunedin City Council has put plans for the Albany Street Connection on hold, I'd like to suggest that the ORC looks again at developing a shared pathway along the banks of the Water of Leith, all the way from the Leith Walk bridge to the harbour basically. There have already been proposals by the ORC to make significant changes to lower reaches of the Leith, with a shared pathway to be included in the redevelopment, and I understand the polytechnic actually did a land swap (or sale?) with ORC to make this proposal more feasible. I suspect the university might also have earmarked some of their properties along Leithbank to be included in any future redevelopment.

The thing with Option 2 is that maybe we don't need to wait for the whole project to be all done at once. It's already been shelved by ORC because of the cost, but a smaller scale version of it could be done. The Clyde Street bridge can already be walked or cycled under and it wouldn't take too much to make the Forth Street bridge underpassable too. And rather than planning to completely remove and "renaturalise" the concrete flood walls, a shared pathway in the form of a wooden boardwalk or just a concrete path could simply be added above the concrete floor of the flood channel. Pathway users would end up walking or cycling alongside the concrete walls, with their lichen, graffiti and street art, but that's just part of Dunedin's gritty, urban vibe and, if done correctly, the post-apocalyptic, post-industrial grunge look could actually add to the appeal of the pathway, not detract from it.

The earlier plan by the ORC appears to have involved complete removal of the concrete walls and their replacement with sloping earthen banks, boulders and geotextile fabrics, all in an effort to make the Leith riverbanks look more natural, and as a continuation of what has been done closer to and within the university campus. The problem is, this all comes at huge cost and does not actually end up looking particularly natural anyway. Surely it's better to achieve the ORC's sustainable transport goals by making the more basic alternations I've suggested, then use the money saved to bolster natural habitat restoration and protection in another part of Otago where we'd get much more bang for buck.

**Respondent: Mr Murray Neilson****Submission Number: 332****Submission Date: 28/04/24 11:21****About You****Comment Number: 19****-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 16****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

ORC should also run a trial on a Dunedin to Outram bus service. Outram is a dormitory suburb for Dunedin, with a significant and growing population, with no access to public transport - why? It is no different from the centres for which trials are proposed. If ORC is truly committed to reducing its car-caused carbon emissions, and resulting climate change resilience, then it should consider this proposal.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 17****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I support this proposal and it's likely reduction in transport carbon emissions.

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 12

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 5

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* Yes

#### Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?

Not on the rating proposals, but a comment: river management operations should be required, over the term of this plan to move to nature-based solutions, as far as possible, rather than to continue to rely on engineering-based techniques.

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

- \* Yes

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 15

#### Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?

- \* Yes

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

No.

**~ORC's must-do work**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

I support the continuation of current and necessary work programmes.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback**

I support the increased funding Option 2. Such a fund should be used, for example, to ensure the ORC invests in restoration of such wetlands as Old Taieri Lake, which should be restored as a functioning wetland containing shallow water, islands of drier land for waterfowl loafing and nesting areas and wetland margins suitable for waterfowl and wading birds. 1- 2 metres of water should be sufficient to provide a wetland similar in nature to the wetlands upstream in the Maniototo and Paerau Scroll Plains. An increase in Otago's biodiversity could be expected with such an approach. Such a restored wetland would also be a suitable site to liberate endangered black stilt, for example, which used to be found in Otago and are occasionally seen here, but would benefit from a site-established population.

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you have any feedback**

In relation to South Dunedin, Forbury Park should be developed as a wetland basin, to contain surface flood flows during high rainfall events, and as a ponding area for increasingly higher groundwater levels as a result of increasing sea level rise occasioned by climate change.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you have any feedback**

See my comments above re: trial of an Outram to Dunedin bus service.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Continue as planned.



**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 4****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

As per my comments above about applying nature-based solutions to river management operations, rather than relying on engineering techniques. That approach should also be followed with drainage schemes, which should make use of constructed wetlands to contain and treat drainage outfalls to settle-out sediment loads and remove nitrogen and phosphorus loads prior to outflow into receiving waters. Such wetlands would also add additional habitat for wetland wildlife, thus increasing Otago's biodiversity. Purchase of private land would, of course, be necessary to achieve this. An example area would be the lower Taieri Plain, where the former Lake Tatawai and adjacent wetlands could be restored for this purpose. Kai Tahu would likely support such an approach this approach, thus adding to ORC's mana with iwi.

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 14****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

I support the planned approach.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I support the planned approach.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I support the proposed increase.

**Respondent: Aukaha (1997) Ltd.**

**Submission Number: 333**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 11:44**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

# SUBMISSION

**TO:**

Otago Regional Council

**DATE:**

29 April 2024

**PLAN:**

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

**SUBMITTER:**

Aukaha (1997) Ltd.[1]

Aukaha **supports** the continuation of the partnership approach that ORC has taken in the development of regional plans for Otago.

Aukaha **supports** the proposal to dedicate \$2 million to per year for large-scale environmental projects.

**Introduction**

- 1 Aukaha is a consultancy owned by five papatipu rūnaka, four of whom hold mana whenua in the Otago region, being Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, and Hokonui Rūnanga.
- 2 This submission relates to ORC's draft Ten-Year Plan 2024-2034. Aukaha seek to endorse the efficacy of the partnership arrangement with ORC, and to recognise the significant projects that have been strengthened by direct engagement with kā rūnaka.
- 3 A number of projects outlined in the ten-year plan are of significant interest to Aukaha in the delivery of the outcomes of rūnaka shareholders. We encourage the ORC in the direction they are taking in relation to environmental protection and enhancement. This aspect of ORC's mahi in the region is vitally important to kā rūnaka and we commend the steps ORC is proposing in this area.
- 4 Aukaha supports Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment. This is an excellent proposal that will enable the community to engage with investing in their environment. We support option 3, \$2 million of dedicated funding per year for large-scale environmental projects, as this will enable more community projects with better outcomes for the environment.

**Supporting the Rūnaka Vision for the Otago region: 2024 – 2034**

- 5 Aukaha supports kā rūnaka to achieve their priorities for the social, environmental, economic, and cultural fabric of the Otago region under an existing partnership with ORC.
- 6 In 2019, kā rūnaka and ORC rekindled their Treaty-based relationship. Aukaha presented a new vision for the investment and engagement of kā rūnaka on strategy and planning in the region, to realise their environmental, cultural, economic, and social outcomes. This led to a partnership agreement between the ORC and Aukaha that supports the council in meeting their obligations to Māori under the Local Government Act 2002 and Resource Management Act 1991.
- 7 The partnership has enabled Aukaha to commit time and resource to engaging in council's strategic and other planning processes. This agreement provides avenues for the values and aspirations of kā rūnaka to be articulated, comprehended, and put into effect in priority projects across the Council's work programme.
- 8 Aukaha strongly endorses the Council's focus on environmental sustainability, protection, and enhancement in the ten-year plan. ORC's broad commitment to the environment, and to consider their actions in relation to climate change, are commendable. These commitments align with mana whenua perspectives and values relating to the crucial importance of land, water, and other aspects of the environment to the future health and wellbeing of the region. Aukaha is heartened by the strong positioning of these elements in the ten-year plan, as this sets a strong foundation for ORC to support kā rūnaka in the actioning of their role as kaitiaki.

- 9 The partnership between ORC and Aukaha on behalf of kā rūnaka has provided a strong platform for engagement with kā rūnaka. Mana whenua perspectives, values, and positions on the mahi of ORC have been listened to and heard, influencing the way that ORC operates and the esteem with which the organisation is considered. Aukaha seeks to endorse the continued growth of this relationship, in order to maintain and advance the partnership agreement.
- 10 Aukaha seeks to support kā rūnaka in accessing opportunities to achieve their aspirations and intentions for the Otago region. The 2024-2034 long-term plan presents an opportunity to build on the foundation set in 2019-2020 and continue our work towards a fully realised Treaty partnership.

### **Investing in our environment.**

- 11 In the consultation document “A Stronger Future for Otago”, Aukaha strongly supports Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment. Of the four options given, Aukaha supports Option 3: \$2 million of dedicated funding per year for large-scale environmental projects, as this will provide the largest benefits to the community and environment.
- 12 One of the guiding principles of the Otago Regional Council’s Biodiversity Strategy is “Biodiversity projects are led or co-led by local communities with support from councils and organisations.”[2] A dedicated fund to support large-scale environmental projects will enable the community to engage with investing in the biodiversity of their environment, encourage community-led projects and support community organisations, and will lead to improved environmental, social, and economic outcomes.
- 13 On of the objectives in the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement is that mana whenua exercise their role as kaitiaki, and Otago’s communities are recognised as stewards who are responsible for te hauora o te koiora (the health of indigenous biodiversity), te hauora o te taoka (the health of species and ecosystems that are taoka), and te hauora o te taiao (the health of the wider environment), while providing for te hauora o te takata (the health of the people). [3] Funding environmental projects will support mana whenua and the community in their respective roles as kaitiaki and stewards.
- 14 *Te Mana o Te Taiao - Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020* also has the objective of: “Resourcing and support are enabling connected, active guardians of nature.”[4] The 2025 Goal for this objective is: “8.3 Community action groups are resourced, growing, connected and coordinated and also have access to knowledge, expertise and information to actively manage biodiversity and other natural resources and act as environmental stewards.” This proposal will provide vital funding for community action groups, allowing them to become the “connected, active guardians of nature” that *Te Mana o Te Taiao*
- 15 A considerable amount of mahi is currently being done in the environmental space by flax-roots groups in Otago. At Aukaha we have two programs: the Maintaining the Gains, which aims to target invasive pest plant species and regenerate native varieties across 1400 hectares of QEII Covenanted land around Coastal Dunedin, and Te Hapakupu programme, which is focused on improving the health of the water in East Otago’s Te Hapakupu/Pleasant River catchment. With the upcoming conclusion of central government funding, programmes such as these will not be able to continue. Option 3 would provide opportunities for further funding that may support these initiatives, and allow new initiatives to start, thus keeping momentum in this space.
- 16 From Aukaha’s experience at running programs of this sort, the \$500,000 proposed by option 1 is not sufficient to maintain the gains made by current projects, let alone allow to any new “Large-scale” environmental projects be established. For this reason, we strongly support option 3: \$2 million of dedicated funding per year, as this will allow for more programmes to gain the support they need to progress.

# Conclusion

- 17 This submission is focused on ensuring that effective provision is made for the engagement of Aukaha as representatives kā rūnaka in the implementation of the 2024-2034 Ten Year Plan. As the Treaty partner kā rūnaka will play an integral role in implementing the vision of the Plan for the future of the region; Aukaha provides operational support for that relationship by engaging directly with Council staff.
- 18 Aukaha aims to support the vision of kā rūnaka for the Otago region as one that embraces a shared cultural heritage, and provides for residents to live, work, and play in an environment that is safe, accessible, and resilient to future changes. For this to be achieved, it is critical that all Council projects protect the outstanding natural environment, support social outcomes, and align with the values and aspirations of kā rūnaka.
- 19 We look forward to continuing to build on the strong relationship with a Council that has genuine partnership at its heart.

[1] Henceforth, “Aukaha.”

[2] Our Living Treasure | Tō tātou Koiora Taoka Otago Regional Council’s Biodiversity Strategy 2018

[3] Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement June 2021 (Decisions Version), ECO-03

[4] Te Mana o Te Taiao - Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020, section 7.5, objective 2

**Respondent: Jason Coutts**

**Submission Number: 334**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 11:58**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Your list here is now irrelevant given the change in government.

First point: The principals of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are being reviewed for clarification through our parliament which will impact any Maori-Crown partnership status.

Second point: What has this got to do with your scope of work?? Nothing.

Third point: Correct, so why are you pushing ahead with this LTP when the agenda of the previous Minister is clearly now irrelevant?

Fourth point: Correct and yet our flood protection on the Taieri have less capacity than it did 20 years ago because of the complete incompetence of the ORC to manage this vital infrastructure.

Fifth point: Yes - all important areas. However, there needs to be a balance where this does not come at the expense of human benefit.

Last point; The labour market has significantly softened. Inflation in the South Island will be in neg figures and financial pressure is clearly being felt across all communities. Hence, to burden ratepayers with additional costs is madness. This is a time when the ORC should be tightening their belt to reflect

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Good god - you call this Focus Areas. What a bottomless pit of expensive woke dribble.

You can't do anything about the climate. Have you noticed we're at the bottom of NZ, which sits at the bottom of the world, with a few 100,000 people living here??

The Environment is also maintained by DOC. Who even knows what resilience and communities relate to. And lets face it, who's seen a bus with more than a dozen passengers?? Buses are fine for busy commercial routes but we just don't have the population and are so spread out.

#### **~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 8**

#### **Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

#### **What level of total funding should be available?**

##### **!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 2**

#### **Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

#### **Please comment**

Personally, I've never taken a bus in Dunedin and never plan to. So I think \$315 million is completely bonkas. I'm actually stunned that anyone thinks this makes business sense. Maybe if I lose my license or get very old I may reconsider. Buses are fine if they are commercially viable, these obviously aren't. So a big NO from me. Who came up with this stupidity?

##### **!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 11**

#### **Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

#### **Please comment**

The madness continues! Of course QT has a congestion problem. Run a commercial business. Downsize the size of buses to vans? High volume routes only. Uber style flexibility is the way forward, not blindly sending buses out on the hour every hour in the hope someone might get on it

##### **!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 3**

#### **Tell us what you think Any other feedback?**

Do not rate me for a bus service that can't pay it's way - because there's no demand. It's madness

##### **!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 5**

#### **Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**Please comment**

You have to be kidding. Lemmings off a cliff. So you're just going to keep sinking money into buses even though you've racked up a decent debt. Covid sent many businesses under, but looks like your bankers (ratepayers) just kept lending. Appauling. Thanks for convincing me that the traditional bus transport model belongs in last century.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

Flood protection should be taken off the ORC. You are completely incompetent. You are not prepared for climate change. The flood protection should never have been handed over. It's been a complete disaster. You are more worried about bugs and ecosystems than maintaining capacity in the purpose built channels and drains. There is less capacity than there was 30-40 years ago. My rates are going through the roof because of this charge and you have done nothing in 20 years. It's criminal

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on drainage scheme rates**

Take all flood protection off the ORC. You should be taken to court for your neglect

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 14**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Remove all flood protection from ORC

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Cut your cloth..... actually. if it's just data collection and analysis, use AI. That should reduce your staffing by 80%



**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Excellent service. Surprised ORC manage this to be honest. Ahhh, I was wring QLDC provide the best harbourmaster service in NZ. Knew it wouldn't be ORC

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Talk to central Govt. If you encourage planting of pines for carbon credits then it's pretty obvious you'll get wilding pines. It's like gorse

## Respondent: Robyn West

Submission Number: 335

Submission Date: 28/04/24 11:59

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

#### Please comment

I think it's particularly important to increase frequency in poorer hill suburbs

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 3

#### Any other feedback?

I'm concerned that the amount of benefit for ratepayers in areas with no public transport is overstated. I don't think it's fair for someone who visits Dunedin or Queenstown rarely if at all to contribute such a large share. Don't see 20% of the users being out of town

**Respondent: Garth Thomson and Christine Oliver****Submission Number: 336****Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:03****Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

We are residents living on the Gordon Road Spillway, and we would ask that you include the following in your Long Term Plan:

- That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%. Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.
- That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.
- That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed. The Flood water Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design. Thank you for the opportunity to submit our requests.

**Respondent: Cath Gilmour****Submission Number: 337****Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:05****Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I agree with your summary of challenges and opportunities and the resultant chosen focus areas for Otago. I would like to see some mention in the transport focus area of active transport, not just public transport. This would help not only with climate change impacts, but also improve health and reduce road congestion.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 1****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

ORC's work is vital for the long-term health of our environment and therefore, our communities that rely on it. Especially when faced with the multiple policy decisions now being made by the coalition government that will reduce environmental protection and put more onus on local government to do the necessary work. Thank you for your part in this – both policy development and implementation thereof. Both will be only more vital in coming years. Please continue to be strong advocates of the interconnected environmental and climate issues, as befits your legal mandate. Please continue especially to advocate and act on climate change mitigation and, when necessary, adaptation.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 3****Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 4****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

I live in Kelvin Peninsula, and very rarely are there more than a couple of people on the bus (school times the exception). I think this is largely because of the impracticality of relying on an hourly bus schedule, exacerbated by the need to wait at Frankton hub for a connecting service into town, and the length of time taken by the circuitous route to the Frankton hub. I very rarely use it because of this (and prefer biking) and talk to many others who say the same. If you are looking at buying new electric buses, please look at the viability of getting smaller buses for this run, to lower both Capex and Opex. If, as we hope would be the case, demand exceeds this capacity in 10 or 15 years, upgrade to larger buses at that time. This could help improve the scheduling earlier. Regularity, frequency and affordability are all fundamental to increasing public transport use. Having only an hourly bus makes it impractical for meetings in town, especially for those living at the far end of the Peninsula who are most affected by the problem mentioned in the bullet point two below. • Retaining the existing ferry services is really important – and having the service on the Bee card, with associated discount for locals. It is absolutely unaffordable for families without this (and it's still pretty expensive!)

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

#### Any other feedback?

I trust that the Hilton Hotel pays a significant fee to ORC, as the access to town provided by this ferry is fundamental to the hotel's attraction. And that is why we (I am on the Kelvin Peninsula Community Association committee) hear complaints from locals who are left behind, through lack of space, at the Bayview marina. And therefore stuck waiting for another hour or more, or having to take the car/bike/kayak. This also points to it being a good idea to schedule more services during peak hours, especially over holiday peaks. • For the same reason, this rate should go back to a capital value basis rather than uniform charge. All hotels/large businesses benefit from efficient provision of public transport for their guests/staff. They should therefore pay more for this service than a house owner in Sunshine Bay, Frankton Road or Kingston. Capital value is the appropriate way to achieve this – unless the same end could be achieved by a targeted commercial/VA rate. • In other words, I am agnostic as to the method used, but the result should be that hotels and businesses that benefit from public transport provision should be paying an amount commensurate to the benefit they gain.

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?

\* Yes

#### Please comment on the proposed catchment rate

It is appropriate that this is capital value based. And catchment management is a much better paradigm than river management for this work.

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 7

#### Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?

\* No

#### Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change

please do not change this. It is important that it remains transparent as to how much is spent on Wilding control. Seeing how little this is, through either land value or uniform rate, will hopefully help ORC be

able to fund more Wilding control work in future – as will be needed.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback**

In light of the recent report outlining the woeful state of our national emergency management system, integrating the warning system for critical civil defence and emergency management messaging is particularly vital. As is support for our Emergency Response Groups - as these are largely voluntary and small community groups, it would be good if ORC looked to coordinate bulk deals on the necessary comms equipment (radios et cetera), generators and so on. This would not be a major impost on your work stream but would make life a lot easier for the volunteers (especially with regard to resultant fundraising requirements). KPCA suggested this to ORC's CDEM person some years ago, and I still think it's a good idea :-).

**Respondent: Ad Bekkers**

**Submission Number:** 338

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:06

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

The submission provides a perspective on rating for - East & West Taieri - Leith flood rating - request an independent and economic assessment

**Respondent: Jim Young****Submission Number:** 339**On-behalf of:** South Otago Forest and Bird**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:07**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**~Environment****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback**

We ask the Otago Regional Council to give increased attention and funding to issues in the Catlins, and support the proposal to provide \$2 million of dedicated funding per year for large-scale environmental projects.

The Catlins, one of the few remaining areas in Otago with significant amounts of indigenous forest, should be established as a site-led programme, which would be adequately funded for the control of pests and weeds.

Under the present and proposed Pest Management Plan there is no change to the management of pigs, deer, goats and other browsing pests.

Maintenance of ecosystem health and diversity depends on reducing the numbers of browsing animals as well as possums, rodents, mustelids and feral cats.

At the same time, the threat posed by invasive weeds mustn't be ignored.



**Respondent: Joanne Liew****Submission Number:** 340**On-behalf of:** Department of Conservation (DOC)**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:09**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

DOC notes the interconnected-ness of the Plans' six focus areas, and the particular importance of the focus areas of environment, partnership, communities, and climate to meet conservation needs.

**~Environment****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback****Environmental and climate challenges**

8. DOC endorses the identification of the environmental challenges noted in the plan as 'water quality and availability, soil and air quality, biodiversity loss, biosecurity threats and impacts on the coastal environment', and the climate challenges noted as 'more impact from natural hazards, including storm and flood events'.

**Large scale environmental projects**

9. DOC supports the creation of a fund for large scale environmental projects.

10. DOC supports that the new fund is in addition to ORC's existing environmental project funding.

11. DOC strongly recommends that the funding mechanism invests in a way that helps drive financial sustainability in community groups, a point of difference to your existing project funding. A focus on the financial sustainability of community groups will help to strengthen the resilience of the sector.

12. DOC recommends that the environmental projects be prioritised based on the greatest environmental need.

**Wilding Pine Control**

13. DOC endorses the ongoing support and lift in funding for Wilding Pine Control, and particularly the Wilding Pine Control Steering Group.

**Science and Monitoring**

14. DOC endorses the continued focus on environmental monitoring programmes, including developing and implementing a regional indigenous biodiversity ecosystem monitoring programme consistent with the NPS-IB.

Integrated catchment management

15. DOC supports the development of Catchment Action Plans as per the Integrated Catchment Management programme.

**Lagarosiphon management**

16. DOC notes the importance of managing Lagarosiphon in Otago's lakes and rivers. There is no specific comment on this in the Plan, however DOC notes the importance of ORC's collaboration with LINZ to fund the management of this highly invasive pest.

The submission provides biodiversity context for Otago Region as background

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Climate Change Strategy**

17. DOC supports ORC taking an Otago-wide approach to climate change and developing a Strategic Climate Action plan.

**Emergency Management**

19. DOC supports and appreciates ORC's leadership on emergency management in Otago, including coordinating the Otago Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and implementing natural hazards management and adaptation programmes.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

18. DOC supports the development and implementation of the ORC Regional Infrastructure Strategy.

**Respondent: Michelle Carruthers**

**Submission Number:** 341

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:10

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

I am writing to say that bus service to Dunedin would be very good for residents of both Balclutha and Dunedin. It would cut down on the number of cars on the road for a start, and consequently green house gases, and be an affordable transportation option for many people.

Some elderly and young people do not have their driver's licenses, or even a car, and the provision of a bus service would make it possible for family members to stay connected.

Some people, may only need to travel as far as Milton to either visit family, or go to work. Workers would not have to rely on others to car pool, and become independent travellers.

Making a stop at the airport is a brilliant idea. These are but a few examples of the benefit of a bus service, that would be many and varied.

## Respondent: Shaun Kelly

Submission Number: 342

On-behalf of: KJet

Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:11

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

#### Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you have any feedback

Request that consideration of ferries on Lake Wakatipu and Kawarau River (outside of the existing service on Frankton Arm) are reconsidered.

We received Resource Consent from QLDC in 2020 to operate a ferry service between Lake Hayes Estate and Queenstown Bay. We have been working with and encouraging ORC, QLDC and NZTA to progress this option since that time. The KJet proposal would involve the use of 40-seater ferries. It would require some work to be undertaken on the Kawarau bridge dam, but it has been confirmed by a Structural Engineer that this is achievable without risking the integrity of the dam

**Respondent: Angela Anderson**

**Submission Number:** 343

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:12

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

I would like to support the Balclutha to Dunedin Public Transport Proposal as there are many people (lots of them elderly) in Clutha without transport, who need to access various services (including health) in Dunedin.

## Respondent: Lyndon Weggery

Submission Number: 344

On-behalf of: Dunedin Area Citizens Association

Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:13

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* No

Please comment

In an ideal world desirable but high uncertainty regarding central govt support into future

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

**Any other feedback?**

80:20 seems fair

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

- \* Yes

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

- \* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

- \* Yes

**!Catchment Management funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

- \* Yes

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

- \* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Need to explain benefits to Dunedin people

**~Climate change and Resilience**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you have any feedback**

Applaud the ORC for working jointly with the DCC on Sth Dunedin CC projects

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

Concerns about management of the Leith and Silverstream waterways

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Strongly support the move to targeted rates given the diversity of the Otago Region eg rural and urban. Caution about going further into debt.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Submission notes the increase over recent years and flags affordability.

Supports the 10% Policy



## Respondent: Paul Kavanagh

Submission Number: 345

On-behalf of: Southern Lakes Sanctuary trust

Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:15

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 4

**Do you have any feedback**

Thank Otago Regional Council for its ongoing support of our work and for considering our Ecofund application. Formally recognise the openness of the Otago Regional Council to work with the Whakatipu Conservation Alliance steering group in exploring the options for funding landscape scale work in our region. Applaud and strongly support the development of a new Biodiversity Strategy and the implementation of an Indigenous Biodiversity Monitoring programme. Encourage further collaboration with Otago Regional Council to achieve our shared goals of a flourishing natural environment.

## Respondent: Ratepayers at Upland Street

Submission Number: 346

Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:16

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

We have a very negative view of the Otago Regional Council, based on the continued and excessive rate rises, which indicates your lack of respect [contempt], for the constituents who voted you into office. Additionally, you do not appear to believe in budgetary constraints. Further too:- The ORC's inability to be decisive; appears to be hog tied by protocols, councillors with huge biases, councillors with vested interests and the lack of human respect which is evident by the political infighting shown by constant in-house power struggles

I

n all; we view this ORC as totally dysfunctional and firmly believe that if it were not for the dedicated staff, nothing would ever be accomplished.  
[Take a good look at yourselves in the mirror and be bluntly honest]

**Respondent: Kate Murray****Submission Number:** 347**On-behalf of:** Community Networks/ LINK**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:17**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Any other feedback?**

We strongly oppose including a targeted rate until it is associated with the provision of a service here in the Upper Clutha. • We encourage ORC to consider other funding methods like dwelling equivalency-based rates, to fund any transport improvements.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

- We believe that the Upper Clutha does not need an additional PT trial at this time, but rather suggest using the 2022-23 community shuttle trial data to inform development of a full service for Upper Clutha residents. A business case can be developed over the next few years and a targeted rate proposed in the next LTP cycle.
- We suggest the focus of PT provision in Wānaka/Upper Clutha should initially focus on transport that connects the outlying suburbs of Lake Hāwea, Hāwea Flat, Albert Town, Luggate with the Wānaka CBD; and/or an on-demand service. Data from our shuttle trials supports this approach.
- We request that progression of PT is thoroughly collaborative in its design – work with QLDC, regional tourist organisations, community groups, Chamber of Commerce, and other community members.

**Respondent: Kate Lindsay**

**Submission Number:** 348

**On-behalf of:** QEII Trust

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:18

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback**

Option 1 -we would encourage the council to focus on protection and enhancement of existing indigenous biodiversity in the first instance, as this tends to lead to more sustainable and ecologically representative outcomes at a lower cost.

We strongly support the establishment of a new fund to support large-scale environmental projects, as proposed in the long-term plan. Great momentum has been gained through Jobs for Nature, and enduring funding for large projects of this nature will be important in the long-term to maintain to progress and make sure the gains made are not lost as central government funding ends.

QEII supports whatever level of funding is feasible for ratepaying communities, and in our view, regardless of whatever rating approach is taken (district or region), decisions about funding allocation should be based off where there is the greatest need and benefit, and where greatest “bang for buck” can be achieved.

**Respondent: Dugald MacTavish**

**Submission Number:** 349

**On-behalf of:** Wise Response Society

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:35

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Submission provides detailed advice/comments about the Strategic Directions Goals

**Respondent: Lee and Ross Ollerenshaw****Submission Number:** 350**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:36**How we fund our work****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

After having read in numerous media outlets about upcoming ORC rate increases, out of curiosity last evening we clicked on the ORC rates estimator and were both absolutely horrified to see our ORC rates were going to increase from \$351.15 to \$1087.06 if option 1 is to be adopted. That is a rise of \$735.91, a 210/% increase which is obscene and totally unjustified. It seems very unacceptable that we seem to have been included in a "New Zoning Lower Clutha One" and we live in Rosebank on the hill. We expected to pay increased OCR rates but not this eye watering amount!!!

Really needing to know if this is a glitch or an error?? Are we been charged way more due to our home having a higher valuation or are we subsidizing others ? We will find this increase hard to finance as we are on a fixed budget due to my husband's terminal illness and me being his full time carer so no options to get out and increase our income.

Please accept our submission that the ORC adopts ESTIMATED RATES OPTION 2 .

**Respondent: Jeff Seymour****Submission Number: 351****Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:37****!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 1****Any other feedback?**

I believe that the proposed funding model of a fixed charge to all ratepayers in the QLDC region is unfair, flawed and not consistent with other regions that the ORC is responsible for. I believe that the basic principle that “User Pays” for the services provided should be the starting point when assessing who and how rates are assessed / collected. Why is the ORC treating each region differently? My example would be that Balclutha/Milton and any other rate payer in the Clutha District, that are relatively close to Dunedin city (no more than a hour to travel) are not paying anything towards the public transport costs in Dunedin/Mosgiel. Compared with the proposed Wakatipu Transport Fixed charge that will be rated on all ratepayers in the QLDC region even though travel distances for some particularly in the Wanaka ward are in excess of an hour. It also appears that there are a range of charges for public transport within the DCC. Also Cromwell is significantly closer to Queenstown than Wanaka, Hawea, Albert Town, etc in the Wanaka ward region. Yet Cromwell is not subject to any charge as it is part of the Central Otago District.

**-Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any feedback**

Why is the ORC treating each region differently? My example would be that Balclutha/Milton and any other rate payer in the Clutha District, that are relatively close to Dunedin city (no more than a hour to travel) are not paying anything towards the public transport costs in Dunedin/Mosgiel. Compared with the proposed Wakatipu Transport Fixed charge that will be rated on all ratepayers in the QLDC region even though travel distances for some particularly in the Wanaka ward are in excess of an hour. It also appears that there are a range of charges for public transport within the DCC. Also Cromwell is significantly closer to Queenstown than Wanaka, Hawea, Albert Town, etc in the Wanaka ward region. Yet Cromwell is not subject to any charge as it is part of the Central Otago District.

My suggestion is that the ORC should be looking at the region as a whole and not settle on what is probably an easy answer by charging a fixed rate to all ratepayers in a particular region irrespective of where the actual services are being provided. Why not look at wards within each region and assess rates accordingly or for example if you live within a certain distance or time of travel from where the public transport service is actually provided. Wanaka ward residents should not be paying the same as Queenstown and Arrowtown wards. We should also be looking at Cromwell paying a share.

**Respondent: Jimmy and Lisa Miles Pam Bain****Submission Number: 352****Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:38****Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%.

Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.

Assurances need to be set that flood protection rate revenues need to be assigned to maintenance of the Silver Stream. There has been no evidence in the past 30 years of maintenance apart from mowing of the banks and driftwood removal. This is not the level of maintenance required to protect your rate payers interests along with protecting life. The ORC needs to take its guardianship of flood protection seriously if it intends to continue to demand moneys from its rate payers.

Insurance's providers need assurances that maintenance and improvements are being considered and actioned, so they have confidence to provide cover for the landowners of the affected by the spillway. It is not fair that landowners must pay more for insurance cover because for the ORC not providing the designed protection the Silver Stream was built to in the early 1970's.



## Respondent: Loran Verpillot

On-behalf of: Te Kāhano Aotearoa Trust

Submission Number: 353

Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:39

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 3

Do you have any feedback

Option 1 - A robust strategy that actively seeks further investment from the private sector is needed to reduce the impact on rates. This approach would assist in filling the central/regional government funding gap and reduce the rates burden.

Concerned that the consultation document and LTP do not provide sufficient detail for ratepayers or certainty for community organisations to understand how this funding will be allocated.

A contestable fund that does not provide certainty or does not fund operational costs would be unhelpful. Te Kāhano urges ORC to provide clear, consistent guidance in this regard.

## Respondent: Colin Brown

**Submission Number:** 354

**On-behalf of:** Taieri Trails Trust

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:51

### About You

**Comment Number: 1**

### Attend Hearing

**Comment Number: 2**

#### Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* No

### ~Transport

**Comment Number: 3**

#### Do you have any feedback

This submission should be considered as a more detailed subset of the submission by Dunedin Tracks Network Trust, with a specific focus on the Mosgiel to Waiholā cycle trail.

request the council consider how it can assist with a part contribution towards the estimated \$150,000 cost of achieving the work programme outlined in the submission.

This is in addition to the \$36,000 that has already been spent on the initial feasibility study, and \$5000 on the subsequent feasibility update, the cost of which has been met by a grant from NZ Lotteries, and Taieri Rotary Club donations. The estimated cost for the total build is \$4.9M (after allowance for inflation).

**Respondent: Sandra McIntyre****Submission Number:** 355**On-behalf of:** Kā Papatipu Rūnaka**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:53**About You****Comment Number:** 2**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The vision for Otago described in the Draft Long-Term Plan (p. 16) is for the environment and communities to be healthy and connected ki uta ki tai. Among the strategic directions for 2024 to 2034 that are identified to achieve this vision include effective and meaningful partnership with mana whenua and a healthy environment ki uta ki tai with thriving ecosystems and communities.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number:** 4**Do you have any feedback**

We believe that a partnership approach is crucial to developing a means of managing the Waitaki catchment holistically. To facilitate this, **appropriate resourcing needs to be made available to enable Kā Papatipu Rūnaka to work alongside the two regional councils.** Because the Waitaki catchment is split between Otago and Canterbury regions, we consider it would be appropriate for **provision for the cost of resourcing to be shared between this Council and Environment Canterbury.**

The March Council report on this matter noted that the proposed work has not been incorporated into proposed LTP budgets but would need to be factored in. The work is closely interrelated to the regional planning work committed in the Regional Leadership workstream and the land and water work in the Environment workstream

The submission provides more detail on the funded work

**Respondent: Colin Scurr**

**Submission Number: 356**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 21:54**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

- The changes to the targeted rates are a movement in the right direction but do not reflect the degree of benefit that ratepayers receive from the schemes. I ask that a detailed benefit study be undertaken to create a fair targeted rating classification. - The portion of Mosgiel that is presently excluded from drainage rate should be rated for drainage. Mosgiel was a swamp before the Silverstream was straightened and deepened and now receives drainage benefit from this work. - The Leith Flood Rate should not be extended to the whole Dunedin City as this is inconsistent with the area included for the Lower Taieri Flood Rate. Exacerbator effect of the surrounding areas of the Taieri Plain are not included in the Taieri Flood Rate.

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

- The level of expenditure both capital and operational are excessive and should be reduced. For example, the Contour Channel continuing work should be stopped. The work planned does not reflect the wishes of the community. Stop future planning for work until true input from the wider scheme communities are sought. I accept that the Silverstream requires maintenance work to be undertaken.
- Fish Passage Adaption should not be a separate item as it only relates to new and upgraded structures. It is a cost to this work
- Create a Liaison Committee, representative of the Lower Taieri Flood Scheme area for input into the communities' expectations of the scheme. Both for operation and future expectations.

**Respondent: Kendal Gouman**

**Submission Number:** 357

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:54

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

My hope for your estimations you have provided is estimation 2

**Respondent: Trevor and Susan Gouman**

**Submission Number:** 358

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:55

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We are the properties owners ===== , Balclutha and we hope that 'estimate 2' is chosen as we cannot afford such a large increase. There are also many others in our district that could not afford such an increase.

**Respondent: Nikita Choveaux**

**Submission Number:** 359

**On-behalf of:** Dream South D

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:57

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

On the basis of the feedback provided by our community, we recommend the introduction of a South Dunedin circuit bus route. The South Dunedin circuit route would be akin to the Mosgiel East and West circuit bus routes, with the aim of connecting residents from the fringes of South Dunedin to the main shopping area in King Edward St



**Respondent: Brett and Angela Anderson**

**Submission Number:** 360

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:58

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We would like to submit in favour of rates option 2 as our property will be facing a nearly \$630 increase if option 1 is chosen, which is unaffordable on top of the Clutha District Council proposed rate increase.

**Respondent: Jennie Doak**

**Submission Number:** 361

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 21:59

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

The mismanagement by the financial team and the over spend on extravagant projects needs to stop. I support an independent inquiry an audit into the mismanagement of funds and unless cuts are made then the council needs to find ways to significantly reduce spending so that debt does not increase.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Hi ,wish to have it noted that i am not in agreement with the unacceptable rate rise. This will be impossible for those on fixed incomes, the elderly, disabled or those on low incomes.

supports option 2

**Respondent: Mary O'Brien**

**Submission Number:** 362

**On-behalf of:** CSS Disability Action

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:01

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Whilst we do not disagree with the challenges and opportunities listed in the plan, however, we suggest that an additional bullet point be added to reflect the Councils vision that our environment and communities are healthy and connected ki uta ki tai (from the mountains to the sea), the purpose of this would be to strengthen the synergy between people and the environment and vice versa.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This will make it possible for more transport disadvantaged people to access the community and people who do not want to use their cars to have the choice not to do so.

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

This will make it possible for more transport disadvantaged people to access the community and people who do not want to use their cars to have the choice not to do so.

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 6

#### Do you have any feedback

##### Regional bus trails

We fully support the investigation of regional bus trails in Oamaru, Wanaka, Alexandra, Clyde, Cromwell to Queenstown and the proposed public transport trial from Balclutha to Dunedin, including Dunedin Airport. The proposed services will assist in alleviating the barriers that disabled people, older people and people who do not drive to travel around their own communities and between local main centres. This will confer community wide benefits which will create a more accessible and equitable community and contribute to improved community wellbeing. The bus services will provide people with transport choices, promote transport mode shift, reduced emissions, and contribute to the Councils focus areas for the next ten years. We would like to work with the Council to develop, and trial these services.

##### Recommendations

That Council consult with disabled people to gain insight into local access requirements and provides fully accessible, electric buses.

##### Waitaki – On demand public transport service trail.

We fully support this, there is absolutely no doubt that there is an acute and urgent need for this service and that it will enable many people who are unable to access essential services to do so, at a more reasonable cost. It will benefit the whole community and in particular people who are suffering due to cost-of-living crisis. As outlined above it will contribute to a reduction in Vehicle Kilometres Travelled. We have had positive feedback re MyWay by Merto from disabled people supported by CCS Disability Action in Timaru who have enthusiastically supported MyWay by Metro from its introduction. Disabled people in Oamaru are aware of this service and would like a similar service in Oamaru. We consider that the success of the My Way by Merto in Timaru can be replicated in Oamaru, and we would like to work with the Council to develop, implement and promote these services.

## Respondent: Simon and Emma Parks

Submission Number: 363

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:02

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 2

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Taieri Flood and Drainage Scheme The work undertaken by the ORC to date on reviewing this, as they committed to at last year's AP, is a start in the process of creating a scheme that is fair to all and one that's financially sustainable. I do support the Council's preferred options as an initial step in this process. However, this review needs to be expanded to a full economic assessment of the scheme to determine who all the benefactors are A consistent and fair approach across all schemes. The LTP proposes we pay more for the Leith scheme but they do not pay more for ours! How is this fair?

### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 3

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

#### Liaison Groups

Council agreed to establish these at the last AP. This still must be done.

#### Capex spend budgeted

This does strike as excessive. Eg Contour channel rebuild, lower pond gravity gate renewal. The scheme must remain financially affordable!

**Respondent: Jason and Lisa Breen****Submission Number:** 364**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:03**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. This work needs to be carried out immediately and not over a period of years. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%.

Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.

- That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.

- That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed.

The Floodwater Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design.

**Respondent: Belinda Glass****Submission Number: 365****Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:03****Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%. Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe. That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs. That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed. The Floodwater Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design. Thank you for the opportunity to submit our requests.

**Respondent: Victoria Crockford****Submission Number:** 366**On-behalf of:** QLDC Climate and Biodiversity Reference Group**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:05**About You****Comment Number:** 1**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?****How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Endorse the proposed electrification of the fleet and believe that an increased level of rates and investment by the ORC will support this. Further investment than what is proposed in Option 1 is needed to ensure that there is more engagement with public transport from all settlement areas (Wānaka, Kingston, Glenorchy) that surround the economic centre of Queenstown. Increasing rates charges to align with Dunedin would fund a more effective public transport network in the Queenstown-Lakes and better help us meet our district and national emissions reduction plans.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 4**Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

A funding model is needed that ensures that both local bus users and visitors to Queenstown contribute to public transport. Retaining the current model of the Commercial and Residential Capital Value rating system better ensures that visitors bear some of the cost of public transport services. Further enhancements to this model could be considered, which could include a significantly higher contribution for commercial properties based on capital value.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number:** 7**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No



**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

will undermine efforts to address the issue.

The scale of the issue we face from wilding pines in the Queenstown-Lakes District is significant and any changes may erode the gains we have made to date through the combined actions of ORC, QLDC, mana whenua, Māori organisations, and community groups.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

It is our position that the draft Strategy would benefit from more tangible connection between the short term infrastructure investment plans and the mentioned risks and opportunities of climate change, making room for rivers, nature based solutions, Te Mana o Te Wai, integrated catch management and PARA as discussed in the draft infrastructure strategy. Currently, there seems to be a lack of detailed integration of these across flood areas. We think there is an opportunity to have more ambition to advance climate and non traditional risk management into planning. **Taking earlier action and creating the enabling conditions for climate resilient investment is a key contributor to limiting the worst impacts of climate change**, as demonstrated by this graphic from the International Panel on Climate Change's 2023 Synthesis Report8:

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 8****Do you have any feedback**

We endorse the ORC's commitment to leading a region-wide Strategic Climate Action Plan and the allocation of "additional funding for climate change actions". Many of the impacts felt in our District will be different from others but we have a shared responsibility to the ecosystem of our region and the wellbeing of all of the diverse communities who call Otago home.

The submission however notes a lack of clarity and discusses

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any feedback**

We also note that the Regulatory workstream will include ORC working with QLDC (and Dunedin City Council) to deliver on the new National Policy Statement on Urban Development. This work will have a significant impact on our Climate and Biodiversity Plan and brings in critical conversations about balancing land use, housing need, and transport options. We offer our support and expertise to the joint councils on this work given our role as the only Climate and Biodiversity Reference Group in the region.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 6****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

It is our position that the draft Strategy would benefit from more tangible connection between the short term infrastructure investment plans and the mentioned risks and opportunities of climate change, making room for rivers, nature based solutions, Te Mana o Te Wai, integrated catch management and PARA as discussed in the draft infrastructure strategy.

Currently, there seems to be a lack of detailed integration of these across flood areas. We think there is an opportunity to have more ambition to advance climate and non traditional risk management into planning. **Taking earlier action and creating the enabling conditions for climate resilient investment is a key contributor to limiting the worst impacts of climate change,** as demonstrated by this graphic from the International Panel on Climate Change's 2023 Synthesis Report<sup>8</sup>:

**Respondent: Craig and Julie Struthers****Submission Number: 367****Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:05****Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 1****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

We are residents living on the Gordon Road Spillway, and we would ask that you include the following in your Long Term Plan:

- That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%. Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.
- That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.
- That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed. The Floodwater Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design.

**Respondent: Kay Gard**

**Submission Number: 368**

---

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:06**

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I would like to voice my concern with the proposed rate increase which has just been brought to my attention. While using your rates estimator I discovered my rates will go from \$316.87 to \$951.32 if option 1 is adopted which is outrageous & daylight robbery. How can some rate payer have be hit with these massive increases & others are not!!!! I will struggle to pay this with super being my source of income. I wish to endorse option "Estimated 2 "  
The ORC should have let the rate payers know by mail about these over the top proposed increases!!!!

**Respondent: Kim and Matt Morgan****Submission Number:** 369**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:07**About You****Comment Number:** 13**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 14**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

We live on the Otago Peninsula, and are greatly concerned about the intersection of climate change, 3 Waters, increased development, and ecological erosion of both flora and fauna in years to come. We hope to work with the DCC and ORC to review infrastructure and development regulations for our sensitive area.

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

While no one likes to see their rates go up, we have always appreciated the invaluable work carried out by ORC, and see how invaluable it is to "future proof" (as much as possible) against a changing climate. We are, accordingly, in favour of several larger programmes (and rate increases) to support these goals.

**-Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$1 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 4****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

We see first hand, living on the only bus route on the Otago Peninsula, how sparse the transport service is out here. We'd like to see it increased both here and city-wide to support more people using public transport (vs private vehicles)

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 5****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

While we recognise that we cannot hold back the tide of expansion in that area, we are genuinely alarmed by the mushrooming population and development in that area and are in favour of projects that limit (rather than enable) that unchecked growth.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

We are, honestly, somewhat ambivalent about this part of your proposal. While we appreciate that our rates often go to projects that we do not personally use, we aren't sure what the best way to fund increased transport is - so we are not ticking a box arbitrarily...

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 7****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 8****Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 11

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 12

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We realise the concerns we have raised re: increased development, ecological impacts and infrastructure on the OP are more immediate matters for the DCC. But as our local Council and the larger ORC are working in concert on the FDS Draft and joint management of these concerns across a larger area in future, we wanted to also note them at the level of this consultation to ensure they are properly flagged - so that the natural taonga of the Otago Peninsula are not irreparably harmed by short- sighted human activities.

**Respondent: Trish and Steve Robins**

**Submission Number:** 370

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:08

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We would only accept the estimate # 2, If you put through the proposal #1, you are going to be putting a lot of clients into future hardship under the economic conditions. Under this proposal it would mean an increase of over 311%. How can this be justified?



**Respondent: Yvonne Craig**

**Submission Number: 371**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:08**

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Why are rate payers in Tsukigawa Tce been hit so hard with rises and another question is why is this area being included "new zoning lower clutha flood zone one" we actually live on the hill. I was expecting a 20% rates rise but not over 200%.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

I am shocked & horrified to see my rates will go from \$340.29 to \$1040.69 if option 1 is adopted. I totally oppose this as I'm on a fixed income & will struggle to find that sort of increase.

## Respondent: Matt Hollyer

Submission Number: 372

On-behalf of: Upper Lakes Conservation Alliance working group

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:11

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 4

### Do you have any feedback

Scaled environmental funding as proposed will not wholly pay for the plans and outcomes needed across the region. It does however establish a clear principle of leadership in conservation thinking and direction for ORC. By adopting this direction the ORC will unlock opportunities for long-term, large scale collaborations amongst conservation groups.

In the event that the scaled environmental funding is adopted in the LTP, during year 1 of the plan our Alliance is willing and able to work with ORC, iwi and other groups to establish cohesive, robust and reliable parameters for the allocation of funds.

**Respondent: Harriet Jopp****Submission Number:** 373**On-behalf of:** Otago Federated Farmers**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:12**About You****Comment Number:** 2**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number:** 3**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

RECOMMENDATION: The Otago Regional Council recognises that farmers, particularly sheep and beef farmers, are in the midst of a farming crisis.

Submission discusses this

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number:** 7**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 6**Any other feedback?**

Core service – Public Transport Recommendation: That public transport is funded by ratepayers that can access public transport, and that it is funded by a combination of grants, targeted rates and user pays. Recommendation: There is a rates remission mechanism for those captured within the targeted rate but due to distance, cannot utilise the benefit of the transport

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number:** 5**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Overarching concerns with ORC's approach to rating: See the submission for detail.

**~Regional Leadership****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback****1. A STRATEGIC CHANGE TO PROVIDE FOR RURAL LEADERSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT**

For Otago to meet its environmental, climate change and biodiversity goals, ORC will need to collaborate and engage with catchment groups and farmers. In the LTP, the first strategic direction is partnership but ORC does not propose to partner with catchment groups or the rural community, rather solely with iwi.

**RECOMMENDATION:** add in the following strategic direction

The knowledge and investment of our rural community over many generations is recognised, including through:

- Engaging with the rural community and catchment groups at early stages in policy making processes and allowing the rural community to take the lead on issues that primarily concern them;
- Involving catchment groups to achieve the community's visions, including through partnerships associated with monitoring and implementation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** ORC funds the establishment of a rural advisory group from its existing regional leadership budget.

**2. Central Government Regulatory Changes to provide a tailwind for Otago**

**Recommendation:** Otago FF recommends that ORC should consider all workstreams within the LTP and reduce resources for consent processing, monitoring and compliance for the matters that have been amended by Central Government.

**Recommendation:** ORC reconsiders its work programme for environmental monitoring and protection.

**Respondent: Marie Calver**

**Submission Number: 374**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:13**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

The bus services you are proposing shouldnt be on our Rates account as it is to do with Dunedin and Queenstown - From Clutha District

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

your rates have rose substantially and you need to look after your rate payers as we are in recession.

I also wonder if rates should be means tested on yearly income.  
especially with families  
and elderly.

**Respondent: Cody and Rosie Cowley**

**Submission Number:** 375

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:14

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

We are in favour of the adjustment to flooding and drainage rate allocations but still believe an independent review is required into further correcting the allocation. We farm along the Owhiro stream and the development upstream has an impact on volumes being drained. We feel strongly that a liaison group is developed to ensure future spending on the flood scheme is targeted to where there is the greatest benefit/ largest risk.

**Respondent: David Wilson****Submission Number:** 376**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:14**Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 1****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 2****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Drainage of the protected area for Lower Taieri Drainage and Banking infrastructure. Drainage rate within the protected area should be a flat rate per hectare. It is unclear to me if this change has been made when reading the information available.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 4****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

the level of banking required we first need to determine whether we need greater than the current 1 in 100 year flood protection. If so, how much more? The 1980 flood reached 2600+cumec at Outram. I feel we need to make the banks wider and stronger so they could withstand water running over them for 12-24 hours if we had a mega flood, which would be preferable to a catastrophic bank failure.

The spill over areas should be chosen strategically to where it was least likely to cause damage.

**Respondent: Allan Kirkland****Submission Number:** 377**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:15**Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

**Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number:** 2**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

I support the reduced number of benefit zones for flood and drainage in the interim, however I am still strongly of the view that the current unfair and flawed targeted rate classification for the LTFPDS, with many anomalies, still needs to be independently reviewed so that it is fair and affordable for all ratepayers. By way of example, under the 2011 rating classification, which is currently in place, significant areas of land contributing into the East Taieri drainage network were removed from the targeted rate zones and many exacerbator effects weren't accounted for. This again left a very unfair rate burden on too few ratepayers.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

for the Lower Taieri Flood Protection and Drainage Scheme (LTFPDS) appear excessive and poorly targeted with regards to achieving worthwhile improvement in scheme performance.

Reestablishing a liaison group to work with ORC staff and councillors would surely be of significant benefit in this regard.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number:** 4**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Rating Model - I support the proposal to increase the general rate contribution for both flood and drainage schemes as a step in the right direction to acknowledge the widespread community and regional benefits of protecting critical infrastructure. However, I struggle with the inconsistency of rating the Taieri Scheme ratepayers for the Leith Flood Scheme and not vice versa, especially as the airport, so critical to Dunedin's economy, lies on land at or near sea level and is located right in the middle of the most extensively protected area within the Taieri scheme and is also so dependent on the largest pumping capacity requirement for its effective and reliable operation. In terms of proposed expenditure, if the ORC deems that the airport needs further upgrades in protection standards, the current too few ratepayers cannot afford to carry the cost burden and surely it should be spread across the entire region that benefits from its continued operation, as is proposed with regards to the Leith.



## Respondent: Dave Macpherson

Submission Number: 378

On-behalf of: Save our Trains

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:16

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 2

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you have any feedback

That funding sought for the scoping studies be split evenly between Otago/Southland and Canterbury, charged as a targeted rate to properties within 10kms of likely railway stations, totalling \$172,000

**Otago Regional Council** – primarily Dunedin urban area, Oamaru & Balclutha

- 55,000 properties in catchment
- One-off targeted rate of \$1.20 in 2024/5
- Yield = \$66,000 approx

## Respondent: Chris Ford

Submission Number: 379

On-behalf of: Disabled Persons Assembly

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:17

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 3

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 4

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 5

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 8

Do you have any feedback

Recommendation: that the ORC makes a considerable contribution to fund any outcomes stemming from community feedback into the South Dunedin Future long term plan due in 2026.

Recommendation: that there is increased investment in flood and drainage scheme maintenance, as well as operational and capital projects to increase flood and river resilience throughout the region.

Recommendation: that ORC allocates additional spending to civil defence and emergency management over the lifespan of the LTP in expectation of the increased number of climate change related and other emergencies.

Recommendation: that disabled people are appointed to Otago regional civil defence and emergency management governance committees to ensure that our community's voice is heard in both the emergency planning and response spaces.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Recommendation 1:** that ORC opt for Option 1 to ensure needed investment for public transport.

**Recommendation 2:** that ORC take the opportunity presented by both the RLTP and this LTP to begin implementing the 'whole of journey' and 'accessible journeys for all' transport models within the Otago region.

**Recommendation 3:** that trial inter-regional services are fully accessible to everyone, including disabled people. This includes putting fully accessible electrically powered coaches and/or mobility vans on the road for these trials.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Recommendation:** that Council advises ratepayers about the availability of rates rebates for low-income ratepayers and that information about them is provided in accessible formats.

**Respondent: Gerald and Karen Holmes**

**Submission Number:** 380

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:18

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

West Taieri Drainage and Flood protection: One drainage rate for this area is sensible as all drainage must be pumped out. The wider community should contribute more to the rates since Outram and Dunedin Airport appear to be the main beneficiaries of existing and future ORC investments as stated in the Long Term Plan documents.

## Respondent: Clare Hadley

Submission Number: 381

On-behalf of: Manuherekia Catchment Group

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:19

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

#### How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### ~Environment

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you have any feedback

##### Option 1

What the Plan does not make clear is how the Council will determine its priorities for projects. Projects that will make a significant difference may need multi-year funding.

Without the detail of how funds will be allocated it is difficult to understand how the fund will measure improving outcomes and importantly how the whole region will feel the benefit of this funding over time.

Delaying introducing the charge until 2025/26 is appropriate; we would suggest that when the annual plan is prepared next year, the economic environment is considered to determine whether its introduction should be further delayed.

**Respondent: Rosa Anderson-Jones**

**Submission Number: 382**

---

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:22**

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

A specific development proposal in Broad Bay has raised serious concerns due to its potential to significantly alter the area's character and negatively impact the local marine ecology. My worries include the potential harm to protected waterways and native fish populations, notably in Styles Creek, the reduction of green spaces and wildlife habitats near existing reserves, increased landslide risks due to proximity to known slip areas, and the creation of large impermeable surfaces that could lead to flooding and impact the nearby Otago Harbour.

**Respondent: Alex King**

**Submission Number: 383**

**Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:24**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I agree the vision "For our environment and communities to be healthy and connected ki uta ki tai (from the mountains to the sea)" is appropriate. I agree partnership with mana whenua is central to environmental management given our responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I agree with the 6 focus areas and suggest a 7th: "Feeding ourselves and the world through horticulture and cropping."

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Any other feedback?**

\* I support a 40% Otago wide general rate for public transport. \* I am neutral on the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district-wide basis. If it was set at 60%, continuing to use a targeted rate for areas covered by public transport would be appropriate. \* I do not support the targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in given areas.

**!Paying back what we borrowed**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 3 years

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 10**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* No

**!Targeted rate allocations**

**Comment Number: 11**

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes



**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

. I support simplification, regularization across schemes, and making these rates easier to understand. I wonder if 2 zones is somewhat arbitrary, and 3 zones might be a better balance between simplicity and allowing the schemes to better rate according to the benefit provided

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 13****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 14****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 15****Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

The ORC's financial strategy relies too heavily on borrowing to fund expenditure in the next 5 years. Rates are artificially low, and the ORC should not be deterred from raising rates to cover the costs of work it is required to do. Targeted rate increases for flood, drainage and river management should be increased to the required levels immediately rather than being lower for the first 3 years.

**How we fund our work****Comment Number: 16****Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

I note the debt track is projected to increase from ~35m to over 100m over the period. I believe we are entering a period of increased uncertainty with sea level rise and climate change. I would be more comfortable with raising rates earlier in the period and keeping the debt burden below 25% of revenue. While it might be acceptable to fund drainage, stockbanks and the like over 20 years in normal times, it makes sense to pay them off more quickly if we can so we have the capacity to respond to future shocks.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

The council should get away from planning rates using a "percentage

increase from last year" mindset. Instead it should ask "what is it critical that we do?", and "what resources are needed to do a good job?" Certainly it should always ask whether it gets good value for the money it spends and whether there might be better or less expensive ways to achieve the same ends. But to set a rate at a level "because it's 10% or less than last year" is not an adequate rationale for setting rates.

**Respondent: Brian Dixon****Submission Number: 384****Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:25****About You****Comment Number: 2****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 1****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's focus areas****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

The strategic directions set out in part 2 of the document are clear and sound and I strongly support those, recognising the linkage between local, regional, national and global values relating to the protection of the environment and human communities and, therefore, the cultural, social, economic and natural well-being of all. The six focus areas and goals of those are, for the most part, appropriate and necessary and there is an interrelatedness of partnership, communities, environment, resilience, climate and transport that makes all of these areas significant and important foci of a regional Council's long-term plan.

**See detailed comments on aspects of these in the submission**

Applaud the position given to the section in the draft plan on the partnership with Mana Whenua and the extremely helpful description of the relationship, how that works and the advantage of that for the people of Otago. I hope that the Regional Council will strenuously defend the relationship and the valuable mahi carried out under the partnership and not allow that to be diminished or impeded by central government actions over coming years.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

**Climate Change** - Invest in energy conservation programmes – partnering with businesses to assist in retrofitting insulation in homes and businesses, and installing renewable energy reserves (eg solar, wind) as a form of insurance for sustainable supply and protection from prolonged disruptions as well as reducing reliance on centralised energy producers.

Consistent with its climate change commitments, the ORC needs to state clearly that certain industrial activities are in conflict with global, national and regional climate change goals. For example, according to industry sources (S&P Global, Market Intelligence), gold mining operations are a little-recognised major source of greenhouse gas emissions. Nearly a tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> was emitted per ounce of gold produced worldwide in 2019.

Furthermore, precious metals mining is an activity of very dubious value. There is an unlevel playing field of tax concessions for gold mining companies that means most of the development costs of mining are paid for by the taxpayer.

In addition to the pervasive impacts of climate change, we need to face up to the current biodiversity crisis.

The ORC needs to be deciding on measures to implement strategies and actions on climate change. In doing this, you are encouraged to investigate ways to address key findings of the Dixon & Morrissey (2023) report and consider the implementation of recommendations. See the submission for the key findings.

## Respondent: Andrew Simms

Submission Number: 385

On-behalf of: Mosgiel Taieri Community Board

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:26

### About You

Comment Number: 2

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 1

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### !Bus services in Dunedin

Comment Number: 3

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes

### Please comment

Detailed Operational Requests: 1. Park & Ride facility essential 2. Mosgiel express - more drop off points 3. Monitor loading at peak times 4. Dunedin/Airport/Balclutha service supported 5. EV technology advancing at pace

**Respondent: Murray Grimwood****Submission Number:** 386**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:27**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have any feedback**

Your sectioned 'spends' do not account for what then next 10 years will bring; indeed much of what we have come to know as BAU – Business as Usual – will be invalid, before that time is up. To understand why, which is the first step in addressing reality rather than the past extrapolated – you need to address the bigger picture. The following is a once-over-lightly; references are attached below.

Energy – the underwrite of everything

Big-picture, all economic activity is dependent on energy. No energy, no work; no work, nothing done. Nothing extracted/processed/produced, so nothing purchased/trashed. And in that no-energy scenario, money would be worth?

Here in its simplest form, is the big picture; the real story; the true narrative:

Notice that energy isn't really 'produced'; we collect it, use it, discard it. It cannot be destroyed, but every move reduces its quality. Eventually it becomes the low- grade thermal energy in the diagram; irretrievable because the retrieving would use more energy than it would return.

All life requires energy. The basics being food and a survivable temperature-range.

Beyond fundamental needs there is 'surplus energy'; firewood and stored grain being humankind's earliest examples (exogenous examples that is; we've always stored energy in our body-fat).

Every stage of human progress, so often recorded as a societal and technological advancement, can be compared with a graph of contemporary energy-use; the tracks overlay almost perfectly. Put differently, every quantum step-up of human

progress thus far, has piggy-backed on an energy step-up.

Now, happening for the first time at global scale, we are entering an energy step- down. We are traversing from fossilised-sunlight energy (fossil fuels, which we are rapidly drawing-down the stocks of) to renewable energy, from which we aren't going to get nearly so much bang for our buck. This is an orders-of-magnitude game-changer, exacerbated by overpopulation.

Growth

Everyone - politicians, businesspeople, bankers, the elite, the disenfranchised - wants growth. But growth is dependent on energy-supply growth – or on endless

efficiency -gains; a thermodynamic impossibility - and that graph is heading down. We avoid this unwelcome possibility by hanging onto the every word of a 'discipline' which evolved to study only what happens inside the box in the above diagram: Economics. To continue validating itself, Economics has had to ever- more-stridently deny the existence of the circle outside the box. Trouble is; without the circle we are dead.

New Zealand

In blunt terms, the current level of energy-use in NZ is spilt; 60% fossil, 40% electricity. Let's not delve into how much of the electricity infrastructure was built using, or is being maintained by, fossil energy. Let's also ignore peak-load fossil energy. Roughly speaking, we are betting on a future level of activity – a rate of work – requiring an extra grid-and-a-half. We are going to have to build the infrastructure using the only energy we use to build stuff; fossil energy. Maintained then by? Nobody has built and maintained renewable infrastructure, using renewable infrastructure.

EROEI

The reason renewable infrastructure doesn't build infrastructure – and the problem with the likes of hydrogen - is EROEI; Energy Return on Energy Invested. It is a simply-understood equation; if a wolf chases a rabbit but the chase expends more energy than the eating of the rabbit returns, the wolf dies. No exceptions.

Plump rabbits, close, are the better target; scrawny ones at a distance, not so much.

In energy terms, we stumbled on an underground store of rabbits, 200 years ago. And fed ourselves as fast as we could, plumpest/closest first. We are about half- way through that one-store; scrawniness is showing up as fracking, tar-sands, deep-water drilling. Distance, as pipelines, tankers, and energy-sapping wars.

Simply put, it is taking more of the energy we extract, to do the extracting and delivering. In net energy input, global society has almost certainly peaked.

Not only is it taking more energy to obtain energy; it is taking more of that energy to obtain mineral resources. Where it once took the removal of 10 tons of 'overburden' to get at a ton of copper, we are now removing 400 – using the lower-EROEI oil to do so. Litres expended per ton obtained – obviously – gets worse rapidly, being a product of both exponentially decreasing trends.

#### Entropy

Entropy is the flow of energy from left to right in the diagram. It flows from low entropy (high quality) to high entropy (low quality – usually low-grade heat). You leave the air behind you a little warmer as you walk – traceable from sun to crop to food to digestion to muscles to friction/radiation/evaporation (sweat). But – and it's the but of all buts – you would expend more energy going back and scooping it up, than it would give you.

Entropy also shows up as decay, it's why we can judge people's age visually. Decay requires parrying; meaning energy being applied to maintenance. There has never been more infrastructure on the planet, all decaying exponentially, all competing for an exponentially-reducing energy supply. The graphs cross; triage, there will be.

#### Geopolitics

Geopolitically, there will be escalating conflict over energy-supplies. Our social narrative regarding conflict – too often regurgitated unquestioningly by our journalists and historians – concentrates on persona; on 'drated others'. They were bad, we are good. The histories are largely written by the winners; the truth is that the winners get access to the best resources – which for the last 200 years, have included fossil energy. And the wish to feel good about themselves makes winners avoid inconvenient truths.

#### The Holy Grail

Globally and locally, the UN Sustainable Development Goals go unchallenged. But human overpopulation, coupled with the finite supplies of energy and resources of a finite planet, render half the SDGs unattainable, and expose at least one as a total oxymoron. There can be no guaranteed 'rights' for an unfettered population within the confines of a Bounded System; the assertion was an unfounded anthropocentric arrogance.

#### Money, aka forward betting

Given that global energy-supply has probably peaked, forward bets are increasingly in danger of becoming invalid; they were, after all, bets on more energy in the future, and on more future resources to apply it to. Pension- expectations, savings, investments, even cash, they're all forward bets. And if there's going to be ever-less available energy (and of lower EROEI, compounded by the ever-worse quality of the remaining resources it will be applied to) then expect increasing supply-chain disruptions.

Expect incurable inflation (for a while, at least). Expect contention as to which currency energy is traded in. (The media, blinded by economic/social thinking and thus failing to understand the primal importance of energy, has missed this global chess-game. It's: 'That drated Putin', rather than 'Watch thou for the Petro-Ruble, our debts will be exposed.) All sounding familiar?

Reconciling our current collection of forward bets with reality, would be beter than collapse of the system. Maybe it cannot be done – but the appraisal will have to be done by folk who think beyond the box in the above diagram. Which rules out the current economics-trained echelon.

#### Flawed narrative

In a nutshell, our entire social narrative is putting its cart before its horse. We assume business as usual will continue as usual, but it was never usual; it was never more than a temporary fossil-energised hiatus. Having made that fundamentally-flawed assumption, we have made matters worse by making heroic bets on the system growing; exponentially and forever. This within a bounded system (Earth) which is already demonstrably under stress; go figure!

#### Looking ahead

If we project forward, say, 50 years; NZ will be doing very well indeed if it is running on 50% of the energy it currently enjoys. Globalism – clearly disintegrating now – is gone, export and import volumes mere vestiges of the past. Physical growth is history. The biggest headache has been increasing infrastructure maintenance; all will have been triaged, much discarded, anything remaining will be locally-maintainable. Given the scarcity of energy, it will be used

very carefully, very essentially; driving kids to soccer in the SUV is... unlikely. And on what road-surface anyway? (Fossil feedstock being what roads are made of, and by).

We will be collecting solar energy directly, and indirectly via hydro and wind.

Rivers, windmills, remnant PV panels, water-heating panels, thermal mass (in buildings), food-production, amber, maybe biofuel crops; these will be the collectors. Storage will be in dams, trees, crops, thermal mass, batteries or hydrogen (the later two being energy-losing propositions).

If we are still thinking environmentally, water-at-height (lakes, ponds, tanks) will be seen as the most benign active-energy storage option.

Via the efficiency imperative, we will be attempting to access energy as close to its source, with as little transmission, alteration and storage, as possible. Electric and bio-diesel/electric trains are possible; private hydrogen/battery cars – reliant on house-heating, water-heating, maybe electricity – is valid, meaning that three-storey urban cramming (too many people per sunlit area) is not.

A migration from urban cramming to food-producing land – the logical reverse of the fossil-energised rural-to-city migration over the previous two centuries – is inevitable. (Cities are not ecologically benign, in the same way that ‘economies’ don’t really decouple from their impacts; both demand production and pollution ‘somewhere else’. Cities are really just giant heat-engines; only economists – purloining physics terms in an attempt to self-legitimise – call them ‘engines of growth’).

#### Leadership

In attempting to prolong the un-prolongable, Government, aided by a substantive portion of the Green voice (think: urban cramming, electric vehicles and carbon sequestration) is advocating anything promising plug-and-play replacement for fossil energy. The impossibility of unfettered growth, the overshoot state of our own species, the unprecedented degradation of our only home, go uncounted. Thus we get enthusiasm for turning water-at-height into electricity, turning that into hydrogen, attempting to contain that smallest of molecules and export it - to ‘make money’.

False conclusions are the inevitable result of beginning with false assumptions, and we are running out of time to base our assumptions on correct ones. We may, indeed, have already run out of time. Leadership in a period of status-quo is done by those who favour the status-quo.

Leadership in the face of inevitable change, requires Churchillian bravery. Covid was an ideal time for a reset; we extended and pretended. Ukraine was another; yet again, we extended and pretended.

Given the enormity of the change and the speed at which events will come upon us, we need much braver leadership. The problem has been known of for at least the 50 years since Forrester’s team at Massachusetts Institute of Technology released World3 (made famous in the Club of Rome publication Limits to Growth, see below via Nate Hagens).

The problem is simple; given the fossil energy left, we need to ascertain what living on, say, 50% less energy in a post-growth world, would look like for New Zealand. We need to ascertain what infrastructure is worth pursuing (to Onslow or not to Onslow?) – and what would be a waste of the remaining time, energy and resources.

As it is energy and resources per capita, which is the valid measure (true poverty being a lack of both), a smaller population will be wealthier individually than a large one (another point those inside-the-box economists got totally wrong). So we need to have a discussion about maximum desirable population; a reasonable assumption being that it will be less than current, due to the reduction of energy/resource inputs. Better we go there proactively, than waiting for the natural overshoot/collapse sequence.

It is obviously better that we retain some form of social cohesion during the period ahead. The reduction of surplus energy, coupled with the ever-more of it required to maintain what we’ve already built, will threaten such cohesion. This too, has to be clearly understood; promise folk the undeliverable and they just get angry; at best they end up on your Parliament grounds in tents. At worst? But promise them ‘Blood, toil, tears and sweat’, being brutally honest about it, and they might just come with you.

It’s worth a shot; we won’t get it all right, but it would be better than flying blind. The discussion will be distorted/prolonged by status-quo-vested interests; Pied Pipers promising ‘a joyous land...just at hand’. We need to be beyond that; we need to raise our game, see a clearer picture, have a more thoughtful societal discussion. Bring it on, we’re late already.



**Respondent: Gerard Hyland**

**Submission Number:** 387

**On-behalf of:** Dunedin Tunnel Trail Trust

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:29

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

we strongly urge the ORC to continue to commit to cycling: specifically the Tunnels Trail, as an identified project within the LTP.

Further detail in the submission

**Respondent: Rodger and Delwyn Burrow**

**Submission Number:** 388

---

**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:30

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number:** 1

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

We are not happy and don't understand how we were not consulted on this.  
This is not fair!! Why should we pay so much more than others in our town, should we not all be equal.

**Respondent: Ian Bryant****Submission Number: 389****Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:31****About You****Comment Number: 2****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 1****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

What needs to happen: 1. Reinstate the exacerbator or indirect benefit rate covering the entire Taieri basin to the skyline that was in place before the 2011 Rating Review. The Leith Flood scheme now rating to the entire Dunedin city area (now including the Taieri) is a precedent for this. 2. Investigate asset sales to fund capital works proposed in the LTP. There are several non-strategic land holdings in West Taieri that could be sold now providing minimal rates of return. 3. Find a way to have the non-rateable assets on the Taieri contribute more to the schemes. The 80-20 split between targeted and general rates much fairer than the 96-4 split previously but nowhere near the 50-50 split that Leith Scheme benefits from.

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 3****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

The LTP expenditure plan for the two schemes is unworkable with the existing rating models.

The 10-year expenditure plan for \$34 million for the schemes needs scrutiny from a Liaison Group and the spending priorities identified and risk assessed to see if really needed. An example is the \$8 million Contour channel bank upgrade.

**Respondent: Amanda Robinson****Submission Number:** 390**On-behalf of:** Lightfoot Initiative Charitable Trust**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:32**About You****Comment Number:** 2**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number:** 3**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

Upgrade the bus fleet – Agree. Additional infrastructure will be needed to ensure this is successful. This will include bus terminals in the Southern Corridor, Ladies Mile and near Arrowtown as growth occurs in the ‘commuter belts’. Additional stops on Ladies Mile are also needed as a matter of urgency. In addition, during the period of upgrade, we urge the ORC to increase the frequency of the service. Earlier and Later – Agree. In addition to this, we urge you to trial a ‘Night Bus’ operating every hour running from Queenstown to Arrowtown, via the Frankton Bus Hub and Lake Hayes Estate. Improved timetables and frequency – Partially agree, but with increased frequency of 8 minutes on key routes eg: Number 1. This needs to be actioned as soon as possible, particularly on key routes. An adaptive and data driven approach is needed to ensure that route scheduling reflects what is needed by the community. This cannot wait 10 years as population growth and contextual factors such as the Sh6 NZUP programme will require increased levels of public transport service. Retain the existing ferry service – Partially agree, an increase to the current service, to include wider coverage and additional ferry stops is needed. Earlier consultations have indicated that a ferry service that provides a higher level of service and coverage would be well used by residents and visitors. We need further investment in this service to better maximise the potential of water-based transport. On-Demand service – Agree. This is not an immediate area of focus in Queenstown, however progress in Wanaka is needed urgently.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number:** 4**Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

believe a higher level of contribution is needed across both commercial and residential Capital Value rates to ensure the public transport system in the Queenstown Lakes is adequately funded to cater to the increased population growth. We do not support Upper Clutha and Wanaka residents contributing towards the Queenstown bus service.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

Lightfoot appreciates the investment that has gone into providing the bus service in Queenstown. It is encouraging to see numbers continuing to increase post-Covid-19. Recent changes to the network through adaptations of times and routes, along with an increase in overall reliability across the network, continues to grow public confidence in the service. The \$2 fare ensures that bus use is affordable and accessible to most. The recent proposed changes in the Government Policy

Statement on Transport, where cost of travel will be absorbed by the user, with decreased subsidy from government, will have a significant impact in Queenstown. We urge the ORC to avoid fare increases where possible. More community education is needed so the community better understand why the bus service is essential, how their rates are used to subsidise it, and the impact the service has on reducing congestion and emissions.

## Respondent: Sarah Davie-Nitis

Submission Number: 391

On-behalf of: Dunedin Tracks and Trails

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:36

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 2

#### Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Transport

Comment Number: 3

#### Do you have any feedback

We, the Dunedin Tracks Network Trust, ask that the Otago Regional Council consider:

1. Providing financial support for the Dunedin Trails Network Trust of \$50k, in collaboration with and matched by the DCC, to complete the pre-build design and consenting work (including landowner permission, legal easements, design, resource consent and administration) Section 5a of the Coastal Communities Cycle Connection and Section 1 of the Taieri Trail, plus key bridges required at Waikouaiti and Outram.
2. Formally supporting, jointly with the DCC, the Trusts vision of the proposed 5 key, off-road, shared use trails for Dunedin City – in addition to the Ta Aka Otakou and Dunedin Tunnels Trail. Including these in transport, recreation, wellbeing and environmental planning documents into the future... especially ensuring both the Taieri Trail and the Coastal Communities Cycle Connection are in the Otago Southland Regional Transport Plan as a part of the integrated regional land transport network.
3. In conjunction with the proposed 'Large Scale Environmental Fund', establish a contestable fund of \$500,000 to support the development of a connected network of trails across the Otago region.
4. Enable and support the use of flood protection assets for the development of trails (including the use of stop banks).

## Respondent: Laureen and Sid Bennett

Submission Number: 392

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:41

### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 2

#### Do you have any feedback

I think the council need to have a very good look at how you do your work, You need to be more efficient and cost effective in the ways that you operate.

We feel that the council is spending far too much money on creating offices that contain and accommodate too much of "the nice to have options rather than the what is necessary". Your long term plan is extremely difficult to understand from the view point of the average rate payer. It is full of tables of numbers and values which requires a lot of time to understand what you are proposing.

---

### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 1

#### Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?

We wish to voice our disapproval of your proposed rates increases.

Rate payers cannot afford the proposed increase in rates either this year, or in the future that your plan requires.

Many of your rate payers are on fixed incomes without any means to supplement these. The burden of local government rates is rapidly becoming unsustainable for these people. A more responsible attitude to perpetual spending by local authorities is going to quickly bankrupt rate payers.

**Respondent: Alasdair Morrison****Submission Number:** 393**On-behalf of:** Waikouaiti Coast Community Board**Submission Date:** 28/04/24 22:42**About You****Comment Number:** 2**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number:** 4**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

The bus service on Route 1 – Palmerston to Dunedin – has been the subject of previous submissions from us to ORC. After many years of asking, it was pleasing to finally have a weekend bus service for our north coast region. It is proving to be popular, but some minor tweaks to the timetable would be appropriate. We do have a problem with periodic overcrowding on an afternoon service returning north from the city. Following discussion with your transport team it was suggested that we make a formal request for an extra bus to Warrington in the afternoons during school terms. We did this on 12th December and we have not yet had a formal response. We also hear complaints from parents who are unsure if their children will be dropped off at Evansdale, or if they will be on a bus travelling into Warrington. We would like some formal clarity on this. There is no mention of Warrington in your published timetable.

**~Environment****Comment Number:** 6**Do you have any feedback**

**Karitane Harbour/Waikouaiti River Estuary** - One of the functions of a Community Board is to respond to concerns within our communities. During the past couple of years we have been having a close look at various issues in the wider Karitane Harbour area. We understand that DCC is going to establish a Management Plan for this area, and this will obviously necessitate participation with ORC. We have yet to see any action on this and it is our fervent hope that this plan will not disappear into the ether, as seems to have been the case with other plans

**Blueskin Bay -**

There have been concerns about the water quality in Blueskin Bay between Waitati and Warrington, mostly related to possible leachate from the Warrington sewerage treatment facility. We understand that ORC is now actively looking into this, and we wish to add that many local residents have a view that the recent, and current, housing development around Warrington may have detrimental consequences as the local population increases. We would



like to be involved in discussions on this topic. We understand from the Future Development Strategy that active consideration is being given the future of wastewater treatment along our northern coast. We do hope that any ORC consents regarding future plans can be dealt with in a timely manner.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

Supportive of ORC

Albeit the recent Civil Defence Independent Review, chaired by Mr. Mike Bush, makes for some sobering reading. Together with the severe flooding events in the North Island, this report highlights the importance of communities when response to emergencies is required

**~Transport****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**

Thank you for providing real support for the 'Coastal Communities Cycle Connection'.

We were rather disappointed to read the following somewhat dismissive comment in the Future Development Strategy – 'This project is not in the 2021-2031 LTP or the 2024-2027 RLTP. As this is a tourism network, rather than a commuter network, co-funding from different sources would need to be explored as Waka Kotahi only co-funds commuter networks. It is not recommended that the FDS indicate this as a short to medium term project due to challenges there may be in gaining adequate funding for this project. It may be appropriate to indicate this as a long timeframe project (10-30 years) as a more realistic timeframe.'

The authors of these comments do not appear to understand the scope or importance of the project. The stretches of State Highway 1 between Waikouaiti & Karitane and between Evansdale & Waitati are significant danger areas and we are sure that some funding from NZTA will be forthcoming.

## Respondent: Liz Angelo

Submission Number: 394

On-behalf of: CITY RISE UP

Submission Date: 28/04/24 22:56

~Transport

Comment Number: 1

### Do you have any feedback

I applaud "significant focus to the areas of 'public transport'

\*I do not applaud City Rise South not being mentioned. I have made submission after submission to having City Rise, Central Dunedin highlighted as having an inadequate public transport service. ORC axed our adequate bus service 7yrs ago

Instead you talk of increasing the 'popular' routes. Nothing is popular if it doesn't exist!

The hill directly above the city is the oldest suburb and has a high density population. Many are students and/or long term residents. There are five major schools and nursery depots here. Thousands of kids are driven & dropped off here each day.

There is no a service going across the hill to the Bus Hub, Hospital & university. So they use cars.

Hundreds of them line the streets.

City Rise has become one giant car park. Unless people live/work near the up/down the hill bus routes of Stuart St and City Road they own a car and drive. It's a very steep hill!

For a cheap and easy solution, please refer to my recent 'in person' submission to the full Otago Regional Council to divert no 63 bus ACROSS to Maori Rd Arthur St, hub and beyond. (Instead of 61 & 63 sailing down High St together.)

\*Good to see electric buses. For our city with hills and tight bends there need to be smaller models.

2. I wish to support the submission to from 'Save Our Trains Otepoti'.

I think this Carbon Footprint image is worthy of scrutiny. ALL must reduce carbon footprint.

I am about to be care-free (like the increasing population of seniors) and sell my EV.

If we wish to travel long distance we need trains. That goes for all. (Not just for expensive travel excursions.)

**Respondent: Margaret and Terry Pollitt****Submission Number:** 395**Submission Date:** 29/04/24 02:17**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number:** 1**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

We are residents living on the Gordon Road Spillway, and we would ask that you include the following in your Long Term Plan:

- That the ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. This work needs to be carried out immediately and not over a period of years. By 2018, the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway had lost 37% of its design capacity due to an inexcusable lack of maintenance from the ORC. A further 6 years have passed with no maintenance carried out by the ORC and it would be fair to guess that the design capacity loss is now even greater than 37%.

Had the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway been maintained to its original design capacity, the flood events in May 2010, June 2015 and November 2018 would not have occurred at all and the July 2017 flood event, which inundated multiple houses would have been less severe.

- That ORC targeted rates collected for Flood Protection Works, are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.
- That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from the Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed.

The Floodwater Conveyance Assessment of Drains M3 and M4 Report carried out by GeoSolve Limited in January 2019, determined that the M3 and M4 Drains were not operating as per the Gordon Road Spillway Design.

## Respondent: Rhys Millar

**On-behalf of:** Predator Free Dunedin

**Submission Number:** 396

**Submission Date:** 29/04/24 09:58

### Attend Hearing

**Comment Number:** 3

#### Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

**Comment Number:** 2

#### Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

#### What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

### ~Environment

**Comment Number:** 1

#### Do you have any feedback

Predator Free Dunedin is highly supportive of the ORC's proposed large-scale environmental funding option, being consulted on in the Long-Term Plan. It is essential that funding of scale is made available to ambitious and well managed landscape-scale projects across the region, including Predator Free Dunedin, Southern Lakes Sanctuary, and others. Predator Free Dunedin is likely to receive future funding from PF2050 Ltd, and though this future funding is to be confirmed, what we do know is that any future funding will be reliant on securing at least a 1:1 ratio of co-funding. Having local co-funding of reasonable scale is essential for the sustainability of PFD and our ability to progress wider and more intensive predator control work. We have achieved so much, that to stutter now would see the rapid unravelling of the enormous social and environmental impacts we have achieved.

**Respondent: Steve Hill****Submission Number:** 397**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 01:47**Attend Hearing****Comment Number:** 1**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number:** 2**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

I noticed that under option 1 the preferred option the rates for my property would increase by over \$750 (rates estimator) compared to Option 2. This led me to look at the reason and it is primarily because I am in the proposed new zone Lower Clutha Flood Zone One. ===== is on the heights of Balclutha and there are no direct benefits from the Lower Clutha Flood protection scheme on my property other than indirect benefits. I don't understand why properties that are within the flood zone of Balclutha that have direct and indirect benefits (8 Paisley Street is an example) that is now in new Flood Zone 2 has a more than \$300 REDUCTION in their rates. In the current rating maps 8 Paisley Street is in U2 which correctly reflects the flood risk. In the current rating maps Tsukigawa Terrace is in F which doesn't correctly reflect anything other than the maps have probably not been updated. One side of Wilson road is F the other is U4. There just appears to be anomalies over the rating maps, what they reflect, and what they mean for rates. It cannot be surely that ===== should be increasing by over \$750 and ===== on a big hill, and those living in the flood zone have a \$300 reduction? Can the rating maps for Balclutha be updated please? I would like to add that I submit that the proposed rating maps should be updated before option 1 is decided upon. There are clear inequities in and inequalities in the existing rating maps that are then being magnified when combined into only two zones. There are many examples in Balclutha and its surrounds. I provided an example as it relates to my property in the attached subdivision but Wilson Road and Keithmore Road are examples where properties on one side are in a different zone to properties on the other, and they are all in an urban area.

**Respondent: Rob Phillips**

**Submission Number:** 398

**On-behalf of:** Upper Clutha Wilding Tree Group

**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 01:49

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

**Funding**

Currently, the wilding conifer rate serves as a clear and dedicated funding source for addressing the wilding tree problem. Our concern stems from the lack of clarity regarding future funding sources. It is essential there is a sustainable and reliable funding mechanism to ensure funding for the ongoing management and control of wildings. The LTP proposal for a biodiversity rate to replace the wilding rate will mean funding for wilding control will have to compete with other biosecurity proposals. We are concerned the proposal to remove the dedicated rate has the potential to reduce the amount of funding available for wilding control.

We also urge you to continue your advocacy with others for national funding to be restored to a level at least sufficient to maintain the investment made to date. There is a real risk that past investment will be lost if national funding is not restored.

**Respondent: rowmata****Submission Number: 399****Submission Date: 03/05/24 01:51****~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment****Comment Number: 1****What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**!Bus services in Dunedin****Comment Number: 2****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes****Comment Number: 3****Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 4****Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

I question large buses on transportation routes that are empty or only 1 or 2 people on these buses. Needs a economic assessment on this.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

Do not agree with the proposed expenditure of the Lower Taieri flood protection scheme. Also the targeted rates on the Lower Taieri ratepayers need to be adjusted more than 80% to 20% as the Dunedin airport is a large benefactor to all dunedin residents and districts. Targeted area of zone 1,2,3 also need to be removed as this system is also extremely unfair. Zone 3 takes on all the water after a flood and not advantaged: there should be no separate zones. As farmers on the Taieri, we cannot afford this financial burden and the amount of new infrastructure in Mosgiel area has an impact. It is legal that Dunedin Airport do not pay rates?

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Navigational safety**

**Comment Number: 8**

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**!Wilding pine control**

**Comment Number: 9**

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No



**Respondent: John Rowley**

**Submission Number: 400**

**Submission Date: 03/05/24 01:52**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Community resilience; rural services as in Resthomes, birthing units, etc. are essential.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

I propose we need to grow the economy like Canterbury. More wealth = more rates revenue! We have 250,000 hectares of horticultural land in Otago currently grazing sheep and beef animals!

**!Bus services in Queenstown Lakes**

**Comment Number: 7**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

This is a social/societal good. I therefore suggest it is funded by tax payers not rate payers.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 8****Any other feedback?**

I'm not convinced its equitable and therefor believe this is the responsibility of the private sector. Can you demonstrate any benefit to ratepayers?

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 9****Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

This is unacceptable! this should have been identified by the elected members before the deficits accrued. This is therefore their challenge.

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 10****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

One of these schemes I know of is partially funded from endowment leases in the Clinton gorge. As these properties may have freeholded, what are the replacement investments and how are they performing?

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 11****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Why is QLDC exempt? Queenstown , Wanaka and Dunedin are major cost centres. So why should Ranfurly, Maniototo, Roxburgh, Millers Flat, Omakau pay?

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 12****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Keep the cost centre transparent. I cannot support rates revenue being gifted/ as in grants out to voluntary groups.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 6****Do you have any feedback**

I support ORC creating more reservoirs for a) flood control, b) for recreation c) for irrigation and d) more GST more taxation and more rates income growth. I strongly recommend a new reservoir - in the Manuherekia Valley. Win - Win

I cannot support proposal 1 without a cost to benefit audit, neither should you at ORC. the whole of Otago maybe facing a huge environmental challenge in the near future - RABBITS- ratepayers as individuals will have to fund/pay.

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 4

#### Do you have any feedback

I strongly support you divest all services across to the District Councils.

#### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 13

#### Do you have any feedback

Governance? I do not believe for one minute the Council is transparent or democratic. e.g your governance removes affected councillor from major debates on policy due to a conflict of interest - irrigation? At this point, I loose confidence in ORC outcomes.

#### Infrastructure Strategy

Comment Number: 14

#### Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?

This looks like deferred maintenance and therefore is a very serious cost to ratepayers when we thought ORC had been responsible over the last thirty years. You need to find a source of cheaper funding.

#### How we fund our work

Comment Number: 15

#### Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?

Ratepayers are not taxpayers! When you have doubts about Port Otago paying you a dividend then think business people, think farmers. This appears to be unaffordable.

#### Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?

As I'm no 81 years, I find the farm plans and accusations of erosion of land to be very socialist and so far unjustified. My experience tells me the stick approach (farm plans) are very expensive and as in the USSR will not work.

Farmers will respond to scientific advice and colleagues setting examples of preferred practise "What are the facts which make ORC think farmers are not environmentally responsible?"

**Respondent: George Redditt**

**Submission Number:** 401

**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 01:53

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

We have to invest and also maintain new and existing infrastructure.

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

There should be no focus area but the whole council responsibilities must be shared equally for the benefit of all.

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$2 million

**How should this initiative be funded?**

- \* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

#### Tell us what you think

- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

#### Any other feedback?

It should lie with the urban areas where the population have the opportunity to use it.

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 8

#### Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?

- \* Yes

#### Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?

These should be paid by dunedin bus routes rate payers and Queenstown. After all they have been the beneficiaries of this service. Rural areas with no bus services should be exempt of these costs.

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 9

#### Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* No

#### Please comment on flood protection scheme rates

The problem should lie within the geographical areas of the water ways.

#### Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

- \* No

#### Please comment on drainage scheme rates

The rate needs to reflect different catchment areas needs. No cross subsidisation.

#### Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?

- \* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 10

#### Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?

- \* No

**Please comment**

This funding should lie with the catchment involved. For the Leith for example, we who live in other areas should not be paying.

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

If the council had allowed timely intervention many of the current problems would not exist. Riparian planting is not the answer as in 20 years waterways will not be accessible and more problems will arise. I have seen river systems grazed by both sheep and cattle very successfully both here and overseas.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 11****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

This should be rated across the geographical area concerned. Those who benefit must wear the cost

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 12****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Should this not be funded as part of fees boats pay when they enter the harbour

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 13****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Once again, this cost should be met by the forest owner. Not all the adjacent land holders who are not responsible for the problem.

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

Get more strategic. Ask landholders in the catchment for their thoughts and do not come up with many hair brained schemes that may be fine in theory but are not really a workable solution. Often the best engineers are ignored because they do not follow the green agenda.

**~Environment**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback**

I think more thought needs to be given to green area where new subdivisions are being established. Concrete causes more flooding.

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you have any feedback**

Public transport is a necessity but perhaps to ease congestion a rail service between Mosgiel and Dunedin needs looked at.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 15**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Yes it should lie where the problem belongs

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

On current projections, these are unaffordable for all land owners.

**Respondent: Elizabeth Herrick**

**Submission Number: 402**

**Submission Date: 03/05/24 01:54**

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Referencing technology - would drones be cheaper, more flexible in the environmental areas, to cover land and water- more than planes and helicopters?

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* Yes

**What level of total funding should be available?**

\* \$500,000

**How should this initiative be funded?**

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

**!Public Transport rates funding**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Tell us what you think**

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?
- \* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes



**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* Yes

#### !Catchment Management funding

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Navigational safety

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

#### !Wilding pine control

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

Biosecurity covers a lot more than just wilding pines. Putting your proposed change sounds as though there will be less money for biosecurity which I wouldn't support.

#### ~Environment

Comment Number: 11

**Do you have any feedback**

- I believe landholders should be held accountable for pest control- Lifestyle blocks and absentees.
- should farmers be required to have water storage? if so, who pays?
- There are historic water allowances that exist from gold mining days. There has been long term notification re years of change to come. these should be gone immediately!

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 4

**Do you have any feedback**

Definitely electric vehicles ASAP.

Alexandra/ Clyde areas are not served well. We need better service to Queenstown, Wanaka, Christchurch without needing to drive to Cromwell. The bus to Cromwell is in the evening. Smaller electric buses?

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 12**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

An example is the Taieri Plains. Local farmers believe the plan is over ambitious and too costly. A difficult one but discussion need to happen.

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 13**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

It sounds fair.

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 14**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

Targeted rates also sounds fair.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

As long as spending on ORC's home base in Dunedin is the necessary and not the frivolous i.e artworks for the walls (!) and careful thought, is given to the number of councillors needed for the work to be done- I can be positive.

**Respondent: Daphne and Jim Ledgerwood**

**Submission Number:** 403

**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 01:55

**About You**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Attend Hearing**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* No

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

I do not believe the challenges are nearly as bad as you suggest

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 4**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Time for a reset. More conservative spending especially staff costs

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 6**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We do not live in dunedin

#### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 7

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

**Please comment**

We do not live in queenstown

#### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 8

**Tell us what you think**

#### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

Please take repayments out of savings made by cutting back on existing overspending

**Do you have any other feedback on the public transport rating proposals?**

Surely you must understand we get nothing for the transport rate. We already pay. The trial you have done in the past doesn't help us at all. Small benefit to hawea and a large benefit to tourists as in "hitch hikers" who were using the bus. The Hawea folk will tell you the trial figures were totally false to benefit the operator.

#### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

#### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 11

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

We have been involved in flood protection on one of our original properties over 30 years ago on the lake front. We, along with our neighbours had to sort it ourselves. Wanaka doesn't have those issues anymore other than those created by the main developers. ORC/QLDC should enforce better protections from the major developer. Actual enforcement not just monitoring.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Not required to be extra management rate. Take it from efficiencies. Cost saving- reduce overheads. 6% saving

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 13****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Unlikely to benefit us in any way. Fund from savings!!

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 14****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

You are ruining the beauty of central Otago by spraying. Surely allowing a contractor to cut trees and sell as fire wood would be better!!

**Do you have any other feedback on the other proposed rating proposals?**

would much rather you reduce your expenditure and live within the revised budgets.

**~ORC's must-do work****Comment Number: 15****Do you have any feedback**

That work should take priority but within the reduced budget

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

surely that is what you should be doing!!

**Financial Strategy**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Fund from the reduced budget by cutting back on wastage as central government are doing

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 18**

**Do you have any feedback on how we fund our work - including rates and debt?**

You seem to come up with an extensive wish list and set your rates accordingly.

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

Please. How can you justify the huge increase in senior high paid staff. Growing from a few dozen to over 300 over the last 15 years, with only studies, monitoring surveys and consultations to show for it. Please cut back expenditure and live within your new budgets.

## Respondent: Danielle Tolson

Submission Number: 404

On-behalf of: Dunedin City Council

Submission Date: 03/05/24 01:56

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 13

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 2

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

The DCC supports the ORC's approach to partnering with mana whenua and the community to manage water.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 1

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$500,000

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A targeted rate on districts that participate

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 5

Tell us what you think

- \* support the 20% Otago-wide rate (i.e. general rate)
- \* support the target rate portion of transport rates being on a district wide basis?

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 6

Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?

\* Yes

**!Targeted rate allocations****Comment Number: 7****Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

The DCC notes that, under changes to the rating system detailed in the draft Plan, Leith indirect is now applied to the whole Dunedin district. According to the draft Plan, this reflects that approximately half of the property in the targeted rate zone is non-rateable, and this cost is now allocated to the entire district rather than a smaller defined area. The differential for the Forsyth Barr Stadium has also been removed. 31. The DCC notes that the ORC has applied the Leith rating to the whole Dunedin district. It would like clarification about the area of the city where the airport is located. The DCC views the airport as a strategic asset, and supports a portion of the rating to be allocated for flood protection in this area. 32. The DCC requests that the draft Plan includes an assurance that flood protection for East Taieri, West Taieri and Silverstream is maintained to capacity.

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 8****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

The DCC supports the proposed introduction of a catchment management rate to cover this work, particularly if it simplifies how this work is funded and provides transparency to ratepayers about the purpose of this rating.

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 9****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* Yes

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 10****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

The DCC supports that the separate wilding tree rate is proposed to be discontinued, and that the amount budgeted for supporting wilding pine groups (\$250,000) be incorporated into one rate for biodiversity.

39. The DCC requests information about how funding to support wilding pine groups will be administered and managed at an operational level, if the funding is incorporated into one rate.

40. The DCC requests that the wilding pines in East and Coastal Otago be included in the draft Plan.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 3****Do you have any feedback**



- The DCC demonstrates support for biodiversity initiatives through the provision of advice and a biannual contestable funding programme, the Biodiversity Fund.
- The DCC supports the ORC's work in delivering programmes that manage pest plants and animals through its Regional Pest Management Plan and Biodiversity Strategy.

#### ~Climate change and Resilience

Comment Number: 11

##### Do you have any feedback

- The DCC requests that its coastal communities, such as Long Beach, Osborne, and Aramoana, are included in planning and action to address climate change risk.
- The DCC welcomes additional funding for climate change action, such as the implementation of natural hazards management and adaptation programmes based on the Otago Natural Hazard Risk Assessment, and the intention of the ORC to integrate the warning system for critical civil defence and emergency management messaging.

#### ~Transport

Comment Number: 4

##### Do you have any feedback

- The DCC supports initiatives to improve accessibility to transport, reduce the impacts of transport on climate change, improve urban environments and public health and reduce deaths and serious injuries. The DCC also supports the goal of public transport being used more often as a preferred mode of travel, to contribute positively to our environment and communities. This is aligned with the DCC's strategic goals and will be critical to achieving Dunedin's Zero Carbon by 2030 goal.
- The DCC supports the ORC's proposal to increase public transport funding over the next 10 years.
- ensure demand is met when the Mosgiel park and ride is operational.
- The DCC seeks more detail on how public transport services in Dunedin will be funded through the existing mix of fares and rates, as suggested in the draft Plan.
- The DCC supports the inclusion of expenditure in the draft Plan to support district councils and communities to explore local public transport service trials, particularly for a Balclutha to Dunedin, including airport and bus service trial.

#### ~Regional Leadership

Comment Number: 12

##### Do you have any feedback

- The DCC is strongly supportive of the ORC's investment in regional leadership, particularly in partnering with Kāi Tahu and in community engagement.
- The DCC welcomes new leadership initiatives from the ORC, as outlined in the Plan: delivery of National Policy Statements on Urban Development statutory requirements with the DCC and Queenstown Lakes District Council; reviewing its Climate Change Risk Assessment and providing information to the community about this work; increasing regional meetings to 3-4 per year and providing additional full-time equivalent staffing to support decision-making.

**Respondent: John Mezger**

**Submission Number:** 405

**On-behalf of:** Business South

**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 02:12

**~Transport**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback**

Investing in public transport – we support targeted investment in improved public transport in the region. Although demand growth is inaccurate e.g. Central Otago and Queenstown Lakes districts growth statistics are residence numbers and not population.

We support the proposed regional transport trials if it works for business owners and staff to efficiency commute between the regional towns.

**~Regional Leadership**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have any feedback**

Compliance costs from both local and central government are escalating, with decisions made in silos and implemented in an ad hoc way, resulting in unintended consequences.

- o Make consenting processes easier for businesses to navigate and afford.
- o Change regional government procurement practices to support local suppliers.

**Respondent: Andrina and Shayne King**

**Submission Number: 406**

**Submission Date: 03/05/24 02:18**

**Infrastructure Strategy**

**Comment Number: 1**

**Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

- That the ORC give surgent priority to restoring the Silver Stream Channel/Gordon Road Spillway back to at least 100% of its design capacity. This work needs to be carried out immediately and not over a period of years.
- That ORC targeted rates collected from Flood Protection Works are allocated to an annual maintenance budget to ensure that the Silver Stream channel is maintained to carry no less than the design capacity of 175 cumecs.
- Please note that Mill Creek has never topped its capacity, but should be regularly maintained. In the 20 years we have owned our property, the mill creek has only been maintained once and this was last year 2023.
- Also note from residents that have lived in our area for quite a number of years mentioned to us that if the silverstream was maintained and if residents built 1 metre above ground that they would be fine due to flooding. Please note that all new builds that had build 1 metre above near us have never been flooded. PLEASE NOTE THAT IT WILL BE ALL OF MOSGIEL NOT JUST US.
- That the culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road West/Dukes Road South are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey the spilt water from Gordon Road Spillway to the Upper Ponding Area, as designed.
- Pleas review the design of the culvet that is facing directly to our property =====). I have spoken to the ORC and they have come out and said they can not do anything about it. Please review and maintain to prevent this issue.

**Respondent: Roger Chittock**

**Submission Number:** 407

**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 02:20

**Otago's challenges and opportunities**

**Comment Number: 2**

**Do you have any feedback about the challenges and opportunities facing Otago?**

Lack of financial management and lwi interference and number of consents needed

**Otago's focus areas**

**Comment Number: 3**

**Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?**

Waterways (River etc) plus Roothing

**Comment Number: 4**

**~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment**

**Do you support this proposal?**

\* No

**!Bus services in Dunedin**

**Comment Number: 5**

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* Yes

**Please comment**

They must be funded by user pay system. Rural people cannot be expected to fund Public Transport when we pay for all our transport

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 6

**Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?**

\* No

### !Public Transport rates funding

Comment Number: 7

**Tell us what you think**

\* support targeted transport rates being charged on a fixed rate in a given area (i.e. uniform rate)

**Any other feedback?**

Being rural people, we don't have public transport, should be user pays

### !Paying back what we borrowed

Comment Number: 8

**Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

### !Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management

Comment Number: 9

**Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support 90% of all drainage schemes being rated based on drainage scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 10% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* Yes

**Do you support the general rate allocation being applied across Otago?**

\* Yes

### !Targeted rate allocations

Comment Number: 10

**Do you support reducing the number of benefit zones for flood and drainage targeted rates?**

\* No

**Please comment**

Every area can be affected by flooding

**Do you have any other feedback on the flood and drainage rating proposals?**

the waterway must be kept clear of willows. Large build ups of gravel on river beaches because bank erosion. Bridge abutments being washed out. Build up of trash on bridge piles must be cleared. River mouths kept clear and open. Riparian plantings should be at least 2 metres from waters edge. Gravel extracted from rivers should be used on road maintenance helping costs

**!Catchment Management funding****Comment Number: 12****Do you support establishing a new catchment management rate, which would be rated across Otago based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the proposed catchment rate**

Capital value rating is unfair to progressive landowners

**!Navigational safety****Comment Number: 13****Do you support a new navigational safety rate to fund harbour and navigational safety activity, which would be rated across Otago (except Queenstown Lakes) based on capital value?**

\* No

**Please comment on the navigational safety rate**

Harbour Boards problem

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 14****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* Yes

**Infrastructure Strategy****Comment Number: 15****Do you have feedback about the draft infrastructure strategy, which focuses on flood, drainage and river control infrastructure?**

River management important part.

Working with local farming folk who live by and know the rivers. Willow clearance a major priority

**Financial Strategy****Comment Number: 16**

**Do you have feedback about our financial strategy?**

Sound practical thinking - instead of a lot of wasteful spending

**How we fund our work**

**Comment Number: 17**

**Do you have any feedback about the proposed increase in rates?**

The overall management of finances and work structure and practical common sense should be looked at.  
Less interference from 'outside bodies' e.g consents iwi and health and safety out of control.

the rabbits Otago wide Canadian Geese (Wanaka) and possums are all out of control

## Respondent: Carrie Williams

Submission Number: 408

On-behalf of: Queenstown-Lakes District Council

Submission Date: 03/05/24 04:39

### About You

Comment Number: 1

### Attend Hearing

Comment Number: 2

Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?

\* Yes

### Otago's focus areas

Comment Number: 3

Do you have any feedback about our focus areas for the next 10 years?

#### 2.7. Recommendations:

2.8.1. QLDC reinforces its commitment to partnering with ORC to achieve strategic goals and outcomes.

2.8.2. It is recommended that the LTP identify both the value of the Grow Well Whaiora Partnership, as well as its role as a key means by which to deliver outcomes for the district and wider region.

### ~Proposal 1: Investing in our Environment

Comment Number: 4

Do you support this proposal?

\* Yes

What level of total funding should be available?

\* \$2 million

How should this initiative be funded?

\* A regional Otago wide rate (i.e. general rate or catchment management rate)

### !Bus services in Queenstown Lakes

Comment Number: 6

Do you support the increased investment and the addition of extra services?

\* Yes



**Please comment**

Levels of services for public transport in the QLD need to be retained and enhanced to provide a high-quality public transport experience. 4.9.2. An increase in ferry services is recommended, rather than the proposed status quo. 4.9.3. Demand led public transport provision should be replaced with a customer-centric approach that drives behaviour change. 4.9.4. More detail is required as to the important role of active travel and a commensurate level of investment. Recommendations: 5.5.1. The provision of public transport in the Upper Clutha by year four of the LTP is strongly supported, and additional trials are opposed.

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 7****Tell us what you think  
Any other feedback?**

It is recommended that the targeted rate for the Upper Clutha be deferred, and consulted on as part of the next LTP cycle in three years when the community has information around the cost and nature of service proposed. 6.7.3. QLDC does not support the 20% Otago wide general rate for public transport, and proposes that this be increased to 30%. 6.7.4. The proposal to charge targeted transport rates on a fixed rate in given areas is not supported. QLDC supports this being determined on a capital value basis, and recommends that other funding options be considered to ensure that visitors to the district are contributing to public transport.

**!Paying back what we borrowed****Comment Number: 8****Do you support repayment of existing transport deficits over 5 years?**

\* No

**What period should deficits be repaid over?**

\* 10 years

**Please comment**

The proposed timing of repayment of existing transport deficits over five years is not supported by QLDC. It is recommended that this be done over ten years, in order to smooth the impact on rates. 6.7.6. The capital value method for determining rates contribution from the QLD should be reconsidered to achieve a more equitable distribution of revenue gathered and service allocation across the region.

**!Flood Protection, Drainage and River Management****Comment Number: 10****Do you support 80% of all flood protection schemes being rated based on flood scheme areas (i.e. targeted rates) and 20% through Otago wide rates (i.e. general rates)?**

\* No

**Please comment on flood protection scheme rates**

QLDC is concerned that the proposed 20% general rate/80% targeted rate for flood protection and river management across the region does not provide a sufficiently tailored response that serves the needs of the QLD. QLDC acknowledges the need to balance the general benefits all communities receive from river management and the location specific benefits of protection schemes, however, QLDC would prefer that the LTP better acknowledge the unique needs of the QLD and the dynamic nature of its alpine landscape and river catchments.

**!Wilding pine control****Comment Number: 9****Do you support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control groups?**

\* No

**Please comment on the wilding tree rate proposed change**

QLDC does not support discontinuing the wilding tree rate and using the biosecurity rate to fund support for wilding conifer control activities.

**~Environment****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback****Proposal 1 Comments**

That a robust strategy be developed which actively seeks further environmental investment from third parties to reduce the impact on rates.

3.8.4. That QLDs community groups be provided with a funding model to allow them to undertake biodiversity work. Where appropriate, this funding should be on a high-trust, long-term basis for efficiency and security.

3.8.5. The QLD warrants a higher level of investment for projects where an ecological emergency has been declared, and on account of the number of threatened species and vulnerable biomes.

3.8.6 It is recommended that ORC considers an Otago wide general rate for biodiversity restoration due to the common good benefits.

3.8.7 It is requested that the QLD be defined as the 'Queenstown Lakes District' rather than Queenstown through the LTP to avoid confusion on the document's application to different geographical areas.

3.8.8 In the case of targeted rates, it is requested that further clarity be provided on how funding will be distributed across districts to ensure equitable distribution.

**ICM****Recommendations**

The provision of sufficient funding for the implementation of the Catchment Action Plan in the QLD is recommended. 8.8.3. That a multi-year specific funding allocation be identified for the Lake Hayes/Waiwhakaata remediation project.

**Background**

QLDC strongly supports ORC's Integrated Catchment Management (ICM) programme and welcomes the efforts to launch ICM initiatives within the district. However, QLDC would like to ensure there is sufficient funding for the implementation of the Catchment Action Plan in the QLD following the development phase.

**Lake Hayes/Waiwhakaata remediation**

ORC's strong commitment to the Lake Hayes/Waiwhakaata remediation project is recognised as a leading example of collaborative partnership with mana whenua and community stakeholders. The potential of this project to deliver transformational remediation of an iconic and culturally significant water body is an exciting prospect that could pave the way for broader catchment level improvements within the Whakatipu basin. QLDC strongly encourages a commitment to allocate a multi-year specific budget line of funding and resource allocation specifically to this ambitious project to ensure that the potential intergenerational outcomes can be effectively delivered.

**~Climate change and Resilience****Comment Number: 11**

### **Do you have any feedback**

Recommendations:

8.8.1. That explicit support for a strategic, coordinated and long term approach between ORC and Otago's territorial authorities be provided in the LTP to ensure efficient and effective natural hazard risk decision-making tailored to the needs of each district.

### **Submission background**

QLDC acknowledges the critical role of flood protection, drainage, river management and other hazard management activities across Otago. With an increasing frequency and intensity of storm events, Otago's people, property and communities will experience additional effects from natural hazards.

QLDC is working with ORC in their assessment of natural hazards (including flooding) in and around Glenorchy (in the area known as the 'head of the lake'), and ORC has been working with QLDC on other natural hazard projects in the district (i.e. Brewery Creek and Reavers Lane natural hazard management). QLDC appreciates this working relationship and emphasises the need to continue and grow a strong and collaborative approach to the management of the natural hazard challenges that the district will face in the coming years.

8.4. QLDC considers that natural hazard risk management will be a key feature of all future land use decision making, and local government will be at the forefront of addressing these challenging decisions. LTPs will need to carefully consider how to meet the financial questions in regard to this matter. QLDC strongly advocates for a strategic and coordinated approach within and between ORC and Otago's territorial authorities to address natural hazard risk. Local government is far more effective and efficient when we work together to share expertise, experiences and resources.

QLDC strongly supports proactive efforts by ORC13 to undertake a region-wide risk assessment (as directed by the decisions version of the Otago Regional Policy Statement). QLDC advocates that this activity happen alongside early engagement from territorial authorities.

**Respondent: Simon Telfer****Submission Number:** 409**On-behalf of:** Wanaka Upper Clutha Community Board**Submission Date:** 03/05/24 04:42**About You****Comment Number: 1****Attend Hearing****Comment Number: 2****Would you like to speak about your submission at a council meeting?**

\* Yes

**!Public Transport rates funding****Comment Number: 3****Tell us what you think****Any other feedback?**

We do not support the targeted rate portion of transport rates being on a district-wide basis and recommend that such a rate be deferred for the Upper Clutha until such time as it is associated with the provision of a public transport service

**~Environment****Comment Number: 5****Do you have any feedback**

We strongly support submissions from Wai Wānaka, Guardians of Lake Hāwea and Guardians of Lake Wānaka and echo the need for deep investment into environmental funds.

**~Transport****Comment Number: 4****Do you have any feedback**

We recommend that the targeted rate for the Upper Clutha be deferred and consulted on as part of the next LTP cycle in three years when the community has information around the cost and nature of services proposed.

5. We encourage ORC to be innovative in its provision of public transport services including the substantive use of technology and consideration given to collaborating with private sector interests around funding and service delivery.

6. We would like ORC to pay particular attention to Community Network's submission and the learnings they have gleaned from the two public transport trials conducted in the ward over the past two years.

7. Wānaka's active transport network is evolving quickly and we encourage ORC to recognise this when considering transport solutions for our area. This includes the role active transport can play in the first mile/last mile of journeys and the integration of other forms of personal mobility devices using active transport infrastructure.



# Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

Sub- No	Submitter Name	Organisation	ORC Activity	Summary of Submitter Request	Manager Recommendations [for Council Deliberation]
19	J	Blampied	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	Privatise the bus service 100% and focus on infrastructure	No Change to the LTP Significant political decision of Council required to move out of the provision of public transport services.
33-2	Emerson	Pratt	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	I find it hard to support an increase to public transport when my current bus stop is 3.2km walk away (Living in East Taieri. Options are either to walk along SH1 with no footpath (1.5 km to bus stop) or 3.2km via footpaths). I would be more willing to see a proposal that saw increase in service frequency as well as bus routes that better serve rate payers. We are literally looking at moving to a location that is better served by public transport.	No Change to the LTP Acknowledge that the submitter does not currently reside within a walkable distance of a bus stop. However, the current level of investment proposed in the LTP, and given likely limited co-investment from NZTA, Council cannot extend scheduled PT services to East Taieri. A future review can consider how East Taieri might be included in the Mosgiel Circular Routes (route 80 & 81).
54-1	Allison	Tschirley	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	This strategy will be very important in moving us away from single-occupancy vehicles. The increase in routes and frequency will make public transport an easier option to choose for many people. I would like to propose an added bus stop at Goodwood Road where it meets State Highway 1 (closer to Waikouaiti). The #1 bus already passes and the bus driver is very helpful in dropping you off there if you ask, but if it were an official bus stop then it would be on the bus route map, encouraging the locals to consider it as an option for transport and encouraging tourists to take the short walk down to the end of wetlands road to visit the beautiful Pleasant River Estuary, or to bike down to Tavora Reserve. Thank you	No Change to the LTP, noting that consideration can be given to the location of an additional bus stop at Goodwood Road within the current LTP proposed funding
71-2	Mac	Robertson	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	I would also like to see increased evening bus services to Brighton.	No Change to the LTP, Additional evening bus services could not be provided within the current proposed funding of PT in the LTP. To run two (evening) return trips between Brighton & Green Island would cost in the order of \$70,000 per annum. It is unlikely these service will attract co-investment from NZTA and it is therefore unlikely to be accepted for consideration in the short-medium term
198-2	Anne Warrington	Blair	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	PT services to Outram	No Change to the LTP, PT services to Outram are not provided for within the current LTP investment proposal for PT. Such services would be unlikely to attract co-investment from the National Land Transport Fund [NLTF] in 2024 to 2027, and it is therefore unlikely to be accepted for consideration in the short-medium term.
393-4		Waikouaiti Coast Community Board	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>The bus service on Route 1 Palmerston to Dunedin has been the subject of previous submissions from us to ORC. After many years of asking, it was pleasing to finally have a weekend bus service for our north coast region. It is proving to be popular, but some minor tweaks to the timetable would be appropriate.</p> <p>We do have a problem with periodic overcrowding on an afternoon service returning north from the city. Following discussion with your transport team it was suggested that we make a formal request for an extra bus to Warrington in the afternoons during school terms. We did this on 12th December and we have not yet had a formal response.</p> <p>We also hear complaints from parents who are unsure if their children will be dropped off at Evansdale, or if they will be on a bus travelling into Warrington. We would like some formal clarity on this. There is no mention of Warrington in your published timetable.</p>	<p>Recommended change to the LTP work programme assuming no increased funding requirement</p> <p>Minor changes to the time-tabling of Route 1 weekend services could be achieved within proposed expenditure.</p> <p>If passengers cannot all be seated this can be perceived as "overcrowding" event thought the service is operating within comp+G17liance. May especially be the case, such as route 1, for service operating on the open road. Additional services were introduced progressively on Route 1 between October 2022 and April 2023. We have limited ability to make further changes without a full review for a variation, at which time Council would need to consider the full operating cost changes. It is not recommended that changes to the Warrington services are made in response to this submission, because the frequency and service span was considered as part of the Fares &amp; Frequencies BC and no case was found to make changes at this point in time.</p> <p>Warrington is not currently a scheduled stop, it was introduced as the starting point of the banker bus for the 7.00am weekday service from Palmerston introduced in April 2023.</p>

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

64-12	Helen Chapman	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>Improving public transport frequency, reach and reliability is essential for community wellbeing and emissions reductions. I would support extra frequency being considered on other routes than just the proposed routes. Low frequencies are a barrier to many using public transport if they cannot travel when they need to.</p> <p>I oppose ratepayers funding buses for low-cost budget cruise travellers who do not respect the local community. I would like ORC to work with DCC, Port Otago and Cruise companies to find a longer-term solution where ratepayers are not subsidising tourists, and the children and elderly of West Harbour are not expected to suffer the consequences of overcrowding of buses by tourists. I would like to cruise companies to be forced to take responsibility for transporting passengers to the city.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Acknowledge the submitter's support for extra frequencies on additional routes. However, ORC has received advice from NZTA that it does not support this higher level of investment to increase frequencies for additional services. Council would need to fund the shortfall via increased rating and/or fares.</p> <p>In the 2023/24 ratepayers did not subsidise the travel of tourists arriving on Cruise Ships. ORC cannot prevent people taking public transport based on where they live or the purpose of a journey. The submitter's concern about cruise companies taking responsibility for transporting cruise ship passengers to the city, would best be raised with those cruise ship operators.</p>
217-4	Strath Taieri Community Board	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>As a minimum service to ratepayers, a twice weekly return service should be available on a prescribed timetable so as they can make firm commitments to attend appointments and be assured that transport will be available to achieve that. recommended that service be contracted locally in the Strath Taieri to minimise unnecessary travel and costs.</p> <p>An appropriate sized vehicle could leave Middlemarch at a specified time, collect residents enroute and return later that day.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>PT services for Strath Taieri/Middlemarch are not provided for within the current LTP investment proposal. Such services would be unlikely to attract co-investment from the NLTF in 2024 to 2027, and therefore are not recommended to be included in Council's activities at this time.</p>
199-3	Chardonna Kyle y	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>Services to Outram and Wingatui are not provided for within the current LTP investment proposal for PT. Such services would be unlikely to attract co-investment from the NLTF in 2024 to 2027, and therefore are not recommended to be included in Council's activities at this time. Highland Park is within an 8 to 12 minute walk of the current bus terminus in Mosgiel (being 300m from Ben Lomond Drive)</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Services to Outram and Wingatui are not provided for within the current LTP investment proposal for PT. Such services would be unlikely to attract co-investment from the National Land Transport Fund in 2024 to 2027, and therefore are not recommended to be included in Council's activities at this time. Highland Park is within an 8 to 12 minute walk of the current bus terminus in Mosgiel (being 300m from Ben Lomond Drive)</p>
200-2	George Alexander	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>Want services to East Taieri</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting that consideration be given to the extent that East Taieri might be included in a future review of the Mosgiel Circular Routes (route 80 &amp; 81)</p> <p>Scheduled PT services for East Taieri can not be provided within the current LTP investment proposal for PT. New services would be unlikely to attract co-investment from the NLTF in 2024 to 2027, and are not recommended to be included in Council's activities at this time.</p>
137-4	Harry Andrew	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>Request a service up the east coast.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Additional services along the east coast would cost in the order of \$50,000 per annum. No provision has been made in the Regional Land Transport Plan for these services and the direction of the draft Government Position Statement suggests that services would be unlikely to attract NZAT co-investment. Therefore it is not recommended to include in Council activity at this time.</p>
77-1	David Fynmore	Transport Proposal - Dunedin	<p>I support option 1 in the OCR transport proposal and do see a more frequent service for route 10 and 11, but this proposal is far too far off. The frequency needs to change now. Why has one of the best services years ago become one of the worst in recent years.</p> <p>As I am now 65 I am using the bus service on a much more regular basis however my big concern is the very poor Shiel Hill to Opoho and return service. The submitter provides detailed insight.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Support for increased frequency on route 10 is noted.</p>
35-1	Howard Scott	Transport Proposal - Queenstown Lakes	<p>I would like to see small 15 seater buses on routes that can be flagged down anywhere on route. No bus stop required. Once full (15) they do not take more passengers</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Approximately 1.5M trips will be taken on Queenstown buses this year, and to support population and residential growth this will need to effectively double. The suggested 15-seater buses would not cater for projected demand for PT in the Whakatipu Basin.</p>

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

37-15	John	Harris	Maori Point Wines	Transport Proposal - Queenstown Lakes	Access to Dunstan Hospital Public transport to major. Shopping areas	No Change to the LTP, There is provision in the LTP for the implementation of trial services between Alexandra, Clyde and Cromwell with a connection to Queenstown. The proposal is subject to receiving co-investment from NZTA.
337-5	Cath	Gilmour		Transport Proposal - Queenstown Lakes	I trust that the Hilton Hotel pays a significant fee to ORC, as the access to town provided by this ferry is fundamental to the hotel is an attraction. And that is why we (I am on the Kelvin Peninsula Community Association committee) hear complaints from locals who are left behind, through lack of space, at the Bayview marina. And therefore stuck waiting for another hour or more, or having to take the car/bike/kayak. This also points to it being a good idea to schedule more services during peak hours, especially over holiday peaks. For the same reason	No Change to the LTP, Ferry services are currently being recontracted. Negotiations are not inclusive of the provision of additional peak hour, holiday peak services. It is not recommended that additional peak hour ferry services, which would be unlikely to attract co-investment, be approved. "
56-1	Roy	Hill		Transport - must do work	A shuttle bus service between Oamaru and Dunedin Hospital is very much needed. There are a lot of people here that have great difficulty in getting to Dunedin.	Recommended adjustment to the LTP work programme, To investigate in year 1, within existing forecast resource, the feasibility of incorporating an Oamaru-Dunedin service within the 'Oamaru year 2 and 3 PT trial'. This could potentially be a scaled down service within Oamaru with an Oamaru-Palmerston connection to link to route 1 services. While this is subject to attracting co-investment from NZTA, provision has been made in the LTP to run trial Oamaru PT services.
40-9	Justinus	Yudistira		Transport - must do work	Make an agreement with ECan for a competitive bus service connecting Dunedin to Christchurch. Investigate the use of heavy rail in these routes Open an Oamaru-Dunedin bus service, or as an extension of the Parlmeston service move the bus routes heading to the university to frequent Create a bus route to Dunedin Airport every half an hour	No Change to the LTP, noting that subject to attracting co-investment, ORC is proposing to investigate and trial PT services between Dunedin and the Airport, and either around Oamaru, and/or between Oamaru and Dunedin.  Inter-regional PT was proposed as an activity class in the draft Government Position Statement (GPS) released before the election of the National-led Coalition government. The new GPS no longer has that funding provision. This signals that inter-regional PT is not a priority for this government and ORC & ECan would be unlikely to secure co-investment for Dunedin to Christchurch bus or rail services. Subject to attracting co-investment, ORC is proposing to investigate and trial PT services between Dunedin and the Airport, and either around Oamaru, and/or between Oamaru and Dunedin.
347-2			Community Networks/ LINK	Transport - must do work	- We believe that the Upper Clutha does not need an additional PT trial at this time, but rather suggest using the 2022-23 community shuttle trial data to inform development of a full service for Upper Clutha residents. A business case can be developed over the next few years and a targeted rate proposed in the next LTP cycle.- We suggest the focus of PT provision in Wanaka/Upper Clutha should initially focus on transport that connects the outlying suburbs of Lake Hawea, Hawea Flat, Albert Town, Luggate with the Wanaka CBD; and/or an on-demand service. Data from our shuttle trials supports this approach.- We request that progression of PT is thoroughly collaborative in its design & work with QLDC, regional tourist organisations, community groups, Chamber of Commerce, and other community members.	Recommended change the LTP work programme - that an Upper Clutha PT business case be included in the LTP, instead of the proposed PT Trial.  The pattern of land-use and the low population base of Upper Clutha presents challenges to the provision of public transport.  While acknowledging the short duration of the Community Shuttle Trials, the variable results suggest that a PT service for Upper Clutha will need full community support.
9	bob	bell		Transport - must do work	Now is not the time for costly trials that ratepayers pick up the tab for. Either user pays or leave it until better times	As per sub 347-2 above
28	William	Bishop		Transport - must do work	All transport levies and subsidies should be discontinued immediately and the public transport system returned to a user pays system. It is the height of stupidity to be running empty buses around the city, as is frequently seen, especially the Otago Peninsular service which must rate amongst the most uneconomic services in the country.	No Change to the LTP, Public Transport in Dunedin has not previously operated as a user-pays service. Record patronage growth, post COVID is, in turn, yielding high fare revenue, meaning Otago PT is not uneconomic compared with other networks services across the country. Providing regular and longer service spans, including 7day services is considered best practice PT planning for a Ridership network, which both Dunedin and Whakatipu are, and again, is key in driving the high patronage growth we are seeing on both networks. indicates



## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

48-1	David	Allard		Transport - must do work	There are too few people in the Wanaka area to pay for a viable transport system. However, over recent years private operators have established a useful taxi network. Some of these vehicles are hybrids etc and there may be the odd EV too. I suggest that rate payers within the Wanaka area be given a card which entitles them to a discount on any taxi journey. The ORC would pay the taxi operators appropriately to offset the discount given. There would be little capital cost involved, the number of taxis in operation would increase/decrease to meet the changing demand.	No Change to the LTP, Accept the premise of this submission that a taxi voucher might be the most cost effective means of supporting transport choice in Upper Clutha. In line with other staff recommendations, a business case could investigate appropriate PT for Upper Clutha.
52-1	Margaret	Henry		Transport - must do work	Bus service trial Balclutha to Dunedin including airport I would like ORC to add a stop at Allanton. Currently there is no public transport between Allanton/Outram and the city unless by taking a bus from Mosgiel. A bus stop at Allanton would give residents in these areas an opportunity to "park and ride" and reduce the numbers of vehicles travelling into the city. Also there are thousands of people through Dunedin airport every day and the only transport options are shuttles, taxis or pick up by friends/family. A space for parking cars would need to be available in Allanton.	No Change to the LTP, We acknowledge the support for the proposed Balclutha to Dunedin service via the airport. A stop at Allanton could be considered in the service design. Park and ride is a matter for Dunedin City Council.
64-6	Helen	Chapman		Transport - must do work	In addition to the proposed trials. I request that ORC consider introducing on-demand services to communities within Dunedin who are not currently served by public transport, like Purakaunui and Aramoana. Many elderly people live in these communities and as driving becomes more challenging they lose independent mobility and must rely on friends and family for transport.	No change to LTP, Per ride subsidies for on-demand PT trips in NZ have ranged from \$12 to \$35. Due to distance and low density it is anticipated that per ride subsidies for on-demand PT services for the areas suggested by the submitter would be at the upper end of the range. Other than being the submitter's suggestion there is nothing to support a decision of Council to invest in these communities and any other of similar communities across the region.
93-19	Faye	Powell-Moore		Transport - must do work	These are all very exciting ideas to trial, I will add that I would also be extremely interested in a train service between Christchurch	Support noted Inter-regional PT was proposed as an activity class in the draft Government Position Statement (GPS) released before the election of the National-led Coalition government. The new GPS no longer has that funding provision. This signals that inter-regional PT is not a priority for this government and ORC & ECan would be unlikely to secure co-investment for Dunedin to Christchurch bus or rail services.
391-3	Sarah & Davie	Nitis	Dunedin Tracks Network Trust	Transport - must do work	We, the Dunedin Tracks Network Trust, ask that the Otago Regional Council consider: 1. Providing financial support for the Dunedin Trails Network Trust of \$50k, in collaboration with and matched by the DCC, to complete the pre-build design and consenting work (including landowner permission, legal easements, design, resource consent and administration) Section 5a of the Coastal Communities Cycle Connection and Section 1 of the Taieri Trail, plus key bridges required at Waikouaiti and Outram. 2. Formally supporting, jointly with the DCC, the Trusts vision of the proposed 5 key, on road, shared use trails for Dunedin City; in addition to the Ta Aka Otakou and Dunedin Tunnels Trail. Including these in transport, recreation, wellbeing and environmental planning documents into the future; especially ensuring both the Taieri Trail and the Coastal Communities Cycle Connection are in the Otago Southland Regional Transport Plan as a part of the integrated regional land transport network. 3. In conjunction with the proposed 'Large Scale Environmental Fund', establish a contestable fund of \$500,000 to support the development of a connected network of trails across the Otago region. 4. Enable and support the use of food protection assets for the development of trails (including the use of stop banks).	Recommended Change to LTP funding and programme - accept this submission in part and allocate \$50,000 in Y2 for potential sponsorship of this or other activity that would deliver on the Public and Active Transport Connectivity Strategy.  Council will be developing a Regional Public & Active Transport Connectivity Strategy this year. That Strategy could guide ORC's financial support for partner organisations such as Dunedin Track Network Trust. Consideration could also be given to the establishment of a larger contestable fund, as suggested in the submission, at a later date and following the completion of the Strategy.  Note: ORC cannot determine matched funding from DCC.
25	Logan	Clarke		Transport - must do work	Trial Bus Services are very relevant to the needs of the expanding Dunedin-Mosgiel urban area and connecting the airport frequently will enable far more reliable service for passengers without using private operators.	No Change to the LTP, We acknowledge the submitter's support for the proposed trial bus services.
362	Mary	O'Brien	CCs Disability Action	Transport - must do work	Requests That Council consult with disabled people to gain insight into local access requirements and provides fully accessible, electric buses.	No Change to the LTP, We note the submitter's request and will continue to involve Disability advocates and the perspective of disabled people within our Transport planning and operations.

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

378-3 Dave	Macpherson Save our Trains	Transport - must do work	<p>Intercity PT</p> <p>That funding sought for the scoping studies be split evenly between Otago/Southland and Canterbury, charged as a targeted rate to properties within 10kms of likely railway stations, totalling \$172,000</p> <p>Otago Regional Council – primarily Dunedin urban area, Oamaru &amp; Balclutha</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 55,000 properties in catchment</li> <li>- One-off targeted rate of \$1.20 in 2024/5</li> <li>- Yield = \$66,000 approx</li> </ul>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>Noting that a scoping study as suggested by the submitter would not attract co-investment from NZTA (as a "strategic case"/feasibility study/scoping study)</p>
394-1	CITY RISE UP	Transport - must do work	<p>I applaud "significant focus to the areas of 'public transport'</p> <p>*I do not applaud City Rise South not being mentioned. I have made submission after submission to having City Rise, Central Dunedin highlighted as having an inadequate public transport service. ORC axed our adequate bus service 7yrs ago! Instead you talk of increasing the 'popular' routes. Nothing is popular if it doesn't exist!</p> <p>The hill directly above the city is the oldest suburb and has a high density population. Many are students and/or long term residents. There are five major schools and nursery depots here. Thousands of kids are driven &amp; dropped off here each day.</p> <p>There is no a service going across the hill to the Bus Hub, Hospital &amp; university. So they use cars. Hundreds of them line the streets. City Rise has become one giant car park. Unless people live/work near the up/down the hill bus routes of Stuart St and City Road they own a car and drive. It's a very steep hill!</p> <p>For a cheap and easy solution, please refer to my recent 'in person' submission to the full Otago Regional Council to divert no 63 bus ACROSS to Maori Rd Arthur St, hub and beyond. (Instead of 61 &amp; 63 sailing down High St together.)</p> <p>*Good to see electric buses. For our city with hills and tight bends there need to be smaller models.</p> <p>2. I wish to support the submission to from 'Save Our Trains Otepoti'. I think this Carbon Footprint image is worthy of scrutiny. ALL must reduce carbon footprint. I am about to be care-free (like the increasing population of seniors) and sell my EV. If we wish to travel long distance we need trains. That goes for all. (Not just for expensive travel excursions.)</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>The route referred to by the submitter was withdrawn when changes were made to the Dunedin network to implement a "ridership" network in 2017. Ridership networks feature more frequent services on more direct routes. The patronage growth on the network (COVID excepted) indicate that the ridership model is working well. Following the 2017 review a further change to route 19 was made to service the schools &amp; nursery on/around Arthur St. However, there will always be potential customers for whom a network change will not work. Inner city areas can be disadvantaged because of their proximity to the key destination of the CBD, meaning that some residents will choose to walk or cycle instead of choosing PT even if available. While acknowledging the hilly location it is not recommended that this submission be accepted.</p>
390-5	Lightfoot Initiative Charitable Trust	Transport - must do work	<p>Lightfoot appreciates the investment that has gone into providing the bus service in Queenstown. It is encouraging to see numbers continuing to increase post-Covid-19. Recent changes to the network through adaptations of times and routes, along with an increase in overall reliability across the network, continues to grow public confidence in the service. The \$2 fare ensures that bus use is affordable and accessible to most. The recent proposed changes in the Government Policy Statement on Transport, where cost of travel will be absorbed by the user, with decreased subsidy from government, will have a significant impact in Queenstown.</p> <p>We urge the ORC to avoid fare increases where possible. More community education is needed so the community better understand why the bus service is essential, how their rates are used to subsidise it, and the impact the service has on reducing congestion and emissions.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>We acknowledge the submitter's support for investment Queenstown bus services. We note the support for the \$2.00 fare (Adult Bee Card), which is not proposed to be changed through the LTP. Community education will go alongside the delivery of PT improvements in line with the Queenstown Public Transport Business case. In addition ORC will seek to promote the convenience of PT throughout the disruption resulting from the periods of significant road works over the coming years.</p>
387-2	Dunedin Tunnel Trail Trust	Transport - must do work	<p>we strongly urge the ORC to continue to commit to cycling: specifically the Tunnels Trail, as an identified project within the LTP.</p> <p>Further detail in the submission</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP,</p> <p>We acknowledge the need to integrate public and active transport networks across Otago, however expertise in the design and construction of cycling infrastructure tends to sit in the territorial authorities, such as Dunedin City Council.</p>

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

52-4	Margaret Henry	Climate change and Resilience- Emergency Mgmt	<p>Emergency management: plan for Outram</p> <p>In nearly 10 years of talk very little has been accomplished in developing and implementing an emergency plan for Outram. Mosgiel has had one for years. The Outram community is vulnerable and flooding as recently as 2017 cut off the township.</p> <p>The responsibility for emergency management lies with the ORC who have devolved this to the DCC and the Mosgiel/Taieri Community Board. All have failed Outram.</p> <p>The Chairman of the MTCB spoke at an ORC meeting on flood protection and the Lower Taieri area in Outram last year . In spite of that, the progress to date seems to have advanced only as far as concern about being cut off:</p> <p>"Outram Emergency Group Dean McAlwee advised that they are looking at pulling their own information together to keep in touch with the communities in the area, as in an emergency, there is a concern that the communities may be cut off."</p> <p>Actually the community has been thinking that for the last 10 years. Finally the MTCB has caught up. When will there be an actual plan with actual information about where to go and what to do in the event the township is cut off or the flooding so severe evacuations are needed?</p> <p>ORC this delay is unacceptable. You need to step in and ensure that the work gets done. There has been far too much hot air from the MTCB and no progress. The MTCB is clearly not up to the task. If local politics are the reason, then ORC needs to sort out the location of an evacuation centre in the township and in the event of cell phone network collapse, methods of communication. The advise the community of the plan.</p> <p>This is urgent. Climate change and heavier rainfall and rising sea levels will catch us out with the possibility of lives lost.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP</p> <p>Emergency Management Otago remains committed to delivering on our strategic goal of enabling, empowering, and supporting community resilience. We continue to work closely with the Dunedin City Council to ensure any community-based planning fits within their broader Civil Defence concept of operations.</p> <p>Additional resources have been employed to focus and prioritise community resilience activity within Dunedin City. Bespoke-integrated flood modeling for Outram and the Lower Taieri has been planned and budgeted for in year 2 of the LTP.</p>
90-3	Ruth Harvey	Climate change and Resilience	<p>The climate crisis will continue to bring existential crises to our door -- invest in this area heavily and act fast.</p> <p>You're going to have to work hard to educate the public about what you have to do and why -- people are going to struggle to adapt and let go of the ways things have always been done. You'll have to have courage, and be creative -- pay artists and creatives from communities to help share your vision for the future and its benefits.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP</p> <p>The Strategic Climate Action Plan [SCAP] will include both mitigation and adaptation, identify goals, and identify where resources need to be focussed. We will be consulting the general public on the SCAP in August and there will be some who feel that it is not ambitious enough, but the initial Implementation Plan is limited by available resources. A gaps analysis will be undertaken in Yr 1, and business cases built for any new/increased/refocussed work programmes so that these can be considered for inclusion in the next LTP.</p>
379-8	Disabled Persons Assembly	Climate change and Resilience	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> that the ORC makes a considerable contribution to fund any outcomes stemming from community feedback into the South Dunedin Future long term plan due in 2026.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> that there is increased investment in flood and drainage scheme maintenance, as well as operational and capital projects to increase flood and river resilience throughout the region.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> that ORC allocates additional spending to civil defence and emergency management over the lifespan of the LTP in expectation of the increased number of climate change related and other emergencies.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> that disabled people are appointed to Otago regional civil defence and emergency management governance committees to ensure that our community's voice is heard in both the emergency planning and response spaces.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP- noting</p> <p>There is already budget allocated (Yr1 to 10) in the draft long term plan to continue the collaborative work with DCC on the South Dunedin Future Programme. Further budget contribution will depend on the outcome of the SDF programme and plan (due in 2026) and will be considered during the preparation of the ORC 2027-37 long term plan if required.</p> <p>The LTP, via the proposed Infrastructure Strategy, provides increased capital expenditure to improve the resilience of flood assets. It also provides increases operational expenditure for maintenance and river management.</p> <p>Additional spending (Emergency Management) has been planned with an extra resource employed to support our district-based activity within Dunedin City. This resource will remain throughout the LTP.</p> <p>Disabled people representatives are key stakeholders on our Regional Welfare Coordination Committee (Response). As a group, they will also be prioritised as those 'disproportionately impacted by emergencies' as we commence planning and consultation (due to begin in August 2024) for our next Group Plan (Strategic Planning).</p>
144-5	National Public Health Service Te Waipounamu	Climate change and Resilience	<p>NPHS Te Waipounamu appreciates the work ORC have underway with the Climate Change Strategy. In conjunction with ORC, we are currently working with Local Authorities across Otago to see if there is value in replicating workshops that were undertaken in the Canterbury Region looking at understanding the human health impacts of climate change across Otago.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>This action is included in draft Implementation Plan for the Strategic Climate Action Plan (climate strategy). No further commitment required at this stage.</p>

# Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

404	Dunedin City Council	Climate change and Resilience	Requests: More funding for Climate change action such as the implementation of natural hazards management and adaptation programmes based on the Otago Natural Hazard. Inclusion of coastal communities, such as Long Beach, Osborne, and Aramoana within adaptation programmes.	No Change to the LTP, noting A natural hazards regional risk analysis and prioritisation process are currently under development and will be completed in 2024. A prioritised list of locations for future natural hazards adaptation or hazard management work will be completed by end of year 2 in collaboration (among other organisations) with territorial authorities. It is then planned to commence targeted investigations to inform adaptation or hazard management work for higher priority locations from year 3 to year 10. There is currently funding in the 2024-2034 LTP for this work (year 1 to year 10). An update on the regional risk analysis and prioritisation process was presented to Council in early May 2024 (workshop recording available on: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=opqk8vN-9mE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=opqk8vN-9mE</a>  ORC in collaboration with DCC have completed, in February 2024, a coastal hazard screening to identify hot spots in the Dunedin area in relation to coastal hazards. This work with DCC will continue and may result in the development of adaptation programmes for exposed coastal communities depending on the level of risk.
408	Queenstown Lakes District Council	Climate change and Resilience	Requests: ORC expresses explicit support in the LTP for a strategic, coordinated and long term approach between ORC and Otago's territorial authorities to ensure efficient and effective natural hazard risk decision-making tailored to the needs of each district.	No Change to the LTP, noting - As per Sub 404 response
39-16 Janelle	Bilcliffe	Infrastructure Strategy	Climate change should be about managing growth into areas which are at risk of erosion or weather events and limiting it to that. managing existing infrastructure and managing long term what will be repaired after events and what will not.	No change to the LTP ORC engages with territorial authorities about growth and the subsequent impact on ORC's flood protection, drainage and river management infrastructure through their respective District Plan processes, and where relevant through the development of their Future Development Strategies.
151-3 Pierre	Marasti	Infrastructure Strategy	With a Climate Change perspective, I support necessary flood protection work keeping in mind that managed retread will be necessary at some point, but I do not want to participate (pay for) in the destruction of wetlands through drainage. Drained areas are the first ones we need to retreat from and we should start rewilding them right away.	No change to the LTP
152-1 Jo	Ashe Marasti	Infrastructure Strategy	I support flood protection in areas affected by Climate change. However I don't support unnecessary drainage of wetland areas, as these areas should be rewilded.	No change to the LTP
217-2 Barry	Williams	Strath Taieri Community Board	Infrastructure Strategy	Security and integrity of infrastructure from flooding. There is an ongoing absolute need to resolve; as a matter of urgency; issues within and adjacent to the Middlemarch township with regard to flooding.  No change to the LTP ORC Engineering and Natural Hazards teams meet regularly with the Strath Taieri Community Board to provide updates on work programmes associated with river management activities and flood hazard mitigation in the Strath Taieri area. Budget has been allocated within the draft LTP to continue performing tactical maintenance within key waterways around Middlemarch and undertake further hazard mitigation investigations and improvements. Hazard mitigation investigations have commenced in the 2023/24 financial year.

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

136-2	Laurence Ashworth	Brownyn Miles	Infrastructure Strategy	<p>ORC gives urgent priority to restoring the Silver Steam Channel/Gordon Road spillway to at least 100% of its design capacity.</p> <p>That culverts of the M4 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East, and the M4/M3 drainage intersection at Riccarton Road East/Dukes Rd Sth are increased in size/upgraded to sufficiently provide land drainage and, in times of high flow events, convey spilt water from the Gordon Rd spillway to the Upper Ponding Area as designed.</p> <p>Related/very similiar submissions including:</p> <p>Sub 212-1 G &amp; J Black</p> <p>Sub 213 Bennet</p> <p>Sub 139 Burt &amp; Thompson</p> <p>Sub 214 Stevenson-Wright</p> <p>Sub 352 Bain</p> <p>Sub 364 Breen</p> <p>Sub 365 Glass</p> <p>Sub 385 Mosgiel Taieri Comunity Board</p> <p>Sub 124 &amp; 395 Pollit</p> <p>Sub 218 &amp; 367 Struthers</p> <p>Sub 336 Thompson/oliver</p> <p>Sub 58 Horne</p>	<p>No change to the LTP</p> <p>ORC has maintenance work scheduled to occur along the Silver Stream between Wingatui Road and the confluence of the Taieri River, including vegetation control activities on formed beaches and islands, in the current financial year. This work is scheduled for completion by the end of June 2024. ORC is also developing a broader programme of works to address restoration of the Silver Stream with a total budget of \$829,000 allocated over Years 1-4 of the LTP, with this working being incorporated in a routine programme of work to maintain channel capacity as part of ORC's broader river channel maintenance programme from Year 5 onwards.</p> <p>In relation to giving priority to the Silver Stream capacity maintenance work, acceleration of this work is limited by the time required to undertake planning works (hydraulic modelling and ecological assessment) and obtain resource consent, as well as any potential limitations imposed through resource consent conditions (seasonal working timeframes, methodology requirements etc.). As such, no changes are recommended in relation to the current programming of these works, noting that if consenting timeframes and resourcing (internal and external) allow, the physical work may be able to be expedited.</p> <p>The scope of work required to improve drainage at the intersection of the Riccarton Road East / Dukes Road South intersection, and further upstream at the at the intersection of the M4 drain and Riccarton Road East intersection, is currently being established with a view to progressing the design works in the 2023/24 financial year if consenting and resources allow.</p>	
142-2	Richard and Jennifer	Quelch	Infrastructure Strategy	<p>Request ORC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Restore design capacity to the Silver Stream and provide ongoing maintenance in the LTP</li><li>- Rates levied for above that reflects a broader benefit</li><li>- Mill creek diversion should be grated to prevent reverse flow in flood</li><li>- The impediment to flow caused by the height of Riccarton Rd West, below the bridge be addressed by resizing culverts and pipes.</li></ul>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>See comment in relation to Submission No. 136-2 (Row 50) above, and:</p> <p>There is drainage modelling and further investigations planned to start addressing potential improvements to the drainage network in East Taieri. This work will assist ORC in effectively planning and implementing improvements to scheme efficiency, such as additional gating or resizing of culverts. Modifications to existing culverts will be carried out within the scope of the culvert renewal programme where appropriate.</p>	
228-14	Andrew	Millar	Infrastructure Strategy	<p>There is no mention within the plan document of whether you are involved in encouraging/facilitating "letting the river run" in some catchments, as opposed to controlling/containing river systems. There is increasing evidence that giving rivers more space is the better long term option, particularly in the face of increasing flood frequency under climate change.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>The Infrastructure Strategy does talk to the room for river approach that may be adopted as an option within the PARA (Protect, Avoid, Retreat, Accommodate) Framework (Section 4) and through various programmes of work that do consider this approach.</p>	
339-2	Jim	Young	South Otago Forest and Bird	Environment	<p>We ask the Otago Regional Council to give increased attention and funding to issues in the Catlins, and support the proposal to provide \$2 million of dedicatedfunding per year for large-scale environmental projects.</p> <p>The Catlins, one of the few remaining areas in Otago with significant amounts ofofindigenous forest, should be established as a site-led programme, which would beadequately funded for the control of pests and weeds.</p> <p>Under the present and proposed Pest Management Plan there is no change to themanagement of pigs, deer, goats and other browsing pests.</p> <p>Maintenance of ecosystem health and diversity depends on reducing the numbers of browsing animals as well as possums, rodents, mustelids and feral cats.</p> <p>At the same time, the threat posed by invasive weeds mustn't be ignored.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP</p> <p>Appropriate resourcing would be required if the Catlin's was added as a site led programme. The submitter is correct that the species named are not included in the RPMP. The RPMP is planned to be reviewed prior to 2029 and both of these issues should be submitted upon at this stage. Forest and Bird could apply for funding for browsing animal control through large-scale funding.</p>
320-2		Southern Lakes Swim Club	Environment	<p>We strongly advocate for monitoring water quality in our lakes, and would like to see more monitoring.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting that the science/monitoring activity provides a budgeted programme for Lakes monitoring</p>	
320-2		Southern Lakes Swim Club	Environment	<p>We'd like to see a better level of understanding of where drains go, within the community, so people understand that storm water drains go into our lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP</p> <p>Catchment Advisors have piloted a stormwater education programme around Tomahawk Lagoon which we will look to roll out in other areas across the region.</p>	

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

74-10	Michel	Herde		Environment	Air quality is not monitored adequately in Dunedin. More sampling stations are needed to better document the poor air quality in areas e.g. Kaikorai Valley, Brockville, etc. These are low socioeconomic areas where still a lot of coal and fireplaces with wet firewood are used. A huge health burden for the communities living there.	No Change to the LTP Dunedin has two monitoring sites (Central Dunedin and Mosgiel) that are designed to be representative of the wider urban area. A review of the Regional Air Monitoring Network and the Regional Plan Air are budgeted in the proposed long-term plan.
158-2			Otago Peninsula Community Board	Environment	<p>The Board submits that this should be a priority for the Otago Regional Council so that conservation and biodiversity gains made on the Peninsula and other areas are able to be built on and enlarged.</p> <p>The rabbit problem in our community is high and this creates serious problems with predator/prey relationships for our area due to increased numbers of mustelids surviving on rabbits. This creates high risk for iconic species of birdlife such as Yellow-eyed Penguin and Blue Penguin through predation that the Peninsula and the City relies on for economic wealth and development. While the Otago Peninsula Biodiversity Trust has made excellent inroads in the possum numbers of the Peninsula and has formed a model of community led control, the opportunity is now required to extend that model onto the rabbit/mustelid issues that we have on the Peninsula.</p> <p>It is the submission of the Peninsula Community Board that resources in control, research and advocacy are required from the Otago Regional Council to support landowners and organisations who are undertaking this type of animal control on the Otago Peninsula. Again there is opportunity for information and resource sharing from the ORC and other agencies.</p>	No Change to LTP, noting that ORC will continue with reseach and advocacy. Large scale funding would allow for community groups to apply for pest control project/work
209-1			LINZ	Environment	<p>LINZ consider that the LTP does not fully cover or provide for ORC's statutory obligations relating to pest management under the Biosecurity Act or the ORC Biosecurity Strategy (from which the Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP) is derived, and which is specifically referenced in the Regional Pest Management Plan).</p> <p>The submission requests the ORC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- to fully support the monitoring of Lagarosiphon in the region and;</li><li>- provide significant long-term funding for controlling lagarosiphon within the lakes where there are current Lake Weed Management plans</li></ul> <p>The submission suggests/provides detail on expenditure options for managing 'lagarosiphon control. It also disputes the statement that ORC is the only agency with a remit across all of Otago to promote biodiversity protection and enhancement.</p> <p>LINZ supports the proposed 'moderate' increase in staff capacity to undertake more education, engagement, and enforcement to manage pests. However, notes a lack of priorities to physically undertake pest management work.</p> <p>LINZ dispute the statement that the ORC leads pest and biosecurity management in the Region. LINZ consider it a significant omission that it's biosecurity role in the region is not acknowledged in the proposed development of a regional partnership approach.</p>	No Change to the LTP ORC acknowledges LINZ role and values the work that has been completed The draft LTP allows for \$50,000 to be provided in funding to Toitū te whenua, Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) to manage lagarosiphon. This is considered on an annual basis. As a land owner/occupier LINZ have responsibilities to manage their resources just like any other landowner/occupier. Lagarosiphon is managed under a site-led programme in the Otago Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2029 whereby LINZ takes a lead role in controlling and eradicating lagarosiphon in Otago's lakes and rivers that it administers. ORC works collaboratively with LINZ and other partners in the preparation, administration, and delivery of 10-Year Management Plans for control of lagarosiphon and in other initiatives to deliver the outcomes and objectives of the Site-led programme. These initiatives include development and implementation of a comprehensive freshwater biosecurity programme, employment of a staff member with a focus on marine and freshwater biosecurity, and delivery of the national Check, Clean, Dry advocacy programme to support community awareness and behaviour change aimed to prevent establishment of lagarosiphon in waterbodies that it is not already present within. These initiatives support enhancing freshwater biosecurity across the region. It is understood that there is a shortfall in funding for LINZ to achieve an equivalent work programme to what they have undertaken over the past three years with the cessation of Jobs for Nature funding. The programme includes control, surveillance, and monitoring and the approximate shortfall is potentially 95K for Lake Whakatipu; 12K for the Kawarau River; and 445k for Lake Wānaka. This should be discussed at the central government level also.
381-3			Manuherekia Catchment Group	Environment	<p>Option 1</p> <p>What the Plan does not make clear is how the Council will determine its priorities for projects. Projects that will make a significant difference may need multi-year funding.</p> <p>Without the detail of how funds will be allocated it is difficult to understand how the fund will measure improving outcomes and importantly how the whole region will feel the benefit of this funding over time.</p> <p>Delaying introducing the charge until 2025/26 is appropriate; we would suggest that when the annual plan is prepared next year, the economic environment is considered to determine whether its introduction should be further delayed.</p>	No change to the LTP, however note that detail around of priorities, criteria and multi year funding are yet to be determined. This would occur during year 1 of the LTP and processes would be developed then.
159-2	Richard	Bowman	National Wilding Pine Network	Environment	<p>Request the Council to raise the priority of the wilding conifer problem in its' Long Term Plan. This would enable the provision of more financial as well as political support to increase the level of funding and to allow the programme to be completed in both Otago and across New Zealand over the next decade.</p> <p>The submission provides background about the reasons for this request.</p>	No Change to the LTP Wilding Conifers is identified as a priority pest in the ORC operational plan for biosecurity. ORC will continue to adocate for funding from central government

# Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

96	John	Cooney	Central Wilding Group	Environment	Requests a more widespread funding structure is prioritized so that the Wilding Control and Prevention programme is on a more stable and assured basis.	No Change to the LTP Wilding Conifers is identified as a priority pest in the ORC operational plan for biosecurity. ORC will continue to advocate for funding from central government
117-4	Murray	Gifford		Environment - Wilding pine control	More work needs to be done on Wilding pines. The Govt planted many of the pine forests and should pay for the damage they are causing.	No Change to the LTP, noting that ORC will continue its advocacy to central government for funding.
315-2			West Harbour Community Board	Environment	Pest Management: WHCB are strongly in favour of the ORC's efforts through the implementation of the Otago Pest Management Plan(External link) (PMP) to better manage and eradicate the pest plants and animals doing the most damage in Otago. Site-Led Programmes for "West Harbour " Mt Cargill", and "Quarantine and Goat Islands / Kamau Taurua"; areas (Page 59, ORC Pest Management Plan) are in place. WHCB encourage and request more active monitoring, management, and eradication across West Harbour for noxious weeds, especially those named in the ORC PMP (Banana Passionfruit, Darwin's Barberry, Sycamore, Gunnera, and Tradescantia) and pest animal species such as feral cats, feral rabbits, mustilids, rats, hedgehogs, and possums).	No Change to the LTP These are species identified in the RPMP under the site led programme for West H/Mt Cargill. ORC will continue to work to achieve the state objectives.
144-4			National Public Health Service Te Waipounamu	Environment	NPHS Te Waipounamu has supported ORC on the development of their Water and Land planthrough participation in some of the catchment conversations and high-level input on some of the underpinning principles. We look forward to supporting ORC as the current process isconcluded and we would like to provide support for its implementation as required.27. Air quality has a significant impact on respiratory health primarily from particulate matter andspecific chemicals of concern including Sulphur Dioxide (SO2), Carbon Monoxide (CO) andNitrogen Dioxide (NO2). NPHS Te Waipounamu supports extending the focus on air qualityto Milton as this is a more disadvantaged (higher deprivation7) community than Alexandra,Cromwell and Arrowtown. As air quality has a very real impact on public health13, we wouldwelcome the opportunity to work with you on updating the Regional Air Quality Strategy.	No Change to the LTP, noting The policy feedback has been passed to staff working on 'Land and Water Plan' implementation, and 'Air Plan' review.
215-3	Jim	McQuillan		Environment	Regarding proposal 1 - would like to see a project to Darwins barberry and sycamore throughout the West Harbour region, including Burns Park Scenic Reserve, that has been unchecked for decades.	No Change to the LTP, noting - Careful prioritisation work has occurred to support the site led areas within the RPMP of which West Harbour/Mt Cargill is one. This work will continue to understand which priority areas are to be focussed on each year.
340-2			Department of Conservation (DOC)	Environment	Environmental and climate challenges8. DOC endorses the identification of the environmental challenges noted in theplan as 'water quality and availability, soil and air quality, biodiversity loss,biosecurity threats and impacts on the coastal environment', and the climatechallenges noted as 'more impact from natural hazards, including storm andflood events'.Large scale environmental projects9. DOC supports the creation of a fund for large scale environmental projects.10. DOC supports that the new fund is in addition to ORC's existingenvironmental project funding.11. <b>DOC strongly recommends that the funding mechanism invests in a way thathelps drive financial sustainability in community groups, a point of differenceto your existing project funding. A focus on the financial sustainability ofcommunity groups will help to strengthen the resilience of the sector.12. DOC recommends that the environmental projects be prioritised based on thegreatest environmental need.</b> Wilding Pine Control13. DOC endorses the ongoing support and lift in funding for Wilding PineControl, and particularly the Wilding Pine Control Steering Group.Science and Monitoring14. <b>DOC endorses the continued focus on environmental monitoring programmes,including developing and implementing a regional indigenous biodiversityecosystem monitoring programme consistent with the NPS-IB.Integrated catchment management15.</b> DOC supports the development of Catchment Action Plans as per the Integrated Catchment Management programme.Lagarosiphon management16. DOC notes the importance of managing Lagarosiphon in Otago's lakes and drivers. There is no specific comment on this in the Plan, however DOC notes the importance of ORC's collaboration with LINZ to fund the management of this highly invasive pest.	No Change to the LTP, noting The LTP continues to support the points raised in the submission.
37-11	John	Harris	Maori Point Wines	Regional Leadership	Reduce costs of resource applications eg allow standard rules without detailed individual compliance requirements	No Change to the LTP, noting - Processing costs are based on a fixed fee, or deposit system and are processed inline with the RMA. Costs are kept as efficient as possible for scale of activity.

## Finance Committee: Long Term Plan Deliberations Agenda - 29 May 2023 - MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

315	Barbara	Anderson	West Harbour Community Board	Regional Leadership	<p>Requests:</p> <p>ORC provides clarity about the status of the 'Harbour User Group', noting that while the Port of Otago has been supporting a process they are also a user. Seeks a more active role from ORC.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting</p> <p>The ORC is currently reviewing issues and opportunities associated with Otago Harbour. This will include mapping roles and responsibilities and identifying any gaps in the current management approach. This work will be underpinned by a comprehensive cultural narrative from Te Rūnanga o Ōtākau, and will also include engagement with key stakeholders including community representatives. A report summarising the findings is due in October 2024 and will be brought to both ORC and DCC Councils to consider the next steps.</p>
349	Dugald	MacTavish	Wise Response Society	Regional Leadership	<p>The submissions provides an assessment and commentary on ORC's Strategic Directions and the associated goals contained within.</p>	<p>Notes the submission has been carefully considered by the ORC Strategy Team who are responsible for overseeing the development of the Strategic Directions for elected regional leadership and partners.</p>
355	Sandra	McKintyre	Kapaptipu Runanga	Regional Leadership	<p>Request funding support regarding their input and liaison with ECAN and ORC regarding Waitaki River Catchment work. Split funding between ECAN and ORC.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting - a proposal is going to Council for consideration in August. Staff anticipate if both ORC and ECan support the proposal in August, work will commence early in 2025. While details are still being developed, it is anticipated that co-funding would be required for an Independent Chair, a secretariat and funding for Aukaha. In Year 1 we anticipate this is likely to require funding in the order of \$50,000 however we would endeavour to cover this within existing budgets given there is currently no certainty that it will proceed. In Year 2, the funding will increase, requiring \$75,000 for Aukaha ( assuming 0.5 FTE), as well as \$75,000 for a secretariat (assuming cost sharing with ECan) and \$24,000 for an Independent Chair ( assuming cost sharing with ECan)</p>
366-9			QLDC Climate and Biodiversity Reference Group	Regional Leadership	<p>We also note that the Regulatory workstream will include ORC working with QLDC (and Dunedin City Council) to deliver on the new National Policy Statement on Urban Development. This work will have a significant impact on our Climate and Biodiversity Plan and brings in critical conversations about balancing land use, housing need, and transport options. We offer our support and expertise to the joint councils on this work given our role as the only Climate and Biodiversity Reference Group in the region.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>ORC staff are open to the reference group's advice and assistance, and would be amenable to working together with QLDC and the Reference Group on this topic.</p>
373			Otago Federated Farmers	Regional Leadership	<p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change strategic directions by broadening the notion of partnership as described in this submission.</li> <li>- ORC funds the establishment of a rural advisory group from its existing regional leadership budget.</li> <li>- ORC reduces regulatory costs to reflect Central Government Regulatory Changes to provide a tailwind for Otago</li> </ul>	<p>No change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>Partners and stakeholders are both important but each has potentially different needs and different preferences for how engagement should be undertaken. By separating them we are recognising different legislative obligations and organisational commitments but our aim to work collaboratively and constructively applies to both groups.</p> <p>Council will be considering the engagement framework in June and can make direction on this, but clear role and scope is important when establishing new groups, or changes to existing engagement channels.</p> <p>Feedback on keeping regulatory costs as low as possible is noted, but no changes are recommended. Making processes as efficient as possible to keep regulatory costs fair and reasonable are part of existing work programmes.</p>
408			Queenstown Lakes District Council	Regional Leadership	<p>Requests:</p> <p>That the LTP identify both the value of the Grow Well Whaiora Partnership, as well as its role as a key means by which to deliver outcomes for the district and wider region.</p>	<p>No Change to the LTP, noting -</p> <p>The LTP contains a commitment to continue its programme of working with the TA's on implementing the regional planning programme</p> <p>The LTP also contains new work to jointly deliver NPS UDS with Teir 2 District Councils.</p>













