



Economic Futures Forum – Draft Economic Development Strategy Feedback
Queenstown Memorial Hall, 23rd September 2014 (29 attendees)
Task Force – Tim Barke, Eric Billoud, Jane Shearer, Alistair Porter

The following feedback was gathered from the Shaping our Future community forum on the Draft Economic Development Strategy. It represents the views of the Queenstown community. Some of the feedback is included in the specific questions asked by the council in their feedback survey. The raw data from the forums is available by visiting www.shapingourfuture.org.nz or by contacting executive@shapingourfuture.org.nz.

General Comments:

Priority 1 – Encourage Higher Value Visitor Activity

- **The District needs to establish an EDA**, independent of Council, with a mandate to carry the message of what the community seeks. Any decisions need to consider impact on existing heritage & environment – the businesses in Queenstown are reliant on the natural environment and maintaining it. This is not currently well recognised in the document. E.g. tall buildings will reduce views, reduce sunlight and increase wind which will negatively impact Queenstown environment.
- **Convention Centre – don't build one if it is just ordinary**, it would need to be high quality. Carry out proper consultation on a fully described and costed proposal with cost/benefit analysis associated.
- **Projects and plans need to be world class and aspirational.**
- **Define infrastructure needed to give a great visitor experience.**
- **Broaden branding without devaluing current reputation for adventure.** Use the adventure and innovation brand already created and leverage off it. This can be done successfully by an independent EDA.

Priority 2 – Facilitate the Growth of Knowledge-Based Service Industries

- **Leverage off the existing adventure branding** as above. Change wording to 'facilitating entrepreneurship and innovation around our core strengths'
- The District needs **strategies to direct new business in education and technology**. We need a strategy to target types of business and sectors that enhance goals for District – maintaining heritage & environment. Logical industries to develop to maintain quality of the environment.
- **Establish EDU independent of QLDC.**

Priority 3 - Enhance the quality of the local environment

- **See point in Priority 1** above regarding protecting the natural environment.

- It was recommended that the title of this priority needed to be expanded to “**Enhance quality of commercial and living environment**”. It was recognised at the forums that there is a lack of affordable rental for commercial and living.

Priority 4 - Future Proof Infrastructure

- **Sell problems as ideal opportunity** to bring innovative people to come and work with the District to collaboratively create solutions.
- **Include transport options** in infrastructure considerations – opportunity for innovation.
- **Infrastructure (in the broad sense of the word i.e. buildings and the physical services they require) is highly important** – no point in having an excellent convention centre if we can’t invest in the infrastructure that make for an excellent commercial and living environment.

Note the following common themes that were seen as important in influencing an Economic Strategy:

- Don’t reinvent the wheel - don’t waste time and resource on investigating or doing things we are already doing successfully.
- Concern about the underlying assumption that growth is necessary and that this isn’t being questioned properly – there should be intelligent growth, not growth for its own sake.
- Council control – how much is necessary? How much is appropriate?

Specific Council Asked Questions:

1. Establish senior economic development capability and / or funding within the Queenstown Lakes District Council.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We can’t make a statement about the question because it is multiple questions within one. We think the statement should be “within the District”, not within the “Council”

The question should be broken into the following 3 questions (our answers in CAPS):

1. Should we establish senior economic development capability for the District? AGREE
2. Should we establish funding for such capability? AGREE BUT FUNDING MODEL NEEDS TO BE DETERMINED
3. Should it be within the QLDC? DISAGREE – MUST BE INDEPENDENT OF COUNCIL

3. Expand economic development activities to include industry development, education and investment promotion; assess how they could be integrated with a regional tourism organisation.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We cannot make a statement about this question because it is two questions in one. The question should be broken into the following 2 questions (our answers in CAPS):

1. "Create economic development activities including industry development, education and investment promotion." AGREE
2. "Should these be integrated into a regional tourism organisation." DISAGREE – EDU SHOULD BE INDEPENDENT OF COUNCIL BUT WITH COUNCIL REPRESENTATION. Note: the "DISAGREE" option was unanimous and it was considered that an EDU independent of QLDC would be the only acceptable option when discussed at SoF workshop. Other options not selected were: EDU fully inside Council, EDU made up of Council & independents, do nothing

4. Set up an Economic Forum as a Council committee with representation from the private sector, to oversee the implementation of the economic development.

- Agree with this proposal
- ***Disagree with this proposal***
- Neutral

Comments

We disagree because there is no support for the Economic Forum to be a Council Committee (as described in relation to the preceding questions), whether it has representation from the private sector or not. An Economic Forum or EDA MUST be independent of QLDC but have Council representation.

5. Assess the effectiveness of the current split of visitor promotion and facilitation arrangements, and whether and how the promotional arrangements should be integrated.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We cannot make a statement about this question because it is unclear.

Clarification is required regarding: what are 'facilitation arrangements', what type of facilitation is referred to? If this means are people happy with how the RTOs spend their money, the answer is that RTOs should stay as they are because people are satisfied with them in their current form and how they currently operate.

The question should be rephrased as: "Should the existing promotional arrangements in the QLDC be integrated?" Our answer would be DISAGREE

7. Set up an investment panel to assess major business and investment opportunities, and advise how to progress them.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We cannot answer this question because we do not consider an investment panel should be set up as a stand alone entity. Investment would be one of the tasks of an EDA, which should be set up.

8. Bring together groups representing the health, education, screen and professional and technical service industries, along with the Chambers of Commerce, NZTE and Callaghan Innovation, to identify major opportunities for the district and see what could be done to make them happen.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

This is a repeat of the question above. As above, we consider that an EDA should be set up and work with the groups identified and other groups as deemed important / appropriate.

9. Evaluate the return on investment from marketing and promotion activities to identify how to get maximum leverage from national partners and initiatives; how to attract higher spending visitors and provide higher value offerings; and how to get visitors to spend more in Wanaka.

- Agree with this proposal
- **Disagree with this proposal**
- Neutral

Comments

We disagree because we consider that tourism marketing & promotion review is already being undertaken and is effective; therefore further review is not necessary for this area.

10. Ensure that a high proportion of events funding goes to events held in the shoulder season.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- **Neutral**

Comments

We are neutral in that this activity is already being implemented by the Events Task Force & DQ.

12. Develop a business relationship model for major investment projects and consent processing.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

The question is not clear as to what is meant by a “business relationship model” and should be rephrased and re-asked.

We AGREE if this question means assisting businesses to get through regulatory processes more efficiently.

13. Review the benefits and costs of options for funding infrastructure long-term; and develop a funding guide and strategy for infrastructure investment.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal

- Neutral

Comments

This question needs to be clarified in regard to what 'infrastructure' means. Does 'infrastructure' refer to buildings, sewage/road/electrical? IT infrastructure is not mentioned. The question should also be divided into two questions.

1. "Review the benefits and costs of options for funding infrastructure long-term." needs to be clarified. Does this question mean "Should long-term infrastructure investment models be reviewed?" If so AGREE
2. "Should we develop a funding guide and strategy for infrastructure investment." AGREE But our answer is also "What – you don't have one yet?" We need a strategy to prioritise infrastructure which will encourage higher value visitor activity, not just tourism activity.

14. Work with industry and the government to investigate factors impacting on housing costs and ways to improve the supply of housing in the long term, including whether and how development and building timeframes and costs could be reduced.

- Agree with this proposal
- ***Disagree with this proposal***
- Neutral

Comments

We disagree as existing information should be used, including the relevant Productivity Commission report. This is not an area that QLDC has power over in most instances; it can only control planning & development levies.

It should be noted that the Forum considered that affordable living was seen as a very important aspect for the District.

15. Evaluate the impact that Plan Change 24 and the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust have had on housing access and affordability.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- ***Neutral***

Comments

We are neutral because this was not specifically discussed in the SoF Forum.

The following questions were considered and answered by the taskforce but were not dealt with by the forum directly.

2. Review the economic development funding and support, including the targeted levy the Council collects.

- Agree with this proposal
- ***Disagree with this proposal***
- Neutral

Comments

We disagree because there is no current targeted economic development levy, only a marketing levy. Therefore there is nothing to review.

The actual question that should be asked (our answer in CAPS) is: “Should the current Destination Marketing Levy be subsumed into a targeted Economic Development Levy?” DISAGREE - this question wasn't dealt with by the forum

11. Establish a Queenstown town centre business improvement district to upgrade the town centre; ensure the reviewed district plan reflects the town centre strategy and explore ways for regulatory or planning support to upgrade the town centre.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We cannot make a statement about this question because it is 3 questions in one. The question should be broken into the following 3 questions (our answers in CAPS):

1. Should there be a Queenstown town centre business improvement district? This was not specifically addressed by the StF Forum but views were expressed regarding maintaining the social quality of downtown Queenstown.
2. Should regulatory and planning support be used to drive upgrading of the town centre? AGREE IF IT IS SUPPORT ASSISTING BUSINESSES UNDERTAKE UPGRADING ACTIVITIES.
DISAGREE IF IT IS MORE REGULATION

6. Finalise and build the proposed Queenstown Convention Centre.

- Agree with this proposal
- Disagree with this proposal
- Neutral

Comments

We cannot make a statement about this question because it is two questions in one. The question should be broken into the following 2 questions (our answers in CAPS):

1. Do you support having new Convention Centre Facilities? GENERALLY ACCEPTED
2. Do you want the currently proposed Convention Centre? NO CLEAR MANDATE AS NOT CLEAR WHAT THE PROPOSAL CURRENTLY IS. Some Shaping the Future participants support the Lake View proposal, some support an alternative proposal, some support both and some do not support either.
3. This question was not dealt with specifically by forum attendees.

