

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF the Urban Intensification Variation to the proposed
Queenstown Lakes District Plan

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF SCOTT SNEDDON EDGAR

ON BEHALF OF THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTERS:

HENLEY PROPERTY LIMITED (SUBMITTER #658 AND FURTHER SUBMITTER #1284)

EVOLUTION TRUST LIMITED (SUBMITTER #660)

D & K INTERNATIONAL PROPERTIES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (SUBMITTER #662)

ARDMORE TRUSTEE NOMINEE LIMITED (SUBMITTER #663)

EDGAR PLANNING LIMITED (FURTHER SUBMITTER #1327)

4th July 2025



Introduction

1. My name is Scott Sneddon Edgar. I am a Resource Management Planner and hold a Bachelor of Arts Degree (Honours) in Town and Country Planning from Strathclyde University in Glasgow, Scotland. I am an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
2. I am an independent planning consultant based in Wanaka. Prior to my current position I was employed by Southern Land Limited, a Wanaka based survey and planning consultancy, from October 2006 to November 2018. During my time at Southern Land I was involved principally with the preparation of resource consent applications and the presentation of planning evidence at Council hearings. I was also involved in the preparation of submissions and further submissions on Stages 1, 2 and 3 of the Proposed District Plan, participation in the Stage 1 hearings and subsequent appeals and Environment Court proceedings.
3. Prior to relocating to New Zealand in 2005 I worked as a development control planner with various Scottish local authorities in both rural and urban regions.
4. Upon my arrival in New Zealand I was employed as a resource consents planner in the Wanaka office of Civic Corporation Limited before taking up a position with Southern Land Limited. I have a total of 26 years' planning experience, 20 of which have been gained in New Zealand.

Code of Conduct

5. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it. In that regard I confirm that this evidence is written within my expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

Scope of Evidence

6. I have been engaged by the following parties to provide expert planning evidence relating to the Urban Intensification Variation:
 - Scott & Jocelyn O'Donnell (Submitters #641, #657 and Further Submitter #1358) (evidence included in separate document)
 - Henley Property Limited (Submitter #658 and Further Submitter #1284)
 - Evolution Trust Limited (Submitter #660)

- D & K International Properties Limited Partnership (Submitter #662)
 - Ardmore Trustee Nominee Limited (Submitter #663)
7. In addition, I will speak to my own further submission (Edgar Planning Limited – Further Submitter #1327)
 8. In this evidence where I am referring to the above parties collectively I use ‘the submitters’ and then referring to individual parties I use the submitter name.
 9. In preparing this evidence I have read and considered the following documents and information:
 - the National Policy Statement on Urban Development;
 - the Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan;
 - the UIV s32 Report and supporting information; and
 - the UIV s42A Reports and supporting evidence;

Submissions

Henley Property Limited (Submitter #658 and Further Submitter #1284)

10. Henley Property made a further submission supporting the submission made by Southern Lakes Property Trust (SLPTL) (1055) that sought a 20m height limit in the Three Parks Business Mixed Use Zone (BMUZ). If a 20m height limit was not supported by Council, Henley Property Trust sought an alternative solution of a 16.5m height Limit, with buildings between 16.5m and 20m requiring a discretionary activity status.
11. I support Council’s updated position, expressed at Paragraph 7.82 – 7.83 of the Town Centre and Business Section 42a report, which provides for a tiered approach to building height. Henley Property Trust also supports the revised wording of Rules 16.5.8 and 16.5.9.

Evolution Trust Limited (Submitter #660)

12. Evolution Trust Limited submitted in support of the recommended changes to the BMU Zone, including the height increase to 16.5m. Council has retained the recommendation to increase the maximum height to 16.5m.

13. I support Council's recommendations made in Paragraphs 7.6, 7.53-7.54, 7.83-7.84, and 7.94 and the general amendments made to the BMUZ in Wānaka.

D & K International Properties Limited Partnership (Submitter #662)

14. D & K International Properties Limited Partnership sought to have their property, located at 8 Dungarvon Street, be removed from Height Precinct 1 and that the maximum building height within the Wānaka Town Centre Zone be increased to 20m.
15. In response, Council has removed all sites not located adjacent to Ardmore Street from Height Precinct 1 and proposed a tiered height rule that will enable the construction of buildings up to 16.5m as a permitted activity and buildings up to 20m as a restricted discretionary activity.
16. I support Council's recommendations made in Paragraph 6.12 of Town Centre Section 42a Report.

Ardmore Trustee Nominee Limited (Submitter #663)

17. Ardmore Trustee Nominee Limited sought to have their property, located at 33 Dunmore Street, be removed from Height Precinct 1 and that the maximum building height within the Wānaka Town Centre Zone be increased to 20m.
18. In response, Council has removed all sites not located adjacent to Ardmore Street from Height Precinct 1 and proposed a tiered height rule that will enable the construction of buildings up to 16.5m as a permitted buildings and up to 20m as a restricted discretionary activity.
19. I support Council's recommendations made in Paragraph 6.12 of Town Centre Section 42a Report.

Edgar Planning Limited – Further Submitter #1327

20. Edgar Planning made a further submission seeking that the definition of ground level in the Proposed District Plan be replaced with the definition included in the National Planning Standards. However the further submission has not been addressed in Council's Section 42a Reports or the supporting documents. I maintain my position as set out in the submission and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, seek that the definition of ground level be amended accordingly.

s32AA assessment

21. I consider that amending the definition of ground level will make interpretation of the definition and associated rules more straight forward as well as more accessible to the general public.
22. The amendment will reduce consenting costs and increase accuracy by reducing the need to research historic ground levels relying on older building consents and permits, and engaging surveyors to interpolate historic ground levels. Both these methods are inaccurate and result in 'best guess' scenarios to determine ground level. Therefore, the amendments to the definition will remove the uncertainty in relation to the level of the ground at which height is measured from. The updated definition will also be consistent with that found in the National Planning Standards and will therefore likely be more consistent with what is used elsewhere in the New Zealand.

Amending the definition of ground level to reflect the National Planning Standard definition is considered to be most effective and efficient method. Further, an amended definition will result in positive economic effects by reducing consenting costs and increasing accuracy. I consider the benefits amending the definition of ground level outweigh the costs of retaining the current, difficult to interpret, definition.

Conclusion

23. Having carefully assessed the proposed UIV and amendments sought by the Submitters, I consider that the objectives of the UIV in relation to the Wānaka Town Centre and Business Mixed Use Zones are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and that the provisions of the proposal in relation to these zones are the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives of the Variation.
24. Further to the above, I consider that the amendment to the definition of ground level is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the act and the objectives of the UIV.

Dated this 4th day of July 2025



Scott Sneddon Edgar

4th July 2025