

Cameron Wallace for QLDC – Summary Statement on Urban Design

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** I have been engaged by QLDC to provide urban design evidence in relation to the Urban Intensification Variation (**UIV**) to the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**). I previously authored the Accessibility and Demand Analysis (Appendix 3 to the s32 Report) and the Urban Design Review (Appendix 4), both of which have informed the spatial extent and content of the UIV.

2. ACCESSIBILITY AND DEMAND ANALYSIS

- 2.1** Prior to notification of the UIV I undertook an Accessibility and Demand Analysis to identify broad locations within the District’s urban environments that exhibited higher relative levels of accessibility and/or demand that may be suitable for more intensive development – either through an amendment to the underlying zone provisions or through the application of a more intensive zoning. The output of this work was a series of maps that identified the Queenstown Town Centre, Frankton, Wānaka Town Centre, and parts of Three Parks and their immediate surrounds as those areas which performed well relative to other areas.
- 2.2** While this mapping has informed the zoning recommendations, it was never intended to provide a binary “in” or “out” outcome in relation to zoning boundaries for individual properties (or small groupings of properties). Rather, it represents one of several inputs into a broader planning and urban design judgment. I acknowledge that some areas may sit on the periphery of those zones identified as having higher accessibility and demand. In these cases, a degree of discretion and professional judgment was still required in drawing rational boundaries that avoid fragmentation or “pepper potting” of zones. In light of the policy context of the NPS-UD, a more enabling approach has generally been adopted for these areas.
- 2.3** My evidence in chief (EiC) explains the approach taken in the Accessibility and Demand Analysis, and responds to submissions relating to provisions of the centre zones, Business – Mixed Use Zone (BMUZ) and residential zones and their spatial application. In response to submissions, I supported a number of amendments to the notified UIV provisions. These are summarised below:

- (a) Queenstown Town Centre Zone (**QTCZ**): Introduction of a tiered approach to upper floor setbacks under Standard 12.5.8 and removal of its application to lanes within the town centre and an amendment to the measurement of permitted height at 12-26 Man Street;
- (b) A reduction in the permitted height limits to 8m within the MDRZ around Clearview Street and The Heights in Wānaka North;
- (c) Inclusion of an area of MDRZ on land (formerly LDSRZ) adjacent to the Cardrona Valley Local Shopping Centre Zone (**LSCZ**); and
- (d) An increase in permitted building heights to the BMUZ and HDRZ around Three Parks as well as the “upzoning” of sites to HDRZ and MDRZ from MDRZ and LDSRZ respectively.

3. REBUTTAL AND UPDATED POSITION

3.1 Following review of submitter evidence and participation in Urban Design Expert Conferencing I have updated my position on a number of discrete matters. These are summarised below:

- (a) Recession Planes (LDSRZ and MDRZ): I now support a return to the PDP provisions for sloping sites within the LDSRZ with the inclusion of a limitation on accessory buildings. I also support bespoke recession planes along the southern boundaries of sloping sites within the MDRZ. This reflects agreed expert conferencing outcomes and addresses concerns regarding unintended development constraints on steeper south-facing sites.
- (b) Hāwea LSCZ: I support an increase in the maximum permitted building height from 10m to 14m, as sought by Mr Williams.
- (c) QTCZ: I now support a number of targeted increases to permitted heights and refinements to rule provisions, including for 10 Man Street, 11–19 Rees Street, 48–50 Beach Street and the Novotel site. In these cases, increased height limits are appropriate based on site context, surrounding built form, and shading analysis. I also support deletion of Matter of Discretion (d) under Standard 12.5.8;
- (d) Frankton Arm MDRZ Extent: While I acknowledge concerns raised by submitters regarding the notified extent of MDRZ zoning in the vicinity of Peregrine Place, Star Lane and Sunset Lane, I continue to support retention of some MDRZ zoning over most of this location due to its relative accessibility and proximity to services.

However, I support a reduced MDRZ extent in this area as reflected in Mr Harland's alternative zoning boundary.

- (e) Thompson Street / Lomond Crescent (HDRZ): I support the requested rezoning of this area from MDRZ to HDRZ. This area was previously identified as having low to moderate accessibility, but will likely improve in future as the adjacent ODP PC50 land develops, increasing local amenity and employment offerings.

3.2 A number of submissions raise opposition to the proposed extension of both the MDRZ and HDRZ boundaries in a general sense or by raising broader issues. The broad reasons provided by submitters are both that the zone extents are too far or not far enough. Some submissions also seek the removal of the HDRZ in its entirety with apartment development limited to centres or retention of the status quo in the PDP, while others seek the extension of more intensive residential zoning on the basis of the location of existing centres or bus routes.

3.3 I remain of the view that changes to the planning framework proposed and now amended, such as the removal of density standards, increased heights, and refinements to bulk and location controls, are necessary to enable the types of residential typologies that will be required to meet future housing demand and are appropriate in urban design terms.

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 In summary, I consider that the UIV, as notified and with the amendments I support, provides an appropriate response to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD within the context of Queenstown Lakes. The UIV better enables a range of housing typologies in appropriate locations and ensures that development can occur in a manner that enhances the built environment, supports vibrant centres, and promotes walkable, well-connected communities.

4.2 The changes I have supported through both my EiC and rebuttal are intended to refine the UIV provisions to ensure they are fit for purpose and do not give rise to unintended outcomes. I believe they respond constructively to submitter concerns while maintaining alignment with the policy intent of the UIV and the broader strategic objectives of the PDP.

Cameron Wallace

28 July 2025