BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL APPOINTED BY THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER A variation to the QLDC Proposed

District Plan - Urban intensification

BY MATT LAMING

Submitter

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE SUBMITTER

Dated: 26 August 2025



Solicitor acting
B B Gresson
PO Box 124 Queenstown 9348
P: 03 441 2743
ben@toddandwalker.com

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL:

Introduction

- [1] The submitter, Matt Laming, has sought an increase in the permitted height limits for the Local Shopping Centre Zone at Hawea¹ from 10m as notified, to 14m.
- [2] Mr Laming has commercial interests within Hawea, including the Local Shopping Centre Zone.
- [3] It is submitted the relief sought in Mr Laming's submission accords with the relevant requirements under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). In particular, the increase in height sought through the submission:
 - (a) is appropriate in terms of s 32 of the RMA;
 - (b) will give effect to the relevant higher order planning provisions, namely the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD); and
 - (c) will be in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA.

Appropriateness of the increase in height under s 32

Mr Williams' evidence

- [4] Mr Laming's submission is supported by planning and urban design evidence of Mr Williams, who considers a 14m height limited to be more appropriate in 32 terms than 10m, for the following reasons:
 - (a) it will allow for greater development density and housing choice;²
 - (b) it will better achieve a more compact, integrated urban environment;³ and

1

The submission also referred to Frankton, Albert Town, Arrowtown, Sunshine Bay and Cardrona Valley Road, but the focus of the relief sought is Hawea.

Statement of evidence of Tim Williams, 3 July 2025 at [25](a).

³ At [25](b).

(c) it will not result in adverse effects on amenity values given the separation from adjacent residential activity via the 30m road corridor.⁴

Mr Wallace's evidence

- [5] Mr Wallace, the Queenstown Lakes District Council's (**Council**) urban design expert, agrees with Mr Williams' opinion and is supportive of the additional height, for essentially the same reasons as set out in Mr Williams' evidence.⁵
- [6] No evidence has been called by other submitters which conflicts with that of Mr Williams and Mr Wallace.

Whether the relief will give effect to the NPS-UD

- [7] Mr Williams' sets out the relevant policies of the NPS-UD that are engaged by this submission.⁶ He considers the relief sought will be in accordance with those policies because it will enable greater height and density of urban form commensurate with the accessibility of and demand for activities in this location (policy 5), whilst not constituting an adverse effect (policy 6).⁷
- [8] The Council's planning evidence of Ms Frischknecht in rebuttal, whilst not specifically addressing the NPS-UD, agrees with Mr Williams as to the appropriateness of the additional height sought for this location.⁸
- [9] On the basis of this evidence, the relief sought will give effect to and accord with the NPS-UD.

Part 2 of the RMA

[10] Neither planner specifically referred to Part 2. However, given their conclusions as to the appropriateness of the relief sought, it logically follows that it will be in accordance with the relevant provisions of Part 2. In particular, it will enable the efficient use and development of

⁴ At [25](e).

⁵ Statement of rebuttal evidence of Cameron Wallace, 24 July 2025 at 5.1-5.2.

⁶ Statement of evidence of Tim Williams at [20]-[22].

At [21] and [23].

Statement of rebuttal evidence of Corinne Frischknecht, 25 July 2025 at 5.4.

physical resources (s 7(b)), will maintain amenity values (s 7(c)), and will overall promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources (s 5)(1)).

Conclusion

[11] For the reasons set out, and on the basis of the consensus of the evidence supporting the 14m height increase, Mr Laming respectfully seeks the Panel accept his submission as it relates to the Local Shopping Centre Zone at Hawea, and that the provisions are amended as set out in Ms Frischknecht's rebuttal.⁹

Dated: 26 August 2025

B B Gresson

Counsel for the Submitter

......

At 5.8.