

**Before Independent Hearing Commissioners
at Queenstown**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the
Act**)

AND

IN THE MATTER Queenstown Urban Intensification Variation
by QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT
COUNCIL

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JASON ASHBY
ON BEHALF OF REID INVESTMENT LIMITED**

**Dated
4 AUGUST 2025**

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- A. This summary of planning evidence is provided on behalf of Reid Investment Trust (**'Reid Trust'**), in relation to the Queenstown Urban Intensification Variation (**'UIV'**) initiated by Queenstown Lakes District Council (the **'Council'**), with regard to the Intensification of the Queenstown Town Centre. Reid Trust are a submitter on the UIV, and are the owners of the site at 11-15 Rees Street (**'the site'**).
- B. While both the Submitter, and myself, support the UIV insofar as it provides for urban intensification we have requested amendments to the Queenstown Town Centre Provisions so that the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan better responds to the National Policy Statement on Urban Design.
- C. I have reviewed the Council s42A report and rebuttal prepared by Ms. Corinne Frischknecht (Town Centres and Business Zones), and the Urban Design Evidence and rebuttal of Mr. Cam Wallace (Urban Design). The changes recommended by Ms. Frischknecht and Mr. Wallace are sufficient to address the relief sought.

Upper Level Setback from Lanes

- D. The Reid Trust's submission sought relief to the effect that the building height setback standard apply to main road frontages only, and that lanes (such as Cow Lane) be specific exclusions.
- E. The s42A report, prepared by Ms. Frischknecht (Town Centres and Business Zones) accepts the Reid Trust submission point on the building height setback and recommends a revision to Rule 12.5.8 accordingly. This amendment is also supported by the Urban Design Evidence prepared by Mr. Cam Wallace. I also support this amendment.

Height Precinct Amendment

- F. The Reid Trust's submission sought relief to amend the boundary of Height Precinct 3 to include 11-15, 17, and 19 Rees St properties, increasing maximum building height from 12m to 20m).
- G. The urban design evidence prepared by Mr Compten-Moen, on behalf of Reid Trust, included visual and shading analysis which demonstrated that the increased maximum building height sought is appropriate in this location. In particular, the analysis demonstrated the additional height would not cause shading on Earnslaw Park or Marine Parade.
- H. This has been assessed by Mr Wallace. Sections 6.9 and 6.10 of Mr Wallace's rebuttal evidence generally concurs with the findings of Mr Compten-Moen, observing that the overall increase in shading from the proposed additional height allowance will have a low adverse shading effect.
- I. The planning rebuttal evidence prepared by Ms Frischknect agrees with Mr Wallace's assessment, and notes at Section 4.12 that the relief sought by the Reid Trust submission will result in similar outcomes to the notified version of the UIV '*...and would still align with the PDP objectives*'.
- J. Ms Frischknect accepts the relief sought by the Reid Trust and recommends that the Precinct Plan is updated to reclassify 11-15, 17 and 19 Rees Street from Height Precinct 2 to Height Precinct 3. I also support this amendment

Summary

- K. In my opinion, the UIV should amend the Queenstown Town Centre Provisions as follows:

- a) Rule 12.5.8 Building height setback at upper floors be amended as proposed by Ms. Frischknecht as set out in her s42A report.
- b) The Height Precinct Plan set out under Rule 12.5.9 be amended to include properties at 11-15, 17, and 19 Rees St in Height Precinct 3, as proposed by Ms Frischknecht in her rebuttal evidence.

Jason Ashby
4 August 2025