

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

<b>Under the</b>	Resource Management Act 1991
<b>In the matter</b>	of the Urban Intensification Variation to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan

---

**REPLY EVIDENCE OF CAMERON WALLACE  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Urban Design**

**1 October 2025**

---



**Sarah Scott / Shanae Richardson**  
T: +64 3 968 4018  
sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
shanae.richardson@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874 Christchurch

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. SCOPE OF REPLY EVIDENCE .....	1
3. HEIGHT PRECINCT 7 .....	2
4. QUEENSTOWN GOLD LIMITED .....	2
5. REVIEW OF QLDC RESIDENTIAL ZONE DESIGN GUIDE WITH PDP PROVISIONS .....	3

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** My full name is Cameron Wallace.

**1.2** I prepared urban design evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) dated 6 June 2025 (**EiC**) and Rebuttal Evidence (**Rebuttal**) dated 24 July on the Urban Intensification Variation (**UIV** or **Variation**).

**1.3** I appeared at the hearing and responded to questions from the Panel on 28 and 29 July 2025. I have been provided with reports of what has taken place at the hearing where relevant to my evidence.

**1.1** Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

## **2. SCOPE OF REPLY EVIDENCE**

**2.1** My Reply Evidence is provided in response to the following evidence presented on behalf of various submitters:

- (a) Mr Scott Freeman for multiple Queenstown submitters;
- (b) Ms Paula Costello for multiple Queenstown submitters; and
- (c) Mr Dave Compton-Moen for Queenstown Gold Limited (**QGL**) (OS765).

**2.2** Where I do not respond to a particular evidence statement, or general theme that arose during the hearing, this does not mean I have not considered the subject matter, but that I have nothing further to add and my views remain as expressed in my EiC and Rebuttal.

- 2.3** I have also read Section 2 of Ms Frischknecht's Reply Evidence in relation to incorporating key design elements from the design guidelines into the PDP provisions, including Appendix 2 to her Reply Evidence.

**3. HEIGHT PRECINCT 7**

- 3.1** I have listened to the hearing recording where Mr Freeman and Ms Costello discuss the new 'Height Precinct 7' and respond to queries from the Panel. I agree with the assessment of Mr Freeman and Ms Costello that this new height precinct would fit best within Rule 12.5.8.2 and better reflects the increased height enabled as well as the existing building which exists on the Site.<sup>1</sup> Rule 12.5.8.1 was designed to apply to the lowest height areas within / adjacent to the heritage areas of the Queenstown Town Centre.

- 3.2** I would observe that its inclusion within Rule 12.5.8.2 does create an anomaly in the theoretical street wall created by the provisions. However, as there is already a building on this site to which Height Precinct 7 applies such a situation already exists. As such, I do not consider that it introduces any adverse urban design effect, rather it does (slightly) increase the potential ease / flexibility of redevelopment of the site which would, in my opinion, likely be of benefit to the Queenstown Town Centre as a whole.

**4. QUEENSTOWN GOLD LIMITED**

- 4.1** I have listened to the hearing recordings associated with the QGL submission (765) and the various discussion points between Mr Compten-Moen and the Panel. Based on this, I am comfortable with the recommendations of the submitter and their experts for the application of a 24m height limit for sites along Brecon Street. Having considered this, I observe:

- (a) The QGL land rises away from the Town Centre, maintaining the overall "amphitheatre" type building form that wraps around the lake edge. This is supported by Mr Compten-Moen's visual simulations;

---

1 Paragraph 65.

- (b) The land adjacent to the QGL land (in all directions) is much less sensitive to increases in height in this location. Collectively it comprises a cemetery, unoccupied hill / Skyline Gondola route, mini golf course, electricity substation, fire station etc. In addition, the playing fields / playgrounds of Queenstown Primary area generally orientated to the north away from this land;
- (c) Additional shading which could impact other parts of the Town Centre or surrounds are largely negated by the shadows already cast by Ben Lamond during the evening hours already. In the morning, any increased shadows would likely fall on the cemetery / hill which I do not consider to be particularly sensitive to shading; and
- (d) The area sits close to key transport routes and the area identified as being most accessible across the District (near Stanley Street / Shotover Street intersection).

## **5. REVIEW OF QLDC RESIDENTIAL ZONE DESIGN GUIDE WITH PDP PROVISIONS**

**5.1** I have reviewed Ms Frischknecht's review of the Residential Zone Design Guide with the PDP provisions as amended by the UIV as well as the amended versions of the provisions recommended by Ms Frischknecht in Section 2 of her Reply Evidence. I am satisfied that the amendments Ms Frischknecht has proposed to the policy framework and matters of discretion for more intensive development in the MDRZ and HDRZ are appropriate in urban design terms.



**Cameron Wallace**

**1 October 2025**