

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT
DISTRICT PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991
and the Canterbury Earthquake
(Christchurch Replacement District Plan)
Order 2014

AND

IN THE MATTER

of the Commercial Proposal (part)

EVIDENCE OF

Raymond John Edwards

On behalf of submissions

Tinline Properties Canterbury Limited
(#1068)

SITE

256 Barrington Street, Christchurch

DATE

24 April 2015

BACKGROUND

1. My full name is Raymond John Edwards, and I act as an authorised agent on behalf of Papanui Properties Limited (#1089). My position, qualifications and experience have been set out in other evidence presented to the Panel and, owing to the nature of this evidence, it is not intended to repeat that information here.
2. The submitter supported the Commercial Core and Commercial Fringe zoning for the subject site as identified on Planning Maps 38 and 45. The Commercial Core and Commercial Fringe zones have now been combined into one Commercial Core zone as part of the amendments to the Commercial chapter of the Plan.
3. The submitter is aware of a number of further submissions in opposition to the Commercial Core and/or Commercial Fringe zoning of the subject site, but considers that the matters raised in the further submissions have been adequately addressed in the evidence of Mr Mark Stevenson on behalf of the Council.

PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

4. The purpose of this evidence is to acknowledge the Council's position as expressed in the evidence of Mr Stevenson in paragraph 25.3 and Attachment C of his evidence.
5. Council's position is further supported in paragraphs 29.1-29.4 of the evidence of Mr. Tim Heath and paragraphs 6.2 to 6.5 of Mr. Andrew Milne.
6. The submitter acknowledges and agrees with the position of the Council experts in support of the Commercial Core zoning. To this effect we attach a letter from Mr. Jamie Gaskell of Tinline Properties that outlines the development potential of the mall site under the proposed zoning. The content of the letter concurs with the position outlined in Mr. Stevenson's evidence in relation to this site.
7. With the Panel's indulgence, we seek that this statement and the attached letter from Mr. Gaskell be accepted as evidence and taken as read. If this approach is accepted then the submitter wishes to notify the Panel that **we no longer seek to be heard in support of the submission.**

24 April 2015

Re: Barrington Mall submission proposed zone change

Tinline Properties (Canterbury) Ltd Limited, (Tinline) has owned Barrington Mall for eight years.

Tinline have recently completed expansion and extension of the buildings on the site up to the B2P zoned land. This has resulted in Barrington Mall having a Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 14,632 m². The Mall is currently fully tenanted.

The B2P zoning of the northern part of the site has resulted in a less than ideal built form for the buildings at Barrington Mall with the restrictive design resulting in a subsequent lack of access to the northern car parking area.

The two key constraints limiting any future growth or expansion at Barrington Mall are the B2P zoned land and the traffic and distribution effects on the road network, including the provision of off-street car parking spaces.

The rezoning of the B2P zoned land would allow the future reconfiguration of buildings on the site, particularly the loading areas for the supermarket, allowing for a more efficient design and better access to the northern parking area. In the unlikely event that future development of the site results in an increase in GFA, the site is limited by the ability to provide off-street car parking and the subsequent traffic effects on the road network.

While it is a possibility that the rezoning of the B2P land could allow for increased development it is unlikely. The increase in floor area would generate the requirement for additional parking spaces. With the site currently fully developed, additional car parking spaces would necessitate the provision of roof top car parking. While this is technically possible, the current market conditions and rent preclude the construction of such an expensive built form. In addition to the supply of car parking spaces, any future development would be subject to an assessment of the traffic effects on the road network. As well as the safety and functioning of the road network this would include an assessment of the amenity values associated with the surrounding residential zones.

In terms of the concept of roof top car parking, we are aware of several recent developments where roof top parking has been rejected. These include:

- Hornby Mall;
- Eastgate parking deck was not replaced;
- Riccarton Mall elected a separate parking building as opposed to roof top parking.

Tinline supports the rezoning the B2P zone as commercial as it would allow a better configuration of buildings on the site and provide a more efficient and better designed parking area.

Yours Faithfully,



Jamie Gaskell

Chief Executive Officer Tinline Property Group