

**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 Residential Proposal (part)

STATEMENT OF

Raymond John Edwards

On behalf of submissions

R & H Investments Limited, R & H
Properties Limited and Sandridge Hotel
Limited (#1069)

SITE

17-29 King Street and 22-30 Huxley Street,
Christchurch

DATE

20 March 2015

INTRODUCTION

Name and Qualifications

1. My full name is Raymond John Edwards. I am a traffic engineering consultant practising from Christchurch. I am the Managing Director of Urbis TPD Limited (Urbis). Urbis is a resource management and traffic engineering consultancy which provides land development related advice to local authorities and to private clients. Urbis is engaged in practise nationwide.
2. I hold the qualifications of a New Zealand Certificate in Civil Engineering, and the Certificate of Transport Planning, Management and Control from the University of New South Wales. I am a Registered Engineering Associate. I also recently gained accreditation as an Independent Hearings Commissioner.
3. I have 26 years employment in the field of civil engineering, 23 of which in resource management related traffic engineering for both the Christchurch City Council and as a consultant to other local authorities, and private developers. I also have extensive experience acting as an expert witness on traffic related issues associated with land use development and the preparation and implementation of District Plans. This experience includes many appearances before the Environment Court.

Purpose of Document

4. The statement has been prepared on behalf of R & H Investments Limited, R & H Properties Limited and Sandridge Hotel Limited. These three entities are Submitter #1069 and all three companies have common owners/directors. Their submission related to the Council's originally proposed zoning of Residential Medium Density for sites under their ownership that are currently used either for commercial purposes, or are currently used for residential purposes but it is considered would be better used for commercial purposes.
5. I want to record that this document is not directly relevant to my particular field of expertise (being traffic engineering and transport planning). Therefore I do not wish for this document to be considered as any form of expert evidence on my part. This document is intended for information purposes only and its purpose is to record our support of the Council's revised position in relation to the zoning of the subject sites.

THE SUBJECT SITES

6. Table 1 below details the characteristics of the subject sites, their operative zoning, the Council's notified proposed zoning and the requested zoning:

Address	Area	Use	Operative Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Requested Zoning
17 King St	705m ²	Mitre 10 car park	Living 3	Residential Medium Density	Commercial Fringe
21 King St	736m ²	Mitre 10 car park			
23 King St	506m ²	Dwelling			
25 King St	506m ²	Dwelling			
27 King St	506m ²	Dwelling			
29 King St	506m ²	Dwelling			
22-30 Huxley St	5063m ²	Sandridge Hotel			

7. Figure 1 on the next page shows the relative locations of the sites and the Council's originally proposed zoning of the sites under the City Plan review process (Map 39). Figure 2, also on the next page, is an aerial image of the site that shows the current land uses. The subject site is bordered in red in both images.
8. Comparing Figures 1 and 2 shows that the Councils originally proposed zoning retained a residential zoning over the Sandridge Hotel (the larger building towards the top of the subject site). This comparison also shows the Council's originally proposed residential zoning over the Mitre 10 Mega drive through area (the larger building towards the bottom of the subject site) and part of the Mitre 10 Mega car park area.

THE SUBMISSION

9. The nature of the Sandridge Hotel and Mitre 10 Mega activities on the subject site is easy to appreciate. The land occupied by these activities has not been used for residential purposes for many years and is unlikely to ever do so.
10. However what is less well known is that the Mitre 10 Mega activity has resource consent to relocate to a much larger facility to be built on the Lane Walker Rudkin (LWR) site nearby on Montreal Street. There is also the potential for the scale for the Sandridge Hotel activity to scale down in the near future to operate at a more economic size – although the motel units along its eastern side are unlikely to change as there is current high demand for their use in association with the rebuild of the CBD. While the existing Mitre10 building is unlikely to significantly change, there is a very real chance that much of the site could be redeveloped in the future.
11. A problem with the shape of the current site is that it has poor connectivity between the northern and southern sides. There is currently only a vehicle access lane that connects the two sites and this has two 90-degree turns within it. The overall site would become significantly more developable with the inclusion of the four properties at 23-29 King Street hence submission #1069 which seeks a rezoning to this effect.
12. When considering this submission it is important to note that the same companies also own 31 and 33 King Street. Also, as noted above, it is not proposed to alter the Motel activities on the boundary neighbouring 34 Huxley Street.

RELEVANT OPPOSING SUBMISSIONS

13. There have been no submissions lodged opposing this proposal

THE COUNCIL OFFICER'S EVIDENCE

14. Mr. Blair discusses the matter in paragraphs 15.35 to 15.37 of his evidence dated 12 March. He does not raise any concerns with the proposal.

MEDIATION PROCESSES

15. Given the agreement of the Council of potentially rezoning the site, and given the lack of opposing submissions, it was not considered necessary to be involved in any mediation process.

PROGRESSING THE MATTER FROM HERE

16. The original submission records that we wish to be heard on this matter. However this position was stated in advance of the submissions process being completed and in advance of the Council's (agreed) position on the matter being known.
17. Given the lack of opposition to the rezoning proposal, we do not consider it necessary to be heard in relation to the residential chapter.
18. However we may still need to be heard in relation to the commercial chapter as the Council's position on this chapter is yet to be confirmed (although we do not expect it to change from Mr. Blair's current stated position in which case we would again no longer need to be heard).