

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14
(Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch
District Plan

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF PHILLIP NEVILLE GRIFFITHS
(QUANTITY SURVEYING) ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

QUALIFYING MATTER: HERITAGE (HERITAGE SITES)

Dated: 9 October 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
EVIDENCE OF PETER EGGLETON (CHURCH PROPERTY TRUSTEES)	1

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is **Phillip Neville Griffiths**. I am a director and shareholder of Rhodes and Associates Limited, where I am a Senior Quantity Surveyor.
2. I prepared a statement of primary evidence on behalf of Christchurch City Council (**Council**) dated 11 August 2023, relating to the submissions and further submissions on Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan; PC14**).
3. My purpose of my primary evidence was to review and escalate the costing information for a repair estimate for St James Church and Setting – 65,69 Riccarton Road, Christchurch, to bring it in line with current expectations for July 2023. This estimate excluded consideration of any additional works which may be required since the costing information was published or due to further deterioration of the building.
4. I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs 9 – 12 of my primary evidence / Section 42A Report dated 11 August 2023.
5. I repeat the confirmation given in my primary evidence / Section 42A Report that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses Contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and that my evidence has been prepared in compliance with that Code.

EVIDENCE OF PETER EGGLETON (CHURCH PROPERTY TRUSTEES)

6. In preparing this rebuttal statement, I have read and considered the evidence filed on behalf of Mr Peter Eggleton (Quantity Surveying) on behalf of Church Property Trustees. I respond to two matters arising from my review of that evidence below.

Cost of repair and strengthening

7. Referring to Mr Eggleton's evidence paragraph 9, the percentages included for Contractor's margin / Preliminary and Generals (**P&G**) at 30% is high based on my recent market experience. On a recent project, an accepted tender allowed a project Contractors margin / P&G percentages of 22% (inclusive of all project management, scaffolding costs required).

Response to Council Section 42A Reports and Evidence

8. Referring to Mr Eggleton's evidence paragraph 12.3, as previously noted in my report, my estimate has been based on a square meter rate which was extracted from a previous project of a similar nature and complexity and has not considered the Aurecon documentation detailing and scope of repair that Mr Eggleton has referenced. I am confident that the \$/m2 budget would be sufficient to cover the required repair.

Phillip Neville Griffiths

9 October 2023