

### Submission from Malcolm Flain

I am a 72 year old widower, and have lived continuously in Christchurch since 1964 (47 years). I have experienced all the earthquakes in that period. I along with my deceased wife observed the growth in high rise buildings during this time, including the controversy over the diminishing of the cathedral by the surrounding business high rise blocks. My wife during this time progressively and deliberately avoided the CBD and its shopping area, as she grew more and more nervous of its potential for disaster in these the "Shakey Isles".

I have three daughters, one who is thankful she left to live in Australia many years ago, another who has left for Australia shortly after the major quakes, and the third who works by necessity at Princess Margaret Hospital and lives in fear of the building.

I initially registered "an expression of interest" believing that it might have some influence on future outcomes. I no longer believe this.

I'm convinced with the passage of time, and providing no further major events occur, the lessons of the past will once again be eroded and ignored. So called business ethics, like "rust never sleeps" and these will over-ride sound common sense. Remaining high rise buildings will stand as sentinels to counter critics, and confound common sense.

I have persisted in order to draw attention to the document ECQ-2205(1991). The Earthquake Hazard in Christchurch: a detailed evaluation. A 105 page report either ignored, or somehow overlooked by decision makers in relation to high rise buildings in Christchurch.

The report is "right on the button" 20 years after it was written, and ignored? How else can you explain consents for high rise buildings that won't break but will topple, such as the "Grand Chancellor" building in 1995 four years after the report, and how many others? And what of those remaining weakened buildings certainly not immune from future earthquakes. I would not appreciate being in their shadow, or worse required to work in them. "But we can't knock down perfectly good buildings", because mistakes were made in the past. Hence my realism.

While buildings survive through ignorance or ignoring past experience and reassuringly still stand, others will rationalise future developments especially if it increases their profits.

It is very unlikely that I will be here to see the outcomes, but at least I've drawn attention to a report prepared 20 years ago that proved prophetic for 2011, and any future disregard for informed analysis and public safety will only result in more crocodile tears and handwringing. However in the modern malaise "no one is responsible" but they will still have taken their fees.

I thank you for the opportunity to present the above submission, which I believe represents some of the ordinary citizens of Christchurch of which I include myself.