

PGC BUILDING - CHRONOLOGY

DATE	EVENT	REFERENCE
1963	5 test bores and 6 penetrometer bores carried out at site	<i>Christchurch City Council foundation records</i>
29 October 1963	Date on the building plans prepared by Paul Pascoe & Linton, Architects	<i>Building Plans</i>
2 February 1964	Application for building permit to build an office building	<i>LIM</i>
25 March 1964	Building permit granted	<i>LIM</i>
About 1966	Building constructed	
25 June 1996	Letter from Powell Fenwick Consultants Ltd to Arrow International stating, 'We have had discussions with Mr John Taylor from the Christchurch City Council to determine whether or not a structural analysis and/or structural upgrade of the building is required. Mr Taylor has advised that no analysis nor structural upgrade is required provided that...no change of use occurs...no alterations to structural members are carried out.'	<i>Letter from Powell Fenwick Consultants Ltd to Arrow International dated 25 June 1996</i>
29 November 1996	Closing date for public tender of property	<i>Tender booklet from Richard Ellis</i>
17 February 1997	Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Architecture Warren & Mahoney stating, 'The building is now 34 years old and while it was designed and built to the structural standards of the day it cannot be expected to perform as well as a more modern building (sic) designed and built to current standards. We recently made a preliminary study of the building and have found a potential for seismic damage to some of the columns and to the base of sections of some of the shear walls. The shear walls can be expected to "rock" in a major seismic event, so damage to secondary elements will be likely...'	<i>Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Architecture Warren & Mahoney dated 17 February 1997</i>
5 March 1997	Property transferred from Christchurch City Council to Pyne Gould Corporation Limited	<i>Certificate of Title</i>
25 March 1997	Fax from Holmes Consulting Group to WJ Fox B& C Consultant setting out results of 'initial assessment of building in its existing form.' Letter states, 'The potential failure of the columns is a life safety issue, as it could result in the loss of support and	<i>Fax from Holmes Consulting Group to WJ Fox B& C Consultant dated 25 March 1997</i>

	consequential collapse of all or part of the building... The cracking and movement of the walls does not appear to carry any life safety implications... Note that we consider the life safety issues above are essential, but the damage reduction measures are optional.'	
April 1997	Seismic Evaluation of Existing Building completed by Holmes Consulting Group	Seismic Evaluation of Existing Building completed by Holmes Consulting Group (T E Kelly)
17 April 1997	Letter from Pegasus Industrial Engineering Limited to JAC Contractor submitting a quote for the supply of 72 "200x100x9 RHS posts"	Letter from Pegasus Industrial Engineering Limited to JAC Contractor dated 17 April 1997
21 April 1997	Letter from JAC Contractor to WJ Fox with quotations for work.	<i>Letter from JAC Contractor to WJ Fox dated 21 April 1997</i>
22 April 1997	Tomlinson & Partners' Preliminary Cost Plan presented to Project Control Group Meeting	Tomlinson & Partners preliminary cost plan presented to Project Control Group Meeting, dated 22 April 1997
24 April 1997	Tomlinson & Partners provide PGC with a redrafted Preliminary Cost Plan for redevelopment of Cambridge House as discussed at the Project Control meeting the previous Tuesday.	Letter from Tomlinson & Partners to PGC dated 24 April 1997
5 May 1997	Application for building consent for 'Stage 1: strip out partitions/commercial/ stage 1: strip out partitions.'	<i>LIM</i>
30 May 1997	Date of plans for strengthening columns	<i>Architecture Warren & Mahoney plans</i>
30 May 1997	Warren & Mahoney report for Pyne Gould Corporation Board states, '...only the strengthening work considered necessary to preserve life safety has been adopted...' Attached Preliminary cost plan from Tomlinson & Partners included, '\$71,344...for interior strip out including block walls, exterior balustrade panels and new column strengthening.' '...the additional cost of damage reduction measures was estimated at	<i>Warren & Mahoney report for Pyne Gould Corporation Board</i> <i>Tomlinson & Partners Preliminary Cost Plan of 28 May 1997</i>

	\$30,400... concrete skin walls over existing shear walls as damage reduction measure...'	
30 May 1997 at 10am	Minutes of meeting of PGC Directors state 'it was resolved that the refurbishment of 233 Cambridge Terrace at the planned cost plus the additional cost of \$41,777 for wool carpet tiles be approved and that the Managing Director be authorised to proceed with the letting of contracts for that refurbishment'.	<i>Minutes of meeting of PGC Directors on 30 May 1997 at 10am</i>
6 June 1997	Application for resource consent to make alterations to façade of an existing building where design and external appearance are considerations.	<i>LIM</i>
1 July 1997	Resource consent granted to make alterations to façade of an existing building where design and external appearance are considerations with the condition 'That the development proceed in accordance with the plans titled 'Pyne Gould Corporation' dated 30 April 1997, drawn by Architecture Warren & Mahoney and entered into Council records as RC 971499.'	<i>LIM</i>
1 July 1997	Tomlinson & Partners write to WJ Fox advising that the quote submitted by JAC Contractor appears reasonable and recommending WJ Fox accept it.	<i>Letter from Tomlinson & Partners to WJ Fox dated 1 July 1997</i>
18 December 1997	Certificate of Compliance for Fire Alarm Systems issued.	<i>Certificate of Compliance</i>
4 April 1998	Application for building consent for 'office fitout, level 4 commercial/internal alterations/office fitout level 4.'	<i>LIM</i>
17 June 1998	Code Compliance Certificates issued for 'Stage 1: strip out partitions commercial/stage 1: strip out partitions' and 'Office building fitout- all stages.'	<i>LIM Code Compliance Certificate</i>
6 July 1998	PricewaterhouseCoopers provides PGC with an analysis of the renovation expenditure, which shows as a separate line item in Schedule A-1 "Steel Columns \$35,384.00"	<i>Letter from PricewaterhouseCoopers to PGC dated 6 July 1998</i>
3 November 1998	Code Compliance Certificate issued for 'alteration of existing buildings and the erection of new buildings. The intended use for this building work is for office fitout-level 4. The intended life of this building work is	<i>LIM, Code Compliance Certificate</i>

	indefinite but not less than 50 years.'	
11 November 1998	Application for building consent for 'office fitout (4 th floor) commercial/office fitout.'	<i>LIM</i>
2 February 1999	Application for building consent for 'plumbing alterations/ partitioning commercial/plumbing alterations/partitioning.'	<i>LIM</i>
26 May 1999	Code Compliance Certificate issued for 'plumbing alterations/ partitioning commercial/plumbing alterations/partitioning.'	<i>LIM</i>
18 August 1999	Code compliance certificate issued for 'office fitout (4 th floor) commercial/office fitout.'	<i>LIM</i>
4 April 2001	Application for building consent for new roof support beam	<i>LIM</i>
30 May 2001	Code compliance certificate granted for new roof support beam	<i>LIM</i>
12 December 2003	Application for building consent for office fitout, levels 3 & 4	<i>LIM</i>
3 March 2004	Application for exemption from building consent for partition alterations- Pyne Gould Corporation-Ground Floor Tenancy.'	<i>LIM</i>
10 October 2004	Application for building consent for office fitout level 1	<i>LIM</i>
2 February 2005	Application for building consent for internal office partitioning to level 3 & 4	<i>LIM</i>
16 February 2005	Code compliance certificate issued for office fitout, levels 3 & 4	<i>LIM</i>
3 March 2005	Application for exemption from building consent for internal alterations to reception - level 3	<i>LIM</i>
11 November 2006	Application for exemption from building consent for proposed office alterations.	<i>LIM</i>
9 May 2007	Code compliance certificate issued for office fitout level 1 and internal office partitioning to levels 3 & 4.	<i>LIM</i>
4 July 2007	Memorandum from Holmes Consulting Group (John Hare) to Warren & Mahoney (Ian Bisman) re 'PGC Building Review-Study Findings' states, 'I have reviewed briefly the findings of our 1997 study when PGC purchased the building. At that stage we concluded that there were severe	<i>Memorandum from Holmes Consulting Group to Warren & Mahoney</i>

	deficiencies with the exterior columns at the upper levels, but that the basic shear wall system was reasonably robust. Assuming the column failure were mitigated in all cases by placing secondary steel props behind them, the capacity of the building was judged at the time to be in excess of 2/3 of current seismic code loading at the time. The loading code has subsequently been updated and probably represents a 10% increase for this building but this is not significant in the context of an existing building. It is certainly not considered earthquake prone which is at a threshold level of 1/3 of current code loading.'	
4 September 2007	Fax from Holmes Consulting group to Warren & Mahoney relating to 'Option D' states, 'Potentially we may need to look a lot more closely at the existing exterior gravity structure as the walls may rock a long way even with the proposed new structure.	<i>Fax from Holmes Consulting group to Warren & Mahoney</i>
31 October 2007	Date of Holmes Consulting Group PGC Office Relocation Structural Specification.	<i>Holmes Consulting Group PGC Office Relocation Structural Specification</i>
1 November 2007	"PGC Office Relocation- Project Features Report' from Holmes Consulting Group states, 'At that time (ie late 1990s) a full seismic assessment was carried out...and it was determined that although the building does not conform with current codes, it is expected to behave reasonably well in an earthquake, provided that sufficient secondary supports were installed to provide back-up to the exterior precast column elements above the ground floor. The general lateral support system of the building comprises a system of structural walls on rocking foundations. These walls are also gravity load bearing, although the overall floor loads are not high.'	<i>PGC Office Relocation-Project Features Report from Holmes Consulting Group</i>
11 November 2007	Application for Building Consent for 'Fit out to Ground Floor Offices.'	<i>LIM Report</i>
10 March 2008	Building consent issued for for 'Fit out to Ground Floor Offices.'	<i>LIM report</i>
2 April 2008	Memorandum from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould Corporation in relation to 'Marac File Storage, states, '...we believe	<i>Memorandum from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould</i>

	that the existing shelving may remain in place, but recommend that no further shelving is added in or near the existing location. If increased floor loadings are required, the main supporting beams may need strengthening.'	<i>Corporation</i>
6 June 2008	Application for building consent for New Entry to Boardroom	<i>LIM</i>
13 March 2009	Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould Corporation about 'Column Cracking Review.'	<i>Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould Corporation</i>
23 March 2009	Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould Corporation states, 'I received your email last Friday instructing us to proceed with engaging Construction Techniques to complete the investigation and repair work so we will proceed on that as soon as possible.'	<i>Letter from Holmes Consulting Group to Pyne Gould Corporation</i>
26 April 2009	Email from John Hare to Helen Golding states, 'I now believe that almost all of the cracking that is visible on the columns (including most likely the one that we were looking at) is happening on the site of previous repairs. This makes it much more likely that the damage is indicative of corroded reinforcing...we will do our best through this process to control your costs and to keep you informed. We will look at alternative repair measures with Contech and present these if it makes sense from a whole of life perspective.'	<i>Email from John Hare (Holmes) to Helen Golding (PGC)</i>
5 May 2009	Application for building consent for 'level 4 demolish partitions/new office partitions.'	<i>LIM</i>
Undated- 2009	Building report from 'Spotless.' Does not include any structural assessment.	<i>Building report from 'Spotless'.</i>
19 August 2009	Fire Fighting Pacific provided PGC with "statements of compliance" certifying that the building was compliant as at August 2009.	<i>Letter from Fire Fighting Pacific to PGC dated 19 August 2009</i>
15 September 2009	Property transferred from Pyne Gould Corporation Ltd to Cambridge 233 Limited	<i>Certificate of Title</i>
15 September 2009	Pyne Gould Corporation Ltd and Cambridge 233 Limited enter a lease of ground floor	<i>Deed of Lease</i>
18 September 2009	Code compliance certificate issued for 'level 4 demolish partitions/new office partitions.'	<i>LIM</i>

30 October 2009	Code compliance certificate issued for 'Fitout to Ground Floor Offices'	<i>LIM</i>
25 August 2010	Perpetual Group Health and Safety meeting	<i>Minutes of meeting dated 25 August 2010</i>
4 September 2010	Magnitude 7.1 earthquake	
5 September 2011 11.25am	CCC rapid Assessment- Level 1: 'OK,' green placard.	<i>CCC Rapid Assessment Form</i>
7 September 2010	Site Report from Holmes Consulting Group (Mark Whiteside- Project Engineer) "confirming 'green placard' building okay to occupy (structurally)."	<i>Site report dated 7 September 2010</i>
8 September 2010	Email from James West (PGC) to staff: 'A quick update, structural engineers have checked out the minor crack in the toilet wall and we have reconfirmation that there are no structural issues with the building'	<i>Email dated 8 September 2010</i>
15 September 2010	Email from Brett Dudley (Leech & partners) to staff: 'I have followed up again with the building managers our concerns regarding the cracks that have appeared in the concrete walls around the toilets and the rear entrance way. Whilst I was unable to get an absolute assurance that everything is ok, they confirmed that the building still had the green sticker and an engineer would be coming back to recheck.'	<i>Email 15 September 2010</i>
16 September 2010 9.30am	CCC Rapid Assessment- Level 2: 'Reinspect cracks in shear walls...ok.' Final posting - 'Green'	<i>CCC Rapid Assessment Form</i>
16 September 2010	Site report from Holmes Consulting Group (Alistair Boys- Project Engineer).	<i>Site report dated 16 September 2010</i>
16 September 2010	Email from Helen Golding (PGC) to ERO staff states, 'As you will be aware, a representative from the above company (Holmes Consulting Group) has been and inspected our building and associated problems ie cracks. He is pleased to report that there is no need for any concern as they are superficial problems only. He will report direct to Harcourts, who manage the building, his findings.'	<i>Email dated 16 September 2010</i>
16 September	Email from Brett Dudley (Leech & Partners)	<i>Email dated 16</i>

2010	to staff: 'The engineer has been through the building and has confirmed that everything is OK-whilest the cracks are a little more than superficial they can be repaired relatively easily. More concerning is the wall behind our carparks.'	<i>September 2010</i>
16 September 2010	Email from Helen Golding to Brett Dudley: 'As you will be aware, a representative from (Holmes Consulting) has been and inspected our building and associated problems ie cracks. He is pleased to report that there is no need for any concern as they are superficial problems only. He will report direct to Harcourts, his findings.'	<i>Email dated 16 September 2010</i>
22 September 2010	Email from Peter Cambray (ERO) to Louise Sutherland (Harcourts), 'Sorry if I'm going over old ground here, but I see that Marsh (who suffered more actual damage than us) are having all their heavy ceiling tiles replaced by a lighter, safer model. I understand that the person installing the new tiles has indicated that he cannot guarantee the safety of our tiles due to their weight. Can you update me on this and tell me if there are plans to replace the tiles on the 3 rd floor too? I am obviously concerned that our staff should not be exposed to any risk from these tiles.'	<i>Email of 22 September 2010</i>
23 September 2010	Meeting of Perpetual Group Health and Safety Committee	<i>Minutes of meeting dated 23 September 2010</i>
30 September 2010	Email from James West (PGC) to Louise Sutherland (Harcourts): 'We spoke early last week in relation to a newly discovered crack in our storage area that backs onto the lift shaft on floor one. You said you had an engineer on site and they would assess the damage but this never occurred. I have tried to call you unsuccessfully so now send a formal email in relation to the building damage which due to its nature we like (sic) to be reviewed as soon as possible.'	<i>Email dated 30 September 2010</i>
30 September 2010	Email from Louise Sutherland (Harcourts) to James West (PGC): 'We have now had two structural engineers inspect the building. It has passed on both occasions and the building has been classified safe to occupy. It was determined that any visible damage is cosmetic and does not pose a risk to the safety of the building.'	<i>Email dated 30 September 2010</i>

14 October 2010	Site inspection by Mark Whiteside, Project Engineer, of Holmes Consulting Group	<i>Handwritten site report dated 14 October 2010</i>
15 October 2010	Site Report from Holmes Consulting Group stating 'Building remains structurally okay to occupy on above observations'.	<i>Site report dated 15 October 2010</i>
15 October 2010	Email from Brett Dudley (Leech & Partners) to staff: 'Engineers went through the building earlier this week and confirmed that after all of the aftershocks that there are no problems and the building is safe.'	<i>Email 15 October 2010</i>
22 October 2010	<p>Email from Peter Cambay (ERO) to Louise Sutherland (Harcourts) states, 'Just a couple of follow-ups really. Following the most recent 5.1 aftershock I understand there was some minor damage to ceiling tiles again. Is there any plan to replace the tiles with the lighter tiles?</p> <p>I also understand from Glenys that there is now an evident crack in the plaster of one of the internal walls on the east side of our office. I suspect not load-bearing but again it needs checking.</p> <p>Along with many other people in Canterbury of course our staff are now hyper-sensitive to any real or imagined problems. One that has been raised is egress in the event of significant problems. IF the power goes off do the internal doors automatically get released? If not, is the only egress via the external fire escapes? Is there, or do you plan to develop, a full building evacuation plan?'</p>	<i>Email of 22 October 2010</i>
1 November 2010	Building Warrant of Fitness issued	<i>Building Warrant of Fitness</i>
5 November 2010	Email from Glenys Ryan (ERO) to Louise Sutherland: 'Further to our other concerns. We have a crack in the wall on the east side- it appears to be where the wall partition (gib) comes in contact with the lift shaft. This is newer than the ones around the east side entrance door but on the same interior walls. It is very hard to send you any photos as our walls are grey. But if you need me to do so please let me know. I wondered if any of the other floors have similar cracks.'	<i>Email dated 5 November 2010</i>
9 November 2010	Email from Louise Sutherland (Harcourts) to Glenys Ryan (ERO): 'Thanks for the	<i>Email dated 9 November 2010</i>

	<p>update. There is cracking similar to what you have described on other floors of the building. These have been inspected on several occasions by structural engineers and confirmed as superficial and do not compromise the structural integrity of the building. We are currently working with the landlord's insurer and will be appointing a project manager to oversee the damage assessment and repairs to the building. They will visit your tenancy and catalogue the damage and what repairs are necessary.</p> <p>We will be in touch once we have instruction from the insurer and have been approved to appoint a project manager. I do not have an ETA yet, sorry.'</p>	
26 December 2010	Magnitude 4.9 aftershock	
27 December 2010	Kate Palmer, Perpetual Trust Consultant reported that the floor to ceiling window next to her desk on the south side of the building had shattered (no glass fell out of the window, rather it shattered like a windscreen). Kate telephoned Louise Sutherland (Harcourts) who arranged for the window to be fixed.	<i>Brief of evidence of James West, PGC</i>
26 January 2011	Email from Helen Guiney (PGC) to Louise Sutherland (Harcourts): 'Last week we requested an inspection of a significant crack under the first floor stairwell which we are concerned about. Apparently our building manager Sheree was here last week (we were not aware she visited us) and advised engineers have pronounced the building as structurally sound. PGC Group held a health and safety meeting yesterday morning and this matter was raised as a potential hazard which required urgent attention. Sheree advised yesterday morning that she would send a copy of the engineer's report. As yet I have not received it, so can you please arrange for it to be sent to ensure the stairwell is safe.'	<i>Email dated 26 January 2011</i>
26 January 2011	Email from Louise Sutherland (Harcourts) to Helen Guiney (PGC): 'As requested on Thursday we instructed the engineers to undertake an inspection. We are now awaiting the report to be sent through to	<i>Email dated 26 January 2011</i>

	us...'	
26 January 2011	Email from Helen Guiney (PGC) to Louise Sutherland (Harcourts): 'Thanks Louise. My understanding from Ann-Cherie was that the stair crack had already been inspected and the report had already been sent to Harcourts.'	<i>Email dated 26 January 2011</i>
27 January 2011	Site Report from Holmes Consulting Group (Mark Whiteside- Project Engineer) stating 'Building remains safe to occupy.'	<i>Site report dated 27 January 2011</i>
28 January 2011	Email from Natasha Rae (Holmes Consulting) to Ann-Cherie Manawatu-Te Ra (Harcourts), 'Please find attached the latest PGC Building Site Report. Please note that Perpetual Trust requested a copy of the report.'	<i>Email dated 28 January 2011</i>
28 January 2011	Email from Ann-Cherie Manawatu-Te Ra (Harcourts) to Helen Guiney (PGC): We have only received a copy of the most recent Engineers Report and attached is a copy as requested.	<i>Email dated 28 January 2011</i>
28 January 2011	Email from James West (PGC) to Christchurch based PGC and Perpetual staff: 'A quick update to let you know we have just received a new engineering report in relation to the premises here on Cambridge Terrace. The inspection reassessed the building and checked new damage identified including cracking around the stairwell. The report confirms that the building is safe to occupy with no material adverse points being noted.'	<i>Email dated 28 January 2011</i>
22 February 2011	Magnitude 6.3 aftershock; PGC building collapses	
April 2011	Building has been deconstructed to ground level; BECA requests that demolition not proceed beyond ground level so that foundations would be preserved.	<i>BECA report dated 26.9.11 page 6</i>