



**Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission**  
**Te Komihana Rūwhenua a te Karauna**

11 October 2011

Peter Mitchell  
General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services  
Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 73016  
Christchurch

By email: [peter.mitchell@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:peter.mitchell@ccc.govt.nz)

Dear Mr Mitchell

**617 Colombo Street, Christchurch**

The Royal Commission is currently examining the failure of the building at 617 Colombo Street (the Building).

I have obtained some of the documentation from the Council's property file.

Would you now please provide the following information, if possible by **21 October 2011**:

**Structural integrity of the Building prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake**

1. What was the status of the Building in terms of the Council's earthquake prone policy prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake?
2. Was the Building deemed to be earthquake prone? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.
3. How was the Council's earthquake prone policy applied in relation to the Building?
4. What structural work had been completed on the Building prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake and how did this impact on the Building's status in terms of the Council's policy?
5. When was the last Council inspection of the Building in terms of its earthquake prone policy prior to 4 September 2010? What was the result of that inspection?
6. Did the Building's heritage status impact on the application of the Council's policy to the Building?

7. I note that in 2009 there was a proposal for a new kitchen facility. Did this work go ahead? If so, did it require any structural strengthening of the Building as a result? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

#### Events post the 4 September 2010 earthquake

8. I note that there were two Level 1 Rapid Assessments on 5/9/10 both resulting in green placards.

On 7 /9/10 there was a Level 2 Rapid Assessment which again resulted in a green placard. Minor damage was noted. Under general comments it is recorded "*Recommend inspection of upper level and repair cracks in brick walls. Inspection at 143 only*".

- (a) Was this recommendation acted on? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.
- (b) Was there any further inspection of the building prior to 22 February 2011? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.
- (c) Given the nature of the Building, did the Council give any consideration to such an inspection? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.
9. I note that on 26/2/11 there was a Level 1 Rapid Assessment which resulted in a red placard. Under general comments the inspector has noted that the front façade has completely collapsed onto the street and that it was too dangerous to place a placard.

The next day there was a further Level 1 Rapid Assessment. This time it resulted in a yellow placard and under comments the inspector has written "*Parapet damaging*".

- (a) The two assessments appear inconsistent. Can you explain them please?
10. Are you aware whether or not the owner obtained an inspection of the Building at any stage after 4 September 2010? If so, please provide details.
11. In the 22 February 2011 earthquake a person was killed when the Building collapsed. I anticipate that an issue that will arise in relation to the Building (in common with many of the other URM buildings, the failure of which caused fatalities) is the adequacy of the inspection process post the 4 September 2010 earthquake, certainly given the nature of such buildings.

I would appreciate it if you could give this issue some thought and advise me of the Council's position on it.

The above information is requested pursuant to the Royal Commission's powers of investigation under s 4C Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908.

Yours faithfully



Mark Zarifeh  
Counsel Assisting  
Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission

CC: Chris Gilbert  
Legal Services Manager  
Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 73010  
Christchurch 8140

Email: [chris.gilbert@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:chris.gilbert@ccc.govt.nz)

---

16 November 2011

Our ref No: LEX 10597

Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission  
PO Box 14053  
Christchurch Mail Centre  
**Christchurch 8544**

**Attn: Mark Zarifeh**

Dear Sir

**617 Colombo Street, Christchurch**

I refer to your letter dated 11 October 2011 to Peter Mitchell asking for the provision of additional information in respect of 617 Colombo Street. Your letter has been referred to me for response.

Your questions are set out below as separate headings, with the answers below each heading.

We **attach** an aerial map of 617 Colombo Street to indicate which buildings made up 617 Colombo Street. 617 Colombo Street is a large premises, and the Council's Webmap records note that the property is also known as 143 Tuam Street (Switched on Gardener), 623 Colombo Street and 625 Colombo Street. The aerial map attached indicates which parts of the building were sometimes referred to as 143 Tuam Street (Switched on Gardener), 623 Colombo Street and 625 Colombo Street, however we note that the entire building is 617 Colombo Street. We **attach** rapid assessment forms for all of the addresses mentioned.

**Structural Integrity of the Building prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake**

1. What was the status of the building in terms of the Council's earthquake prone policy prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake?

The building was noted as an Earthquake Prone building.

2. Was the building deemed to be earthquake prone? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

Under the provisions of the Building Act 1991 the building was deemed to be Earthquake Prone because it was constructed of unreinforced masonry. Strengthening work was undertaken in 1994 to bring the structural strength above the requirements of section 66 of the Building Act 1991.

The Building Act 2004 had no provision to deem buildings as Earthquake Prone. The Building Act 2004 and the relevant 2005 Regulations which defined the level of strength below which a building could be classed as Earthquake Prone raised the trigger level significantly from about 10% of new building standard to about 33% of new building standard.

TRIM: 11/570750

---

This meant that buildings that had been strengthened prior to the commencement of the relevant 2005 Regulations would probably be Earthquake Prone under the new standard. The building at 617 Colombo Street was noted as Earthquake Prone prior to 4 September 2010.

3. How was the Council's earthquake prone policy applied in relation to the building?

When a building consent application was received an assessment of the application was made to see if it could be considered to be a Significant Alterations as defined in the Earthquake Prone Policy 2006. If the work was in this category, the procedure in the Policy would be followed (see section 1.7 of the Policy).

4. What structural work had been completed on the building prior to the 4 September 2010 earthquake and how did this impact on the building's status in terms of the Council's policy?

The building was strengthened in 1994 to meet the requirements of section 66 of the Building Act 1991. The work included adding extra walls in a North-South direction; adding an over-lay to the first floor to provide a diaphragm and connecting this to the walls and tying the existing brick parapets back to the roof system.

This work strengthened the building to above the requirements set in the Building Act 1991 but the strengthening was unlikely to meet the increased standard in the Building Act 2004 and 2005 Regulations.

5. When was the last Council inspection of the building in terms of its earthquake prone policy prior to 4 September 2010? What was the result of that inspection?

The building was not inspected in terms of the Earthquake Prone Building Policy 2006.

6. Did the building's heritage status impact on the application of the Council's policy to the building?

The strengthening work was undertaken prior to the 2006 Policy. The Policy did contain a separate section 3 relating to heritage buildings as required by section 131 of the Building Act 2004, however there was no further building work undertaken that would necessitate an application of section 3 to this building.

7. I note that in 2009 there was a proposal for a new kitchen facility. Did this work go ahead? If so, did it require any structural strengthening of the building as a result? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

The work was started but the owner had not advised the Council that the work was completed by September 2010.

The consent was valued at less than \$50,000 and did not affect the structural support of the building. The building's rateable value was \$2.17 million so the value of the work was less than 25% of that value. Therefore the work was not defined as a significant alteration and the Policy did not require strengthening work to be done.

## Events post the 4 September 2010 earthquake

### Question 8

There were two Level 1 Rapid Assessments on 5/9/2010 both resulting in green placards. On 7/9/2010 there was a Level 2 Rapid Assessment which again resulted in a green placard. Minor damage was noted. Under general comments it is recorded "Recommend inspection of upper level and repair cracks in brick walls. Inspection at 143 only".

- (a) Was this recommendation acted on? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

The Council does not have a record of any further inspection of the building taking place between 7 September 2010 and 26 February 2011. We note that the building assessment dated 7 September 2010 has a Beca stamp on it. At the time Colliers, as property manager, engaged Beca to carry out building inspections of the buildings it managed. It is possible that this assessment was carried out by Beca as part of this process, and therefore was carried out on behalf of the building owners, and was not an assessment carried out by the Council's contracted engineers. We suggest you speak to Colliers about this. We also note that the assessment states "inspection at 143 only" and the building name is Switched on Gardener. We refer to our comments above regarding the various addresses given to 617 Colombo Street.

- (b) Was there any further inspection of the building prior to 22 February 2011? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

As the building received a green placard in September and the Council had not received any notification of the building being potentially unsafe, no further assessments would have been carried out by the Council. It was the building owner's responsibility to arrange a detailed engineers inspection.

- (c) Given the nature of the building, did the Council give any consideration to such an inspection? If so, please provide details. If not, please explain why not.

The Council did not undertake any further inspections or assessments. As noted above, the building had received a green placard, and it was not the Council's general practice after the 4 September 2010 earthquake to undertake further inspections in such circumstances.

### Question 9

I note that on 26/2/2011 there was a Level 1 Rapid Assessment which resulted in a red placard. Under general comments the inspector has noted that the front façade has completely collapsed onto the street and that it was too dangerous to place a placard.

The next day there was a further Level 1 Rapid Assessment. This time it resulted in a yellow placard and under comments the inspector has written "Parapet damaging".

- (a) The two assessments appear inconsistent. Can you explain them please?

As outlined above, 617 Colombo Street was a large building, which was often referred to as different addresses. The rapid assessment form dated 26 February 2011 states that the address is to be confirmed. 623 Colombo Street has been crossed out and replaced



with 617 Colombo Street. There is no building name. The assessment carried out on 27 February 2011 states that the building is 617 Colombo Street and the building name is Sampan House. It is possible that the two assessments were carried out on adjacent premises.

We also **attach** a photograph taken of the building after the 22 February earthquake. This photo is in the building file and has been sent to the Royal Commission. The photograph shows the part of 617 Colombo Street which has collapsed. It is possible that this part of the building was referred to as 623 Colombo Street, and this correlates with the rapid assessment forms completed, as the front façade of what is referred to as 623 Colombo Street has collapsed onto the street, while Sampan House has minimal damage.

Question 10

Are you aware whether or not the owner obtained an inspection of the building at any stage after 4 September 2010? If so, please provide details.

The Council does not have a record of whether the owner obtained an inspection of the building at any stage after 4 September 2010.

Question 11

In the 22 February 2011 earthquake a person was killed when the building collapsed. I anticipate that an issue that will arise in relation to the building (in common with many of the other URM buildings, the failure of which caused fatalities) is the adequacy of the inspection process post the 4 September 2010 earthquake, certainly given the nature of such buildings.

I would appreciate it if you could give this issue some thought and advise me of the Council's position on it.

Council is considering this issue. It will be dealt with later in the Inquiry.

Yours faithfully



Chris Gilbert  
**Solicitor**  
**Legal Services Manager**

CCC WebMap - Windows Internet Explorer provided by Christchurch City Council

maps.ccc.govt.nz

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

[Favorites](#)
[Address & Postcode Finder](#)
[CCC Phone List](#)
[Cnch](#)
[Google](#)
[Library](#)
[Library Catalogue](#)
[NZ Directories](#)
[NZ White Pages](#)
[NZ Yellow Pages](#)
[Other NZ Directories](#)

CCC WebMap

Page Safety Tools

Colombo Street

Tuam Street

Scale 1: 500

50 m

**THIS INFORMATION IS NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE**

Local intranet 100%

**Maps Legend Groups**  
 Display Order:
 

- Bridge Status
- Building Assessment
- Building Demolition Status
- Bus Routes
- CBD Access
- Commercial Rating Units
- Christchurch Heritage
- Chemical Toilet
- Waste Pipe Status
- Waste Pump Station Status
- Water Main Status
- Water Pump Station Status
- Water Reservoir Status
- City Care Job Data
- Contours - Feb 2011
- Cordon Access
- Facilities
- Inspections
- Service Centres
- Trees
- Parks
- Property
- Roads
- Community Boards



AC 28

5

Ac

**Christchurch Eq. RAPID Assessment Form - LEVEL 1**

Inspector Initials ARB Date of Inspection 5/9/2010 Exterior Only   
 Territorial Authority Christchurch City Time 14:20 Exterior and Interior

**Building Name** Respawon Ltd

Short Name \_\_\_\_\_ **Type of Construction**

Address 143 Tuam Street  Timber frame  Concrete shear wall  
1st floor  Steel frame  Unreinforced masonry

GPS Co-ordinates S° \_\_\_\_\_ E° \_\_\_\_\_  Tilt-up concrete  Reinforced masonry

Contact Name \_\_\_\_\_  Concrete frame  Confined masonry

Contact Phone \_\_\_\_\_  RC frame with masonry infill  Other:

Storeys at and above ground level 2 Below ground level \_\_\_\_\_ **Primary Occupancy**

Total gross floor area (m<sup>2</sup>) 720 Year built \_\_\_\_\_  Dwelling  Commercial/ Offices

No of residential Units \_\_\_\_\_  Other residential  Industrial

Photo Taken Yes  No   Public assembly  Government

School  Heritage Listed

Religious  Other

Investigate the building for the conditions listed below:

Overall Hazards / Damage	Minor/None	Moderate	Severe	Comments
Collapse, partial collapse, off foundation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Building or storey leaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wall or other structural damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Overhead falling hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ground movement, settlement, slips	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbouring building hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Choose a posting based on the evaluation and team judgement. Severe conditions affecting the whole building are grounds for an UNSAFE posting. Localised Severe and overall Moderate conditions may require a RESTRICTED USE. Place INSPECTED placard at main entrance. Post all other placards at every significant entrance.

INSPECTED GREEN  RESTRICTED USE YELLOW  UNSAFE RED

Record any restriction on use or entry:

Further Action Recommended:

Tick the boxes below only if further actions are recommended

- Barricades are needed (state location):
- Level 2 or detailed engineering evaluation recommended
  - Structural
  - Geotechnical
  - Other:
- Other recommendations:

Estimated Overall Building Damage (Exclude Contents)

- None
- 0-1 %
- 2-10 %
- 11-30 %
- 31-60 %
- 61-99 %
- 100 %

617 Colombo St  
 Propri 896388  
 dot 3 DP 13211

Sign here on completion

M. Byce

Date & Time 5/9/2010  
 ID \_\_\_\_\_

Inspection ID ARB528 (Office Use Only)

AC 29

5

Ac

**Christchurch Eq. RAPID Assessment Form - LEVEL 1**

Inspector Initials

ARB  
Christchurch City

Date of Inspection

Exterior Only

Exterior and Interior

**Building Name**

Switchover on Gardener

Short Name

**Type of Construction**

Address

143 Tram Street  
Grnd floor

Timber frame

Concrete shear wall

Steel frame

Unreinforced masonry

GPS Co-ordinates

S° E°

Tilt-up concrete

Reinforced masonry

Contact Name

Concrete frame

Confined masonry

Contact Phone

RC frame with masonry infill

Other:

Storeys at and above ground level

2

Below ground level

**Primary Occupancy**

Dwelling

Commercial/ Offices

Total gross floor area (m<sup>2</sup>)

720

Year built

Other residential

Industrial

No of residential Units

Public assembly

Government

School

Heritage Listed

Religious

Other

Photo Taken

Yes

No

Investigate the building for the conditions listed below:

**Overall Hazards / Damage**

Minor/None

Moderate

Severe

Comments

Collapse, partial collapse, off foundation

Building or storey leaning

Wall or other structural damage

Overhead falling hazard

Ground movement, settlement, slips

Neighbouring building hazard

Other

Choose a posting based on the evaluation and team judgement. Severe conditions affecting the whole building are grounds for an UNSAFE posting. Localised Severe and overall Moderate conditions may require a RESTRICTED USE. Place INSPECTED placard at main entrance. Post all other placards at every significant entrance.

INSPECTED

GREEN

RESTRICTED USE

YELLOW

UNSAFE

RED

Record any restriction on use or entry:

**Further Action Recommended:**

Tick the boxes below only if further actions are recommended

Barricades are needed (state location):

Level 2 or detailed engineering evaluation recommended

Structural

Geotechnical

Other:

Other recommendations:

**Estimated Overall Building Damage (Exclude Contents)**

None

0-1 %

31-60 %

2-10 %

61-99 %

11-30 %

100 %

617, Colombo  
PROP: 896388  
dot 3 DP 13211

Sign here on completion

*Albye*

Date & Time  
ID

3/9/2010

Inspection ID ARB529 (Office Use Only)

A3

C

5

# Christchurch Eq RAPID Assessment Form - LEVEL 2

Inspector Initials  
Territorial Authority

MNC MNC Date  
Christchurch City Time

7/9/10  
2:30pm

Final Posting  
(e.g. UNSAFE) INSPECTED

6

**Building Name** Switched on Gardner  
**Short Name**  
**Address** 143 Tuam St  
*actual addy = 617 Colombo St*  
**GPS Co-ordinates** S° E°  
**Contact Name** COLLIER  
**Contact Phone** 379 6280  
**Stores at and above ground level** 2  
**Total gross floor area (m<sup>2</sup>)**  
**No of residential Units**  
**Photo Taken** Yes No

**Type of Construction**

<input type="checkbox"/> Timber frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete shear wall
<input type="checkbox"/> Steel frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unreinforced masonry
<input type="checkbox"/> Tilt-up concrete	<input type="checkbox"/> Reinforced masonry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Confined masonry
<input type="checkbox"/> RC frame with masonry infill	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

**Primary Occupancy**

<input type="checkbox"/> Dwelling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commercial/ Offices
<input type="checkbox"/> Other residential	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial
<input type="checkbox"/> Public assembly	<input type="checkbox"/> Government
<input type="checkbox"/> School	<input type="checkbox"/> Heritage Listed
<input type="checkbox"/> Religious	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Investigate the building for the conditions listed on page 1 and 2, and check the appropriate column. A sketch may be added on page 3

Overall Hazards / Damage	Minor/None	Moderate	Severe	Comments
Collapse, partial collapse, off foundation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Building or storey leaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wall or other structural damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SOME MINOR CRACKING TO WALL
Overhead falling hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ground movement, settlement, slips	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbouring building hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO SIGNS OF DAMAGE FROM OUT SIDE
Electrical, gas, sewerage, water, hazmats	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NOT INSPECTED

Record any existing placard on this building:

Existing Placard Type  
(e.g. UNSAFE)

GREEN

Choose a new posting based on the new evaluation and team judgement. Severe conditions affecting the whole building are grounds for an UNSAFE posting. Localised Severe and overall Moderate conditions may require a RESTRICTED USE. Place INSPECTED placard at main entrance. Post all other placards at every significant entrance. Transfer the chosen posting to the top of this page.

INSPECTED

GREEN

G1

G2

RESTRICTED USE

YELLOW

Y1

Y2

UNSAFE

RED

R1

R2

R3

Record any restriction on use or entry:

Further Action Recommended:

Tick the boxes below only if further actions are recommended

- Barricades are needed (state location):
- Detailed engineering evaluation recommended
- Structural
- Geotechnical
- Other:
- Other recommendations:



Estimated Overall Building Damage (Exclude Contents)

- |         |                                     |         |                          |
|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| None    | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 31-60 % | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 0-1 %   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 61-99 % | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2-10 %  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 100 %   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11-30 % | <input type="checkbox"/>            |         |                          |

Lot 30 P 13211

896388

correct PRUPI

Sign here on completion

Date & Time  
ID

7/9/10 2:30pm

Inspection ID: MNC 7A3 (Office Use Only)

AC

5

**Sketch (optional)**  
Provide a sketch of the entire building or damage points. Indicate damage points.

A large grid for sketching a building or damage points. The grid consists of 15 columns and 18 rows of squares.

**Recommendations for Repair and Reconstruction or Demolition (Optional)**

A series of horizontal lines for writing recommendations. There are 12 lines provided for text entry.



AC 25

5

Ac

**Christchurch Eq. RAPID Assessment Form - LEVEL 1**

Inspector Initials  
Territorial Authority

ARBS  
Christchurch City

Date of Inspection  
Time

5/9/2010  
14:15

Exterior Only  
Exterior and Interior

**Building Name**

Silk Road Food Post

Short Name

Address

625 Colombo Street

GPS Co-ordinates

S° E°

Contact Name

Contact Phone

Storeys at and above ground level

200

Below ground level

Total gross floor area (m<sup>2</sup>)

2

Year built

No of residential Units

Photo Taken

Yes

No

**Type of Construction**

- Timber frame
- Steel frame
- Tilt-up concrete
- Concrete frame
- RC frame with masonry infill
- Concrete shear wall
- Unreinforced masonry
- Reinforced masonry
- Confined masonry
- Other:

**Primary Occupancy**

- Dwelling
- Other residential
- Public assembly
- School
- Religious
- Commercial/ Offices
- Industrial
- Government
- Heritage Listed
- Other

Investigate the building for the conditions listed below:

Overall Hazards / Damage	Minor/None	Moderate	Severe	Comments
Collapse, partial collapse, off foundation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Building or storey leaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wall or other structural damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Overhead falling hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ground movement, settlement, slips	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbouring building hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Broken glass at upper ground floor

Choose a posting based on the evaluation and team judgement. Severe conditions affecting the whole building are grounds for an UNSAFE posting. Localised Severe and overall Moderate conditions may require a RESTRICTED USE. Place INSPECTED placard at main entrance. Post all other placards at every significant entrance.

INSPECTED  
GREEN

RESTRICTED USE  
YELLOW

UNSAFE  
RED

Record any restriction on use or entry:

**Further Action Recommended:**

Tick the boxes below only if further actions are recommended

- Barricades are needed (state location):
- Level 2 or detailed engineering evaluation recommended
  - Structural
  - Geotechnical
  - Other:
- Other recommendations:

**Estimated Overall Building Damage (Exclude Contents)**

- None
- 0-1 %  31-60 %
- 2-10 %  61-99 %
- 11-30 %  100 %

617 Colombo St  
Piripi  
896385  
dot 3 DP 13211

Sign here on completion

*[Signature]*

Date & Time  
ID

5/9/2010  
ARBS

Inspection ID ARB525 (Office Use Only)



AC 26

5

AC

**Christchurch Eq. RAPID Assessment Form - LEVEL 1**

Inspector Initials ARB Date of Inspection 5/9/2010 Exterior Only   
 Territorial Authority Christchurch City Time 1415 Exterior and Interior

**Building Name** JS Eq Club **Type of Construction**  
 Short Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address 623 Colombo Street  Timber frame  Concrete shear wall  
 Steel frame  Unreinforced masonry  
 Tilt-up concrete  Reinforced masonry  
 GPS Co-ordinates S° \_\_\_\_\_ E° \_\_\_\_\_  Concrete frame  Confined masonry  
 Contact Name \_\_\_\_\_  RC frame with masonry infill  Other  
 Contact Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Storeys at and above ground level 2 Below ground level \_\_\_\_\_ **Primary Occupancy**  
 Dwelling  Commercial/ Offices  
 Total gross floor area (m<sup>2</sup>) incl (145 sqm) in built Year built \_\_\_\_\_  Other residential  Industrial  
 No of residential Units 625  Public assembly  Government  
 School  Heritage Listed  
 Photo Taken Yes  No  Religious  Other

Investigate the building for the conditions listed below:

Overall Hazards / Damage	Minor/None	Moderate	Severe	Comments
Collapse, partial collapse, off foundation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Building or storey leaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wall or other structural damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Overhead falling hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ground movement, settlement, slips	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbouring building hazard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Choose a posting based on the evaluation and team judgement. Severe conditions affecting the whole building are grounds for an UNSAFE posting. Localised Severe and overall Moderate conditions may require a RESTRICTED USE. Place INSPECTED placard at main entrance. Post all other placards at every significant entrance.

INSPECTED GREEN  RESTRICTED USE YELLOW  UNSAFE RED

Record any restriction on use or entry:

Further Action Recommended:

Tick the boxes below only if further actions are recommended

- Barricades are needed (state location):
- Level 2 or detailed engineering evaluation recommended
  - Structural
  - Geotechnical
  - Other:
- Other recommendations:

Estimated Overall Building Damage (Exclude Contents)

- None
  - 0-1 %  31-60 %
  - 2-10 %  61-99 %
  - 11-30 %  100 %
- 617 Colombo  
P1001 296328  
dot 3 DP13211*

Sign here on completion  
M. Boyle  
 Date & Time 5/9/2010  
 ID \_\_\_\_\_

Inspection ID ARB526 (Office Use Only)

CDB 75017145

EQ COLOMBO STREET 619

BUI.COL617-625-0009.15

2011-7-1

PDF

