

15 DEC 2011



8 December 2011

Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission
 PO Box 14053
Christchurch Mail Centre 8544

Attention Mark Zarifeh

Dear Sir

32 Cathedral Square: The Press Building
HG Ref: 1011-000000-99

In relation to the summons received on 30 November 2011, dated 29 November 2011, we provide the following information as requested;

1. *Your full name, qualifications and years of experience.*

Andrew James Thompson
 BE, MIPENZ, CPEng
 Graduated 1993, 18 years experience

2. *How you became involved with this building and in particular what your instructions were from The Press.*

I received a phone call from Barry Appleby from The Press on 14 September 2010 requesting a structural engineer to make an inspection of the building and report on the structural integrity of the building. I met Barry outside the building on 15 September 2010 and we had a further discussion on their requirements. Our instruction was to undertake a visual inspection of the building structure and to complete a structural safety assessment report based on our observations and discussions with the Contractor and their principal structural engineer. Our report was intended as a review of the Green status that had already been completed for the building by others.

3. *What your inspection/assessments involved if they are not covered in your report of 15 September 2010.*

Our assessment involved a visual assessment with no testing, calculation or analysis required. We believed it was of a similar nature to a Level 2 assessment in nature, but with the report being more suitable and made available to the staff of The Press.

4. *When your involvement with the building ceased.*

Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited
 Level 1 Dilworth House
 71 Great South Road Newmarket Auckland 1051
 P O Box 5760 Wellesley Street Auckland 1141
 P +64 9 917 5000 | F +64 9 917 5001
 E auckland@harrisingrierson.com
 W www.harrisingrierson.com
 ISO9001 Quality Assured

Our involvement with the building ceased when our report was issued to The Press, at 4.04pm on 17 September 2010.

5. *Whether in coming to the conclusions that you did in your report of 15 September 2010 you took into account any of the following:*

- i. *The impact of the 4 September 2010 earthquake and any subsequent aftershocks on the structural integrity of the Building and, in particular, whether the Building's capacity to withstand future aftershocks was diminished as a result?*

My report of 15 September 2010 details several aspects of the building in which I believed there was an impact on the structure, such as the comments on the parapet strengthening, the cracking found to the NE corner of the top level and the strengthening completed to the NW corner of the North wall. It was my opinion that, other than these localised areas of damage that were being strengthened or investigated by others, the building had suffered aesthetic damage only which did not diminish the building's capacity to withstand future aftershocks.

- ii. *Any information from GNS or any other source about the likelihood, location and extent of future aftershocks? If so, please provide details of this information.*

I cannot recall visiting the GNS website, but do recall some information about the likelihood of continuing diminishing aftershocks for some time. This would have been in discussion with colleagues and peers, and/or from the media.

- iii. *Information from the Christchurch City Council relating to building standards or the inspection of buildings following an earthquake? If so, please provide details of this information.*

None.

- iv. *Any information from any other party relating to building standards or the inspection of buildings following an earthquake? If so, please provide details of this information.*

I have been a member of the New Zealand Society of Earthquake Engineering for over 10 years and have in the past read most of their published bulletins and publications. I was aware of the "Guidelines for Building Safety Evaluation during State of Emergency", but had not read in detail.

- v. *The Building plans.*

No plans were provided to us and it was not in our brief to review the building plans.

- vi. *The Christchurch City Council's earthquake prone policy and whether the building complied with that.*

I was aware of the council's earthquake prone building policy, but it was not in our brief to check the building for compliance with this policy.

- vii. *Whether any previous structural strengthening had been carried out.*

We understood from our discussions with the client that there had been localised structural strengthening undertaken to the building as follows;

- The parapets had been lowered to remove potential toppling risk (1970's?).
- The parapets had been propped (1980's ?).
- The parapet over the main entry was in the process of having additional propping installed.

I am based in Auckland and would wish to provide evidence in writing. Alternatively I can be present in person.

Yours faithfully

Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited



Andrew Thompson
Team Manager - Structural Engineering

I:\L001-Royal commission-ajt.doc