

**E-MAILED**

## Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission

Komihana a te Karauna hei Tiro tiro i ngā Whare i Horo i ngā Rūwhenua o Waitaha

13 September 2011

CPG New Zealand Ltd  
236 Armagh Street  
CHRISTCHURCH 8141

Attention: David Coatsworth

Email: [christchurch@nz.cpg-global.com](mailto:christchurch@nz.cpg-global.com)

Dear Mr Coatsworth

**CTV Building, 249 Madras Street: File Number 702974 Report dated April 2011;  
Your reference: 101006 Report**

In the course of its investigations into the collapse of the CTV Building (**the Building**) the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Canterbury Earthquakes (**Royal Commission**) has reviewed a copy of a report from CPG to Madras Equities Ltd dated 6 October 2010, which details an inspection carried out on the Building on Wednesday 29 September 2010.

The report refers under the heading "Introduction" to a telephone discussion with John Drew, the Building Manager of the CTV Building, on 24 September 2010. Beyond this, however, it makes no reference to any instructions received by CPG regarding the nature of the investigation CPG was instructed to undertake.

Would you please provide any written instructions that were given to CPG regarding the nature of the investigation it was required to undertake. As well, please advise the content of any verbal instructions CPG received.

Did these instructions include advising on whether the Building was safe to re-occupy?

Would you also please provide the following information:

- (a) The report records that no structural drawings for the Building had been sighted by CPG. Please advise why this was the case. In particular, did CPG consider it relevant in determining the structural integrity of the Building to examine the structural drawings? If yes, what steps (if any), were taken to obtain the structural drawings and why were they not reviewed? If an examination of the structural drawings was not thought to be relevant, please explain why.

---

15 Barry Hogan Place, Addington, Christchurch  
PO Box 14053, Christchurch Mail Centre 8544

- (b) The report records that CPG had no information regarding the Building foundations. Did CPG consider it relevant in determining the structural integrity of the Building to obtain information about the Building foundations? If yes, what steps were taken (if any) to obtain information about the foundations? If this information was not considered to be relevant, please explain why.
- (c) It appears from the report that no steps were taken to accurately determine the design load requirements that applied under the code at the time the CTV Building was permitted. Did CPG consider it relevant in determining the structural integrity of the Building to know what the design load was that applied to the CTV Building at the time of construction? If yes, what steps were taken (if any) to obtain this information? If CPG did not consider this information relevant, please explain why.
- (d) The report recommends that the internal ground storey strapping and plasterboard lining be removed to review the structure behind. Why did CPG recommend this? Did you discuss this recommendation at any stage with John Drew or anyone else acting for the Building owner? If yes, please provide details. Do you know whether this recommendation was ever followed? If yes, what was the result of that further investigation?
- (e) The report refers to the removal of ceiling tiles in a "limited number of locations". Would you please provide detailed information about the locations where ceiling tiles were removed and why those particular locations were selected.

This request for information is made on the basis of the Royal Commission's statutory powers under s 4C of the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908.

Would you please provide this information by no later than **Friday 23 September 2011**.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully



Stephen Mills QC  
Counsel Assisting  
Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission