

CERA

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery
Authority



Job Name: Anderson Building SB#34 Revised v2			
Minutes of:	Meeting regarding ground floor slab Anderson building		Date: 3/8/11
Meeting held at:	CERA Office, HSBC Building 4pm		No: 1
Attendees			<i>File Ref:</i>
Name	Company	Name	Company
Present:		Martin Cooper	CERA
Julius Long	Structex	Alex Robson	CERA
David Jurgen	Jurgens	John O'Hagan	CERA
Cameron Jurgen	Jurgens	Malcolm Timms	CERA
Aaron Jurgen	Jurgens	Anthony Leighs	Leighs
Philip Richards	Ballantynes	Stuart Winterbourne	W2
Paul O'Connell	Ballantynes	Richard Ballantyne	Ballantynes
John O'Loughlin	O'Loughlin, Taylor, Spence		
Apologies:			
Mike Jefferys	CERA		
Distribution – As above:			

Post Meeting Note = **PMN**

	Item	Action	Date
1.0	Initial observations		
1.1.	During the initial tender it was assumed that little damage had been observed to the ground floor slab. No damage was visible from the underside of the beams and double T's in the basement.		
2.0	Current observations		
2.1.	Stuart (w2) with the carpets have been removed from the ground floor slab, the following damage had been observed. -Extensive cracking throughout the topping slab this was similar to what has been seen on other floors: In some cases these cracks have opened up to 4mm wide. Stuart noted it was unusual to see this type of cracking on the ground floor. -Investigation has shown that there is a lack of topping steel in the top 65mm of the slab leading to the redundancy of the slab being significantly reduced. -No slab, starter reinforcement running over the double TT's and the beams tying the floor /TT's into the beams was evident either.		
2.2.	John O'loughlin noted he agreed with the observations of the w2 report and comment on the building. - Cracking is not only extensive to the edge of the beam but also between adjacent double T's. Therefore showing no load distribution,		

	Item	Action	Date
	-From calculations which have been completed the reduced topping has caused the shear capacity to reduce. John noted concerns over the ability of the ground floor, even when propped to safely take the weight of a 60 tonne machine on the ground floor slab is no longer a viable option.		
2.3.	Anthony Leigh noted that floor was understood to require some repairs as part of the new build project but they had not been quantified -These repairs were considered minor based on a relatively undamaged floor slab it is apparent that these are substantially more extensive than initially anticipated. Repairs are required before it can be used for retail occupancy.		
2.4.	Philip Richards noted the use of the basement was considered vital to the efficient operation of inwards good to Ballantynes.		
3.0	Summary of Options going forward		
3.1.	It was agreed by all to complete further work to be review the viable option moving forward. The main drivers, after safety, are noted as time and cost -Two options, as below were agreed upon.		
3.2.	Option 1- Retain Existing Ground floor Slab 1)Demolition cost – Original Tender Sum \$745,000.00 2)Additional Demolition costs to retain slab following further inspection and structural supports (propping and temporary protection) \$235,000.00 3)Repair cost to retained existing slab to allow Temporary building to proceed. \$ Leigh's to provide Total \$ -Repair cost for the slab to be based upon scabbling of floor, new 100mm rapid set concrete slab and intermediate secondary columns siting on pads of 2000x2000x400. It was noted that this would impede truck access to the basement however.		
3.3.	Option 2- Remove Existing Ground Floor Slab 1)Demolition cost- Original Tender Sum \$745,000.00 2)Saving to remove existing ground floor slab [\$80,000.00] 3)New suspended ground level floor \$ Leigh's to provide Total \$		
3.4.	Option 3- Involved filling the basement with demolition debris/hard fill. This offered a further saving from Jurgens but was dismissed for the reason noted in 2.4 above.		
3.5.	Time factor for each option to be considered. Option 1- David noted propping would add 1-2 weeks to the demolition. AL to review time implementations of repairing the slab Option 2- Aaron noted the original end date could still be maintained. AL to review time constraint for new floor.		
3.6.	PR noted Ballantynes have a meeting with their insurer tomorrow and will discuss these items with them		

Note: Unless advised specifically these minutes represent a true and accurate record of the above meeting.

Next Meeting: TBC
Minuted by: Alex Robson