

23 November 2011



Mr Mark Zarifeh
Counsel Assisting
Canterbury Earthquake Royal Commission
P O Box 14053
CHRISTCHURCH 8544

Dear Sir

I refer to our letter of 16 November in response to your letters of 2, 7 and 10 November 2011. As advised in our letter, we were arranging the information you had requested in respect of 116 Lichfield Street, and 382 Colombo Street.

The following is our response in respect of these buildings, noting that these should be read together with our letter of 16 November.

382 Colombo Street

Questions in Royal Commission letter 2 November 2011

- 1 Not to Mr Ryburn's recollection.
- 2 No because actioning of recommendations was undertaken by the Council's staff.
- 3
 - (a) Yes. His report recommended canopy works and fencing and he red stickered the property (it was previously yellow stickered).
 - (b) Yes, a red sticker was placed in a prominent position on the building and a recommendation for extended fencing protection to further communicate the risk to the public and neighbouring properties, was made.
 - (c) The instructions received from the Council were not specific on this point. Generally Mr Ryburn would accept that his role was to identify additional visible hazards as a result of the previous seismic events presented by the buildings he was instructed to inspect. However these were usually external inspections only, and did not involve detailed structural engineering evaluations. In relation to advice, again this was not specifically part of the instructions received. The sticker system was the primary means of giving advice to the public about the status of a particular building.
4. See answers of general application in our letter dated 16 November 2011 (page 1 and 2, answers 1 to 6).

Questions in Royal Commission letter 10 November 2011

1. See letter dated 16 November 2011.
2. Same answer.
- 3 A partial visual external inspection covering the matters recorded in the Reinspection Report dated 4 February 2011. A closer inspection was not carried out due to concerns about the apparent instability of the occupants
- 4 The gable wall is not mentioned in the report and Mr Ryburn cannot recall an assessment of this part of the structure. His recollection is also that access and visibility to that area was limited from both the front and rear of the property. Item 1.2 does not specifically refer to structural walls. If a problem with the gable wall had been identified it is likely that this would have been noted in items 1.1 and/or 2.1.
- 6 The recommendation was "Propping to canopy and strengthening of canopies should be carried out." The purpose of this recommendation was to secure and strengthen the canopies themselves but not to specifically affect the loading on the existing wall.
- 7 Mr Ryburn does not recall exactly why he imposed a 2 month period for works. Generally the inspectors were working to a 2 month period for works because this appeared, after consultation with Council, to be a reasonable requirement on property owners that reflected the practicalities of the situation. In other cases, shorter time frames were imposed. For example, Mr Ryburn imposed a 30 day period for 187 St Asaph Street where his reinspection report dated 14 February 2011 recorded that no works had been undertaken to secure a hazard to passersby since 12 October.
- 8 See answer to 3(b) above in response to your letter dated 2 November.
- 9 Nil.

Yours faithfully
OPUS INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANTS LTD

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Glen Hughes', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Glen Hughes
SOUTHERN REGIONAL MANAGER