

Mark Zarifeh

From: Robert Ling [ghr.ling@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 18 October 2011 6:30 p.m.
To: Mark Zarifeh
Subject: Re: 382 Colombo St

Dear Mr Zarifeh

I beg your pardon for the delay. Life couldn't be busier.

Regarding 382 Colombo St. it happened such a long time ago.

On 8th January 2011 Insurance Loss adjustor Mr Peter Anvell of Cunningham Lindsay emailed me requesting a report on the damage and condition of the property at 382/384 Colombo st having visited the properties the day before.

I did a quick preview with Mr Anvell during that visit and did more subsequent visits after.

During the visit with Mr Anvell he expressed his view that he believe the buildings can be saved.

Ms Smith of the Heritage unit of CCC was very keen to protect and preserve the four shops also.

A bit of history: About five years ago the Yan family commissioned our company to refurbish and strengthen the four shops creating four modern shops on the ground floor, four apartments on the first floor, storage units at the rear of the properties and ample car parkings in between the shops and the storage units.

During the Consent approval process the plan met with strong request for details of strengthening and so much was the requirement that the refurbishing idea was abandoned in favour of designing and building a new complex to which multiple sketches were done but not proceeded because of problems with access right for 382 Colombo st to the ROW running at the back of the properties from 384 through to Wordsworth st.

We were still waiting for solution to the ROW when the Sept EQ struck.

Back to reality, as afore said I make numerous visits to the site and inspected all the damages and I concluded as follows:

Exterior:

Shop front (facing Colombo St)

Minor damages only

Verandah holding well and no sign of stays loosening.

Parapet appeared stable

Shop front (western wall) looked stable apart from a few minor cracks

Southern wall

This is one of the better wall where there was no sign of damage and remains plumb. The parapet too remained sound.

Northern wall - mostly obscured by the building next door but parapet appeared damaged.

Rear wall -

A fair bit of damage at the rear walls to shop 382a, 384 and 384a, Rear wall of shop 382 was ok.

Roof:

Roof iron was ok

Parapet and chimneys damaged

Interior.

The interiors of all shops and upstairs accomodation suffered considerable amount of damages with substantial diagonal cracks in the walls (both brick and timber).

Conclusion:

My conclusion stayed the same as three years ago and that was demolition. But since the loss adjustors seek costs to repair I was working on it when Feb EQ struck.

After Sept and boxing day EQs, although the buildings were damaged, since the shops were not occupied except for a free lodger, I didn't consider the buildings dangerous and hence did not consider make safe as necessary.

The buildings were essentially weak in the north south direction and when the Feb EQ struck the heavy unsecured south wall got tilt out of plumb and fell on to the single storey building on the south. Had there been a two storey building on the south side like the north side the south wall would not have collapsed. This is similar to the north wall of the Ascot building at Wordsworth st frontage when with no support the whole north wall got push off.

I hope the above helped. To cap of I like to conclude that had I finished the report on time I would have recommend demolition because repairing is just too expensive to be a considered option.

However even if the Insurance company accepts my recommendations, because of time constraints w would not have demolish the building before Feb EQ. and same scenario will happen regardless.

Thanks and regards

Robert Ling
MIPENZ

On 18 October 2011 09:15, Mark Zarifeh <Mark.Zarifeh@royalcommission.govt.nz> wrote:

Dear Mr Ling,

Please reply to my letter of 30/9/11 by return email.

Thank you,

Mark Zarifeh,

Counsel Assisting,

Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission

=====
CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. Thank you.
=====

Robert Ling
MIPENZ