

Brief of evidence regarding 200 Manchester Street

I, **MARK JOHN RYBURN** of Wellington, Structural Engineer, state:

Introduction

1. I hold a BE (Civil) (Hons). I am a member of the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand. I have 11 years experience as a civil engineer and construction project manager. Between 22 April 2010 and the present day I have been employed by Opus International Consultants Limited ('Opus') as a structural engineer.
2. My brief of evidence [**WIT.RYB.0001**] relating to another building which I read into evidence at the hearing into 593 Colombo Street held on 13 December 2011 contains evidence of a general nature relating to the building reinspection process after the September 2010 earthquake and aftershocks. I do not intend to repeat that evidence but it remains relevant to the other buildings that I have been asked by counsel assisting the Commission to comment on.

My role

3. In January 2011 I was seconded to the Christchurch City Council ('**the Council**') to carry out inspections under the direction of its building recovery office ('**BRO**').
4. I carried out about 10 inspections each day. Each inspection would take about half an hour, sometimes more sometimes less.

200 Manchester Street

5. I have been asked by the Commission to provide information about my inspection of 200 Manchester Street on 9 February 2011.
6. The inspection was requested by the Council BRO team.
7. I am now aware that the building had been the subject of remedial works following the Council serving a Building Act notice on the building owner. I was not aware of this at the time of my inspection, and when I inspected the building I do not recall seeing any placard, although I am now aware that the building had been given green status following an

engineer's certificate in late December or early January. Given that my reinspections were typically of buildings with red or yellow status, I had assumed that this building must have red or yellow status and that my inspection was for the usual purpose of updating the Council file and checking the placard. The file provided to me by the Council did not include information about the remedial works carried out after Boxing Day.

8. When I visited the property, I spoke to the owner of the Iconic Bar. I think she was the new owner. She told me that an Engineer's report had been obtained as part of the sale and purchase agreement. I told her that this assessment did not appear to be on the Council file I had been given and that a formal sign off process with the Council was needed before buildings could be reoccupied. I told her to submit the report to the Council within 7 days for it to be reviewed and processed. I do not recall the basis for the 7 day requirement other than providing her with a reasonable timeframe and a cut-off point. It also appeared that the bar was not yet open fully to the public.
9. I noted on my reinspection form **[BUI.MAN200.0004.168]** that there had been a loss of bricks on the rear (east) wall which had been stabilized for the moment with plywood.
10. My general comments noted that:

New owner imminent. Eng[ineer] has apparently reviewed the requirements for stabilizing the rear wall in which [about] 6 bricks fell from the apex. Recommend contacting the Eng[ineer] for a confirmation of the works as lateral load capacity may not exist. Also get comments on the cracking (likely just in the paint).
11. The information about an Engineer's review came from the owner. Although I used the word stabilized, I was not able to determine whether the plywood wall had been installed as weatherproofing or to reinstate some degree of lateral continuity to the gable wall. I would have expected this to be covered by the building owner's Engineer's report.
12. The cracking on the walls appeared to be minor and older. I recall it following a more random pattern consistent with cracking in the paint rather than in a defined stepwise manner that might be related to cracking in the bricks themselves. Again I would have expected this to have been covered in the Engineer's report.

13. My reinspection report recorded that protection fencing was required to the “rear corner parapet on Gloucester Street”. This was due to my concern about the potential risk from the east wall pending confirmation from the Engineer on remedial works. I was not involved in any follow up work to check that cordons were in place.
14. I have no recollection of any further contact with the Council about this building. I note that the Commission’s copy of my reinspection report **[BUI.MAN200.0004.168]** has what appears to be a post-it note on it saying “Neville please view and make a decision” indicating that Council staff proposed a further inspection of the building. The handwriting on the note is not mine. I was not involved in the decision to re-inspect nor in the reinspection.
15. When inspecting this building along with other buildings that I reinspected, I attempted to take into account the likely performance of the building with regard to its pre-September condition. I was not aware that the building had been subject to previous structural strengthening prior to September 2010 and my assessment was based on a visual external inspection only.
16. Inspections were limited in scope, they did not involve calculations and I was not provided with building plans. In this case, I considered that the correct action was for the building to be subject to a detailed engineering assessment which would be provided to Council for its decision on future occupancy or requirements for further works, and appropriate placarding as a result. Unknown to me, an Engineer's report had already been submitted to the Council and the Council had approved the building's red status being changed to green.

Dated 16 January 2012

Mark Ryburn