

## Brief of evidence regarding 603 Colombo 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.

### 603 Colombo Street

5. On 16 February 2011 I conducted a reinspection of the property at 603 Colombo Street. I completed an Engineers Re-Inspection of Damaged Buildings form in respect of that property [**BUI.COL603.0038.34**]. I do not recall specifically what instructions I was given by the Council for this inspection.
6. I was not aware at the time of my inspection that the building had a heritage classification.
7. I noted in that report that:

*Building is red stickered. No access to update sticker on [building] due to fencing although it is still in good condition (sticker) and visible.*

8. My report indicates that I considered the condition of the existing protective fencing specifically having regard to the south wall where I observed damage. I was unable to get access to the building because of the fencing already in place. At no other time did I access the building. My report noted that protective fencing was in place. The fencing prevented access to the building and to Mollett Street, the lane running beneath the south wall, and my report noted my recommendation that the fencing was to remain.
9. I do not now recall specifically why I considered the fencing to be adequate but my report indicates that I considered it was adequate. I believe that I considered it to be adequate in relation to the damage observed, which was to the southern wall running along Mollett Street. That part of Mollett Street was cordoned off both at the Colombo Street end and further down Mollett Street. The cordon on the Colombo Street side of the building also extended beyond the footpath into Colombo Street.
10. I am not aware of any other assessments of the protection fencing or who was involved in setting up the fencing.
11. To the best of my knowledge I was not involved in any further action in respect of 603 Colombo Street. My report notes my recommendation that remedial works be carried out within 30 days which reflected my view that the works should be prioritized.

Dated 19 January 2012

---

Mark Ryburn