

Under **THE COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY ACT 1908**
In the matter of the **CANTERBURY EARTHQUAKES ROYAL COMMISSION
OF INQUIRY INTO THE COLLAPSE OF THE CTV
BUILDING**

**COMPOSITE STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ALAN MICHAEL REAY –
PERMIT ISSUES**

BUDDLE FINDLAY
Barristers and Solicitors
Christchurch

Solicitor Acting: **Willie Palmer / Kelly Paterson**
Email: kelly.paterson@buddlefindlay.com
Tel 64-3-379 1747 Fax 64-3-379 5659 PO Box 322 DX WP20307 Christchurch 8140

Counsel Acting: **H B Rennie QC**
Harbour Chambers Tel 64-4-4992684 Fax 64-4-4992705 PO Box 10242 Wellington

COMPOSITE STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ALAN MICHAEL REAY – PERMIT ISSUES

FIRST STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

1. My full name is Alan Michael Reay. I reside in Christchurch. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and a Company Director.

Council permitting

38. In those days it was the contractor who applied for a building permit and to whom the permit was issued. However, in this case it appears that the permit application was submitted by the architect, Alun Wilkie Associates on behalf of the contractor [BUI.MAD249.0141.8]. Mr Harding handled the permit process from ARCE's perspective. I was not involved with the Council permit application process. I expect that Williams would have submitted the structural drawings to Council.
39. I note that ARCE received a letter dated 27 August 1986 from Mr Tapper at the Council [BUI.MAD249.0141.14]. Mr Harding would have dealt with the letter. I do not recall having anything to do with the letter or its response. I do not know who wrote the notation on the letter "*rec'd a day or two after letter sent*", the ticks in the left hand margin or the notations next to items S26, S28, S29 and S30 on the second page of the letter. I am unable to say how the items raised in Mr Tapper's letter were addressed or dealt with by Mr Harding or ARCE, as I do not recall any involvement.
40. Mr Harding appears to have responded at least in part with a document transfer form that enclosed certain documents [BUI.MAD249.0141.1]. The calculations referred to (Bondek structure after fire, pp G78 and G79) would not have been the complete set of calculations and I am unable to say when or how the full set of calculations was provided to the Council.
41. Engineers and Council staff would sometimes meet or speak on the phone during the building permit application process. I note, for example, a letter dated 19 August 1987 from ARCE to Williams [BUI.MAD249.0259A.4]. The fourth paragraph of the letter refers to detailed discussions between ARCE and the Council at the time of building permit application. Those discussions would have been between Mr Harding and the Council engineers.

42. Council engineers would do a full engineering review of some buildings and other times they would appear not to. Bryan Bluck knew all the engineers around Christchurch. He knew the strengths and weaknesses of the Christchurch structural engineers. He would have weighed up the complexity of the proposed building with these qualities of the design engineer in determining the extent of structural review. Usually the Council engineers would do the review themselves and sometimes they would arrange an independent external review.
43. Mr Bluck and Mr Tapper were both dedicated and competent engineers. Mr Bluck had been at the Council for many years. I am unsure of Mr Tapper's background, but his role at the Council was secondary to that of Mr Bluck. I had a professional relationship with Mr Bluck and I respected him.
44. If the Council engineers were not sufficiently satisfied with their interpretation of compliance, they would not issue the permit. That was my experience.
45. It is evident that the Council engineers reviewed this building closely themselves. The Council engineers must have believed that the building complied with the relevant code or they would not have issued a permit.
46. I do not recall any discussions with Council engineers about the building. I was not involved in the design so would not have been in a position to discuss the details of it with Council engineers. I deny any suggestion that I pressured Council engineers to process or grant the permit. I do not recall any discussion with either Mr Bluck or Mr Tapper about the project.
47. A building permit was granted subject to conditions [**BUI.MAD249.0141.5, BUI.MAD249.0141.6, BUI.MAD249.0141.10**].
48. There was no formal sign off of a building required at the time. There was no equivalent to today's Code Compliance Certificate under the Building Act 2004. The consent conditions sometimes required the building's designer to sign a form of construction completion certificate. However, often the Council did not request the completion certificate at the end of the job. ARCL's file does not disclose whether any such sign off was given in this case. If it had been given, it would have been by Mr Harding as the engineer responsible.
49. I do recall a Design Certificate was in use at the time and was sometimes given as a form of design sign off. A Design Certificate was similar to

today's PS 1 and it stated that the engineer believed based on the information available to him or her that the building complied with Code. There is no record of a Design Certificate being requested for the CTV Building.

THIRD STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

Peter Nichols

59. I do not recall any dealings with Mr Nichols at any time while he was at the Christchurch City Council. I recall only dealing with Mr Bluck at the relevant time (1981 to 1984).
60. I recall dealing personally with Mr Nichols once when he was at Riccarton Borough Council, in which I answered his question and he subsequently approved the building permit.
61. At paragraph 26 of his evidence, Mr Nichols refers to a conversation he had with Mr Bluck in which Mr Bluck said that he had been "convinced by Alan Reay" that his reservations about the design of the building were unfounded. I do not recall any such conversation with Mr Bluck. As I have said in my first statement, I was not involved in the building permit process and would have had no reason to speak with Mr Bluck.
62. I also note that Mr Nichols refers (at paragraph 29) to Mr Bluck requiring a Design Certificate (as opposed to a verbal undertaking). I have no recollection of a Design Certificate being issued for the CTV project.
63. At paragraph 36 Mr Nichols states that I would go over the head of the "ordinary engineer" and speak to Mr Bluck. I entirely reject the evidence in this paragraph. I always appreciated the assistance and direction Mr Bluck provided and simply preferred to continue dealing with him.

Dated this 30th day of July 2012



A M Reay