
Christchurch City Council

Clent Lane Housing Complex PRO 1091

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Quantitative Assessment Report





Christchurch City Council

Clent Lane Housing Complex

Quantitative **Assessment Report**

32 Cobham Street, Spreydon,

Prepared By

Claire Ford

Engineering Assistant

Lachlan Howat

Reviewed By

Structural Engineer

Approved for Release By

Mary Ann Halliday Senior Structural Engineer

Opus International Consultants Ltd Christchurch Office 20 Moorhouse Avenue PO Box 1482, Christchurch Mail Centre, Christchurch 8140 New Zealand

Telephone: Facsimile:

+64 3 363 5400 +64 3 365 7858

Date: Reference: Status:

April 2014 6-QC331.00 Final



Summary

Clent Lane Housing Complex PRO 1091

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Quantitative Report - Summary Final

Background

This is a summary of the quantitative report for the Clent Lane Housing Complex, and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011. This assessment covers the 36 residential units and the Residents Lounge on the site.

Key Damage Observed

The residential units have suffered minor damage to non-structural elements. This included cracking of the internal wall linings and ceiling diaphragms. There is minor cracking to the concrete bond beam and firewall. This damage was deemed low enough to not affect the capacities of the buildings.

Level Survey

All accessible floor slopes were assessed in a laser level survey. Some of the floor slopes were greater than the 5mm/m limitation set out in the MBIE guidelines [6], as shown below.

Internal Lining Nail Spacings

The internal lining nail spacings were measured on site to vary between 150 – 400 mm.

Critical Structural Weaknesses

No critical structural weaknesses were found in any of the buildings.

Indicative Building Strength

Table A: Summary of Seismic Performance by Blocks

Block	NBS%	Indicative Floor Levels	Nail Spacings
PRO 1091 B001 (Block A)	27%	Pass	Pass
PRO 1091 B002 (Block B)	27%	Pass	Pass
PRO 1091 B003 (Block C)	27%	Pass	Pass
PRO 1091 B004 (Block D)	27%	Pass	Pass
PRO 1091 B005 (Block E)	27%	Pass	Pass
PRO 1091 B006 (Block F)	27%	Fail	Pass
PRO 1091 B007 (Block G)	27%	Fail	Pass
PRO 1091 B008 (Block H)	27%	Pass	Pass

All buildings on the site are considered to be Earthquake Prone.

Blocks A, B, C, D F, G and H have capacities of 27%NBS as limited by the capacity of the timber framed walls in the longitudinal direction. They are deemed to be a 'high risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines.

Block E has a capacity of 27%NBS as limited by the capacity of the timber framed walls and temporary braces in the residential units in the longitudinal direction. It is deemed to be a 'high risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines.

Increasing the number of nails in the plasterboard will not significantly improve the strength of the buildings.

Recommendations

It is recommended that;

- Strengthening schemes be developed to bring the capacities of the structures to at least 67%NBS.
- Cracking in the concrete bond beam and block firewall be repaired.
- Replace temporary propping with permanent strengthening solution.
- Cosmetic repairs be undertaken as required.

Contents

Sum	imaryi
1	Introduction4
2	Compliance4
3	Earthquake Resistance Standards8
4	Background Information 10
5	Damage16
6	Detailed Seismic Assessment17
7	Geotechnical Summary21
8	Conclusions 22
9	Recommendations 22
10	Limitations22
11	References 23
Арр	endix A – Photographs

Appendix B – Level Survey

- Appendix C Methodology and Assumptions
- Appendix D CERA DEE Spreadsheet

1 Introduction

Opus International Consultants Limited has been engaged by Christchurch City Council to undertake a detailed seismic assessment of the Clent Lane Housing Complex, located at 32 Cobham Street, Spreydon, following the Canterbury earthquake sequence since September 2010. The site was visited by Opus International Consultants on 2 December 2013.

The purpose of the assessment is to determine if the buildings in the complex are classed as being earthquake prone in accordance with the Building Act 2004.

The seismic assessment and reporting have been undertaken based on the qualitative and quantitative procedures detailed in the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure (DEEP) document (draft) issued by the Structural Engineering Society (SESOC) [2] [3] [4] [5].

2 Compliance

This section contains a brief summary of the requirements of the various statutes and authorities that control activities in relation to buildings in Christchurch at present.

2.1 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)

CERA was established on 28 March 2011 to take control of the recovery of Christchurch using powers established by the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act enacted on 18 April 2011. This act gives the Chief Executive Officer of CERA wide powers in relation to building safety, demolition and repair. Two relevant sections are:

Section 38 – Works

This section outlines a process in which the chief executive can give notice that a building is to be demolished and if the owner does not carry out the demolition, the chief executive can commission the demolition and recover the costs from the owner or by placing a charge on the owners' land.

Section 51 – Requiring Structural Survey

This section enables the chief executive to require a building owner, insurer or mortgagee to carry out a full structural survey before the building is re-occupied.

We understand that CERA require a detailed engineering evaluation to be carried out for all buildings (other than those exempt from the Earthquake Prone Building definition in the Building Act). CERA have adopted the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure (DEEP) document (draft) issued by the Structural Engineering Society (SESOC) on 19 July 2011. This document sets out a methodology for both initial qualitative and detailed quantitative assessments.

It is anticipated that a number of factors, including the following, will determine the extent of evaluation and strengthening level required:

1. The importance level and occupancy of the building.

- 2. The placard status and amount of damage.
- 3. The age and structural type of the building.
- 4. Consideration of any critical structural weaknesses.

Christchurch City Council requires any building with a capacity of less than 34% of New Building Standard (including consideration of critical structural weaknesses) to be strengthened to a target of 67% as required under the CCC Earthquake Prone Building Policy.

2.2 Building Act

Several sections of the Building Act are relevant when considering structural requirements:

Section 112 - Alterations

This section requires that an existing building complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code to at least the extent that it did prior to the alteration. This effectively means that a building cannot be weakened as a result of an alteration (including partial demolition).

The Earthquake Prone Building policy for the territorial authority shall apply as outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Section 115 – Change of Use

This section requires that the territorial authority is satisfied that the building with a new use complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code 'as near as is reasonably practicable'.

This is typically interpreted by territorial authorities as being 67% of the strength of an equivalent new building or as near as practicable. This is also the minimum level recommended by the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE).

Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

This section was extended by the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2010, and defines a building as dangerous if:

- 1. In the ordinary course of events (excluding the occurrence of an earthquake), the building is likely to cause injury or death or damage to other property; or
- 2. In the event of fire, injury or death to any persons in the building or on other property is likely because of fire hazard or the occupancy of the building; or
- 3. There is a risk that the building could collapse or otherwise cause injury or death as a result of earthquake shaking that is less than a 'moderate earthquake' (refer to Section 122 below); or
- 4. There is a risk that other property could collapse or otherwise cause injury or death; or
- 5. A territorial authority has not been able to undertake an inspection to determine whether the building is dangerous.

Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings

This section defines a building as earthquake prone (EPB) if its ultimate capacity would be exceeded in a 'moderate earthquake' and it would be likely to collapse causing injury or death, or damage to other property.

A moderate earthquake is defined by the building regulations as one that would generate loads 33% of those used to design an equivalent new building.

Section 124 – Powers of Territorial Authorities

This section gives the territorial authority the power to require strengthening work within specified timeframes or to close and prevent occupancy to any building defined as dangerous or earthquake prone.

Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy

This section requires the territorial authority to adopt a specific policy for earthquake prone, dangerous and insanitary buildings.

2.3 Christchurch City Council Policy

Christchurch City Council adopted their Earthquake Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Building Policy in October 2011 following the Darfield Earthquake on 4 September 2010.

The policy includes the following:

- 1. A process for identifying, categorising and prioritising Earthquake Prone Buildings, commencing on 1 July 2012;
- 2. A strengthening target level of 67% of a new building for buildings that are Earthquake Prone;
- 3. A timeframe of 15-30 years for Earthquake Prone Buildings to be strengthened; and,
- 4. Repair works for buildings damaged by earthquakes will be required to comply with the above.

The council has stated their willingness to consider retrofit proposals on a case by case basis, considering the economic impact of such a retrofit.

If strengthening works are undertaken, a building consent will be required. A requirement of the consent will require upgrade of the building to comply 'as near as is reasonably practicable' with:

- The accessibility requirements of the Building Code.
- The fire requirements of the Building Code. This is likely to require a fire report to be submitted with the building consent application.

Where an application for a change of use of a building is made to Council, the building will be required to be strengthened to 67% of New Building Standard or as near as is reasonably practicable.

2.4 Building Code

The Building Code outlines performance standards for buildings and the Building Act requires that all new buildings comply with this code. Compliance Documents published by The Department of Building and Housing can be used to demonstrate compliance with the Building Code.

On 19 May 2011, Compliance Document B1: Structure, was amended to include increased seismic design requirements for Canterbury as follows:

- Increase in the basic seismic design load for the Canterbury earthquake region (Z factor increased to 0.3 equating to an increase of 36 47% depending on location within the region);
- Increased serviceability requirements.

2.5 Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand (IPENZ) Code of Ethics

One of the core ethical values of professional engineers in New Zealand is the protection of life and safeguarding of people. The IPENZ Code of Ethics requires that:

Members shall recognise the need to protect life and to safeguard people, and in their engineering activities shall act to address this need.

- 1.1 Giving Priority to the safety and well-being of the community and having regard to this principle in assessing obligations to clients, employers and colleagues.
- 1.2 Ensuring that responsible steps are taken to minimise the risk of loss of life, injury or suffering which may result from your engineering activities, either directly or indirectly.

All recommendations on building occupancy and access must be made with these fundamental obligations in mind.

3 Earthquake Resistance Standards

For this assessment, the building's earthquake resistance is compared with the current New Zealand Building Code requirements for a new building constructed on the site. This is expressed as a percentage of new building standard (%NBS). The loadings are in accordance with the current earthquake loading standard NZS1170.5 [1].

A generally accepted classification of earthquake risk for existing buildings in terms of %NBS that has been proposed by the NZSEE 2006 [2] is presented in Figure 1 below.

Description	Grade	Risk	%NBS	Existing Building Structural Performance		Improvement of Struc	tural Performance
					←	Legal Requirement	NZSEE Recommendation
Low Risk Building	A or B	Low	Above 67	Acceptable (improvement may be desirable)		The Building Act sets no required level of structural improvement (unless change in use)	100%NBSdesirable.Improvementshouldachieve at least 67%NBS
Moderate Risk Building	B or C	Moderate	34 to 66	Acceptable legally. Improvement recommended		This is for each TA to decide. Improvement is not limited to 34%NBS.	Not recommended. Acceptable only in exceptional circumstances
High Risk Building	D or E	High	33 or lower	Unacceptable (Improvement required under Act)		Unacceptable	Unacceptable

Figure 1: NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE Guidelines [2]

Table 1 below compares the percentage NBS to the relative risk of the building failing in a seismic event with a 10% risk of exceedance in 50 years (i.e. 0.2% in the next year).

	to relative risk of failure
Percentage of New Building	Relative Risk (Approximate)
Standard (%NBS)	
> 100	at times
>100	<1 time
80-100	1-2 times
67.80	o = times
67-80	2-5 times
33-67	5-10 times
	0
00.00	10-25 times
20-33	10-25 times
<20	>25 times
	5

Table 1: %NBS compared to relative risk of failure

3.1 Minimum and Recommended Standards

Based on governing policy and recent observations, Opus makes the following general recommendations:

3.1.1 Occupancy

The Canterbury Earthquake Order¹ in Council 16 September 2010, modified the meaning of "dangerous building" to include buildings that were identified as being EPB's. As a result of this, we would expect such a building would be issued with a Section 124 notice, by the Territorial Authority, or CERA acting on their behalf, once they are made aware of our assessment. Based on information received from CERA to date and from the MBIE guidance document dated December 2012 [6], this notice is likely to prohibit occupancy of the building (or parts thereof), until its seismic capacity is improved to the point that it is no longer considered an EPB.

3.1.2 Cordoning

Where there is an overhead falling hazard, or potential collapse hazard of the building, the areas of concern should be cordoned off in accordance with current CERA/territorial authority guidelines.

3.1.3 Strengthening

Industry guidelines (NZSEE 2006 [2]) strongly recommend that every effort be made to achieve improvement to at least 67%NBS. A strengthening solution to anything less than 67%NBS would not provide an adequate reduction to the level of risk.

It should be noted that full compliance with the current building code requires building strength of 100%NBS.

3.1.4 Our Ethical Obligation

In accordance with the IPENZ code of ethics, we have a duty of care to the public. This obligation requires us to identify and inform CERA of potentially dangerous buildings; this would include earthquake prone buildings.

¹ This Order only applies to buildings within the Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District Councils authority.

4 Background Information

4.1 Building Descriptions

The site contains 36 residential units which were constructed in 1977 and a resident's lounge which was converted from two residential units. The roofs of all units were replaced and interiors refurbished in 2011. A site plan showing the location of the units, numbered 1 to 38 (residential lounge occupies units 21 and 22), is shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 shows the location of the site in Christchurch City. The units are grouped together to form 7 blocks of three, four, six or eight units.

Unit 18 could not be entered due to fire damage.




Figure 2: Site plan of Clent Lane Housing Complex.




Figure 3: Location of Clent Lane (circled) relative to Christchurch City CBD (Source: Google Earth).

The residential units have reinforced concrete block walls with 12mm diameter rods vertically at 600mm centres. The roof structure comprises of timber roof trusses supporting lightweight metal roofs. The walls and ceilings are lined with plasterboard. The internal timber framed walls in the transverse direction are not full height. The 'front wall' of the units is thought to have no bracing capacity as it consists of large windows and doors.

The units are separated by 190mm block masonry fire walls which are filled with 12mm diameter rods at 600mm centres. A reinforced cast in situ bond beam is located at the ceiling line within the block fire wall.

Foundations are strip footings with 190mm by 900mm reinforced 'spade' footings 2.5m from either end of the fire walls and end walls. All other walls have reinforced concrete footings around the perimeter. A reinforced concrete slab is tied into these footings.

The Residents Lounge has been converted from two adjacent units in Block E. After initial investigations by Opus International Consultants, temporary braces (Figure 6 and Photos 20 and 21) were installed on 20 March 2014 so that the units in this block could remain occupied.

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show floor plans of a typical residential unit and the Residents Lounge respectively produced from site measurements by Opus. Figure 7 shows a comparable cross section used in calculations, from Clent Lane prior to the roof replacement.




Figure 4: Typical partial floor plan of residential unit blocks.




Figure 5: Partial floor plan of Residents Lounge.




Figure 7: Comparable cross section of Clent Lane (before roof replacement).

4.2 Survey

4.2.1 Post 22 February 2011 Rapid Assessment

A structural (Level 2) assessment of the buildings/property was undertaken on 8 March 2011 by Opus International Consultants.

4.2.2 Level Survey

A full level survey was not deemed to be necessary at Clent Lane as it is located in a TC2 zone. Properties in TC2 zones suffered minor to moderate damage due to liquefaction and/or settlement. In lieu of a full level survey, a laser level was placed in each unit so that differentials in vertical levels could be measured at the extreme ends of the unit. These values could then be used to determine the floor slope of the entire unit. For this site, the maximum slope in a unit was 6 mm/m (which exceeds the 5mm/m limitation imposed by MBIE guidelines), the general slopes across all units was approximately 3 mm/m.

Table 2: Summary of the Level Survey				
Block	Unit No.	Comment	Maximum Fall*	
	1	Pass	-	
•	2	Pass	-	
A	3	Pass	-	
	4	Pass	-	
	5	Pass	-	
	6	Pass	-	
В	7	Pass	-	
D	8	Pass	-	
	9	Pass	-	
	10	Pass	-	
	11	Pass	-	
	12	Pass	-	
С	14	Pass	-	
	15	Pass	-	
	16	Pass	-	
	17	Pass	-	
D	18	Pass	-	
D	19	Pass	-	
	20	Pass	-	
	Residents Lounge	Pass	-	
E	23	Pass	-	
	24	Pass	-	
	25	Fail	5 mm/m	
	26	Pass	-	
	27	Pass	-	
Б	28	Pass	-	
F	29	Pass	-	
	30	Pass	-	
	31	Pass	-	
	32	Pass	-	
	33	Fail	6 mm/m	
G	34	Pass	-	
	35	Pass	-	
	36	Pass	-	
Н	37	Pass	-	
-	38	Pass	-	
* Values are only recorded if greater than 5mm/m				

Table 2: Summary of the Level Survey

Values are only recorded if greater than 5mm/m

Orange results represent floor levels which fall outside the MBIE guidelines when using the laser level but may comply when surveyed using more accurate equipment.

4.2.3 Nail Spacings

The internal lining nail spacings were measured on site to vary between 150 – 400 mm.

4.3 Original Documentation

The following documentation was provided by the Christchurch City Council:

 Document No. A241 – Christchurch City Council – Cobham Street Elderly Persons Housing – p. 1-13/14 – Site plan; Services plan; Unit plans and Elevations by block; Foundation plans and Sections; Electrical layouts, Door elevations and details, Fencing details; Wall elevations; Amendments to original plans – 1975 (amended in 1976).

In addition, a typical floor plan has been produced by Opus to help confirm as-built measurements.

Copies of the design calculations were not provided.

5 Damage

This section outlines the damage to the buildings that was observed during site visits. It is not intended to be a complete summary of the damage sustained by the buildings due to the earthquakes. Some forms of damage may not be able to be identified with a visual inspection only.

Although most damage is evenly distributed, it is noticeable that some residential unit blocks, and individual units, have suffered more damage than others. Overall, Unit 19 appears to have suffered the highest levels of damage.

Note: Any photo referenced in this section can be found in Appendix A.

5.1 Residual Displacements

Only minor displacements were observed in all units inspected. Two units exhibited levels which exceeded the 5mm/m MBIE guideline.

5.2 Foundations

No damage was observed to the foundations.

5.3 Primary Gravity Structure

Stepped cracking was observed in the concrete block walls.

5.4 Primary Lateral-Resistance Structure

Minor damage was observed to the primary lateral resistance structure in the form of cracking to wall and ceiling linings. Cracking was also observed to the bond beam at the top of the fire walls in most units (photo 12). Similar cracks were also observed from the exterior of the bond beams (photo 15) which have been patched between the time of the damage and the site inspection. Stepped cracking was also observed in the fire wall of Unit 19 (photo 13).

5.5 Non Structural Elements

Minor to moderate damage to non-structural elements was observed. This included cracking to plasterboard wall linings where they join at corners (photos 11 and 14).

Damage was also observed to the paths around the complex in the form of cracking and displacement.

5.6 General Observations

The buildings appeared to have performed reasonably well, as would be expected for buildings of this type, during the earthquakes. They have suffered distributed amounts of minor damage which is typical of the type and age of construction.

6 Detailed Seismic Assessment

The detailed seismic assessment has been based on the NZSEE 2006 [2] guidelines for the "Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes" together with the "Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Part 2 Evaluation Procedure" [3] draft document prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, and the SESOC guidelines "Practice Note – Design of Conventional Structural Systems Following Canterbury Earthquakes" [5] issued on 21 December 2011.

As the residential units have the same floor plan, the analysis was simplified by conducting the analysis of one multi-unit block with similar cladding and using this for all multi-unit blocks.

6.1 Critical Structural Weaknesses

The term Critical Structural Weakness (CSW) refers to a component of a building that could contribute to increased levels of damage or cause premature collapse of a building.

No CSWs were identified in the buildings.

6.2 Quantitative Assessment Methodology

The assessment assumptions and methodology have been included in Appendix C. A brief summary follows:

Hand calculations were performed to determine seismic forces from the current building codes. These forces were applied globally to the structure and the capacities of the walls were calculated and used to estimate the %NBS. The walls, highlighted in Figure 8 through Figure 10, were used for bracing in their respective directions.




Figure 8: Walls used for bracing in the longitudinal direction residential units.




Figure 9: Walls used for bracing in the transverse direction residential units.




Figure 10: Walls used for bracing in the longitudinal direction Residents Lounge.




Figure 11: Walls used for bracing in the transverse direction Residents Lounge.

6.3 Limitations and Assumptions in Results

The observed level of damage suffered by the buildings was deemed low enough to not affect their capacity. Therefore the analysis and assessment of the buildings was based on them being in an undamaged state. There may have been damage to the buildings that was unable to be observed that could cause the capacity of the buildings to be reduced; therefore the current capacity of the buildings may be lower than that stated.

The results have been reported as a %NBS and the stated value is that obtained from our analysis and assessment. Despite the use of best national and international practice in this analysis and assessment, this value contains uncertainty due to the many assumptions and simplifications which are made during the assessment. These include:

- Simplifications made in the analysis, including boundary conditions such as foundation fixity.
- Assessments of material strengths based on limited drawings, specifications and site inspections.
- The normal variation in material properties which change from batch to batch.
- Approximations made in the assessment of the capacity of each element, especially when considering the post-yield behaviour.
- Construction is consistent with normal practise of the era in which constructed.

6.4 Assessment

A summary of the structural performance of the buildings is shown in Table 3. Note that the values given represent the worst performing elements in the building, where these effectively define the building's capacity. Other elements within the building may have significantly greater capacity when compared with the governing elements.

Although the governing criteria is less than 33%NBS it is not considered to be a brittle failure mechanism so the buildings remain safe to occupy.

Building Description	Critical element	% NBS based on calculated capacity in longitudinal direction	% NBS based on calculated capacity in transverse direction.
Blocks A-D and F-H	Out of plane bending of Fire Wall	41%	-
blocks A-D and F-H	In plane shear of bracing walls	27%	100%
Block E	Out of plane bending of Fire Wall A (Figure 10) with temporary propping	55%	-
	In plane shear of bracing walls in residential units	27%	100%

Table 3: Summary of Seismic Performance

7 Geotechnical Summary

CERA indicates that Clent Lane is located in a TC2 zone (as shown in Figure 12). This classification suggests future significant earthquakes will cause minor to moderate land damage due to liquefaction and settlement.




Figure 12: CERA Technical Categories map (loc. starred).

There is no evidence to suggest that further geotechnical investigation is warranted for this site.

8 Conclusions

- Blocks A, B, C, D, F, G and H have capacities of 27% NBS, as limited by the in-plane capacity of the bracing walls. They are deemed to be a 'high risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines. Their level of risk is 10-25 times that of a 100% NBS building (Figure 1).
- Block E has a capacity of 27%NBS as limited by the capacity of the timber framed walls and temporary braces in the residential units in the longitudinal direction. It is deemed to be a 'high risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines. The level of risk is 10-25 times that of a 100% NBS building (Figure 1).
- The buildings remain safe to occupy as they are not considered to have a brittle failure mechanism.

9 Recommendations

It is recommended that;

- Strengthening schemes be developed to bring the capacities of the structures to at least 67%NBS.
- Cracking in the concrete bond beam and block firewall be repaired.
- Replace temporary propping with permanent strengthening solution.
- Cosmetic repairs be undertaken as required.

10 Limitations

- This report is based on an inspection of the buildings and focuses on the structural damage resulting from the Canterbury Earthquake sequence since September 2010. Some non-structural damage may be described but this is not intended to be a complete list of damage to non-structural items.
- Our professional services are performed using a degree of care and skill normally exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable consultants practicing in this field at this time.
- This report is prepared for the Christchurch City Council to assist in the assessment of any remedial works required for the Clent Lane Housing Complex. It is not intended for any other party or purpose.

11 References

- [1] NZS 1170.5: 2004, Structural design actions, Part 5 Earthquake actions, Standards New Zealand.
- [2] NZSEE (2006), Assessment and improvement of the structural performance of buildings in earthquakes, New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering.
- [3] Engineering Advisory Group, Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Part 2 Evaluation Procedure, Draft Prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group, Revision 5, 19 July 2011.
- [4] Engineering Advisory Group, *Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Nonresidential buildings, Part 3 Technical Guidance*, Draft Prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group, 13 December 2011.
- [5] SESOC (2011), Practice Note Design of Conventional Structural Systems Following Canterbury Earthquakes, Structural Engineering Society of New Zealand, 21 December 2011.
- [6] MBIE (2012), Repairing and rebuilding houses affected by the Canterbury earthquakes, Ministry of Building, Innovation and Employment, December 2012.

Appendix A – Photographs

Clent Lan	Clent Lane Housing Complex		
Residentia	dential Units Layout		
1.	Typical exterior elevation (front)		
2.	Typical exterior elevation (end)		

3.	Typical attic space	
4.	Typical roof space (showing fire wall)	
5.	Typical dining area view	

6.	Typical lounge view	<image/>
7.	Typical bedroom view	
8.	Typical bathroom view	

9.	Typical kitchen view	<image/>
10.	Typical cracking to ceiling diaphragm	
11.	Typical cracking where wall and ceiling linings meet	

12.	Cracking in bond beam	

13.	Stepped cracking observed in the interior fire wall of Unit 19	


14.	Typical separation of interior wall linings from fire wall	
15.	Exterior crack in bond beam	


Residents	Lounge	
16.	Entrance view	
17.	Kitchen view	
18.	Bathroom view	

19.	Main room view	
20.	Temporary braces installed in Residents Lounge	<image/>



Appendix B – Level Survey





Unit 33

Appendix C – Methodology and Assumptions

Seismic Parameters

As per NZS 1170.5:

- T < 0.4s (assumed)
- Soil: Category D
- Z = 0.3
- R = 1.0 (IL2, 50 year)
- N(T,D) = 1.0

For the analyses, a μ of 2 was assumed for the residential units.

Analysis Procedure

As the units are small and have a number of closely spaced walls in both directions, the fibrous plaster board ceilings are assumed to be capable of transferring loads to all walls. It was therefore assumed that a global method could be used to carry the forces down to ground level in each direction. Bracing capacities were found by assuming a certain kN/m rating for the walls along each line. Due to the relatively unknown nature of the walls, the kN/m rating was taken as 3 kN/m for all timber walls with an aspect ratio (height: length) of less than 2:1. This was scaled down to zero kN/m at an aspect ratio of 3.5:1 as per NZSEE guidelines. Concrete block walls were analysed using New Zealand Standards %NBS values were then found through the ratio of bracing demand to bracing capacity for all walls in each direction.

Additional Assumptions

Further assumptions about the seismic performance of the buildings were:

- Foundations and foundation connections had adequate capacity to resist and transfer earthquake loads.
- Connections between all elements of the lateral load resisting systems are detailed to adequately transfer their loads sufficiently and are strong enough so as to not fail before the lateral load resisting elements.

Appendix D – CERA DEE Spreadsheet

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data			
Location	Conseleus (Placeba A. 8, D)	Deviewer Many Area Hellider	
Building Name: Clent Lane Housing	Unit No: Street	Reviewer: Mary Ann Halliday CPEng No:	67073
Building Address: Legal Description:	62 Cobham Street	Company: Opus International Consultants Ltd. Company project number: 6-QC331.00	<u>. </u>
	Degrees Min Sec	Company phone number: (03) 363 5400	
GPS south:	43 33 22.40		Feb-14
GPS east:	172 36 36.32	Inspection Date: 2-D Revision:	Dec-13 1
Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRO 1091		Is there a full report with this summary? yes	
Site			
Site slope: flat Soil type:		Max retaining height (m): Soil Profile (if available):	-
Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m):		If Ground improvement on site, describe:	
Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):			44.00
Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m):	11.00
Building			
No. of storeys above ground: Ground floor split? no	1 single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
Storeys below ground	0		
Foundation type: <u>strip footings</u> Building height (m):	3.00 height from ground to	if Foundation type is other, describe: evel of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	_
Floor footprint area (approx): Age of Building (years):	<u>168</u> 36	Date of design: 1976-1992	_
Strengthening present? no		If so, when (year)?	
Use (ground floor): multi-unit residential		And what load level (%g)? Brief strengthening description:	
Use (upper floors): Use notes (if required):			
Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2			
Gravity Structure			
Gravity System: load bearing walls Roof: timber truss		truss depth, purlin type and cladding	
Floors: concrete flat slab Beams: timber		slab thickness (mm)type	
Columns: other (note)		typical dimensions (mm x mm) timber (only present in some units)	
Walls: fully filled concrete r	nasonry	#N/A	
Lateral load resisting structure Lateral system along: fully filled CMU	Note: Define along and a	cross in note total length of wall at ground (m):	
Ductility assumed, µ:	2.00 detailed report!		
Period along: Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	0.10 ##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated estimate or calculation?	
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
Lateral system across: <mark>fully filled CMU</mark> Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00	note total length of wall at ground (m):	
Period across:	2.00 0.10 ##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated	
Total deflection (ULS) (mm): maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	_
Separations:			
north (mm):	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm):	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm):	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm):	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): <tr< td=""><td>leave blank if not relevant</td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): West (mm): Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: glazing: plaster, fixed	leave blank if not relevant		
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): West (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):	leave blank if not relevant	describe original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): West (mm): Wall cladding: Exposed structure Roof Cladding: Image: Ceilings: Plaster, fixed Services(list):	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): West (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):	leave blank if not relevant	describe original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-199 original designer name/date	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: diazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report	leave blank if not relevant	describe original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date original designer name/date	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical Geotech report none Electrical none Site: Site performance: good	leave blank if not relevant	describe original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date original designer name/date	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: Exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):	leave blank if not relevant	describe original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): West (mm): West (mm): Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: Import (mark) Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Electrical none Geotech report none Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Image Site performance: good Crefer none observed Differential settlement:	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Inferential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Liquefaction: Inone apparent Lateral Spread: inone apparent	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Inone observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential settlement: Inone apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Differential spread:	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Geotech report none Site: Site performance: good triefer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: Differential steral spread: <	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spreat: none apparent Differential steral spreat: none apparent Damage to area: Building:	leave blank if not relevant	describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Electrical none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Index document Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: Building: Current Placard Status: green		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable):	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spreat: none apparent Differential steral spreat: none apparent Damage to area: Building:		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable):	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Structural Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Across <		describe original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NB	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: Barage Ceilings: plaster, fixed Structural full Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical Geotech report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: Along Damage ratio: Describe (summary):		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable):	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): west (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Structural Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Across <		describe original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NB	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Wall cladding: Exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Celevent report none Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Differential settlement: Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: Differential settlement: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Damage to area: Building: Current Placard Status: Green Along Damage ratio: Describe (summary):		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable): NBS (before) - % NBS (after)) % NBS (before)	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm):		describe original designer name/date Ohristchurch City Council, 1995-199 original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NBS (before) Østrore Østrore </td <td></td>	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: [Metal Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Structural Available documentation Architectural Architectural full Barrial none Ceilings: plaster, fixed Structural partial Mechanical none Celectrical none Celectrical none none Geotech report none observed none observed none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Damage to area:		describe original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NBS (before) Describe: <td< td=""><td></td></td<>	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm):		describe original designer name/date Ohristchurch City Council, 1995-199 original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NBS (before) Østrore Østrore </td <td></td>	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Structural Available documentation Architectural Architectural full Batter, fixed Structural Structural partial none none Electrical none none Geotech report none Observed none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Describe (summary): De		describe original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): NBS (before) Describe: <td< td=""><td></td></td<>	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Available documentation Architectural Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural Geotech report Image Site: Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Image to area: Image		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: NBS (before) Describe:	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: imber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Bectorical none Electrical none Ceilings: good (refer DEE Table 4-2) Settlement: Site: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to a		describe original designer name/date notes (if applicable): NBS (before) Øserribe: Describe: Describ	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Wall cladding: Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: Jaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Baster, fixed Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical fore Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: Differential steral spread: none apparent Differential steral spread: none apparent Differential asteral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Caross Damage		describe original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-199 notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: NBS (before) Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: <td></td>	
north (mn): east (mn): south (mn): south (mn): west (mn): Non-structural elements Wall cladding: Wall cladding: Base (mail): Available documentation Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none apparent Litrer DEE Table 4-2) Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Site: Ground cracks: Ground cracks: none apparent Litrer al Spread: Differential settlement: none apparent Differential settlement: none apparent Litrer al Spread: Damage to area: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Across Damage ratio: Describe (summary): <		describe	
north (mm): east (mm): south (mm): south (mm): west (mm): Non-structural elements Wall cladding: Wall cladding: Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: imber frames Ceilings: Jaster, fixed Services(list): Available documentation Architectural full Baster, fixed Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical fore Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: Differential steral spread: none apparent Differential steral spread: none apparent Differential asteral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Caross Damage		describe original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-199 notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: NBS (before) Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: <td></td>	

Location				
	Duilding Names Oland Lang Hausian Complex	(Pleake D&C)	Denimum	
	Building Name: Clent Lane Housing Complex	Unit No: Street	Reviewer: Mary An CPEng No:	67073
	Building Address: Legal Description:	62 Cobham Street	Company: Opus In Company project number: 6-QC331.	ternational Consultants Ltd.
	· · ·	Degrees Min Sec	Company phone number: (03) 363 5	
	GPS south:	43 33 22.40	Date of submission:	28-Feb-14
	GPS east:	172 36 36.32	Inspection Date: Revision:	2-Dec-13 1
	Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRO 1091		Is there a full report with this summary? yes	
Site				
	Site slope: flat		Max retaining height (m):	
	Soil type: Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D		Soil Profile (if available):	
P	Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m): Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):		If Ground improvement on site, describe:	
	Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m):	11.00
Building	No. of storeys above ground:	1 single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
	Ground floor split? no		Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
	Storeys below ground Foundation type: strip footings	0	if Foundation type is other, describe:	
	Building height (m): Floor footprint area (approx):	3.00 height from ground t 252	to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	
	Age of Building (years):	36	Date of design: 1976-19	92
	Strengthening present? no		If so, when (year)? And what load level (%g)?	
	Use (ground floor): multi-unit residential		Brief strengthening description:	
	Use (upper floors): Use notes (if required):			
	Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2			
Gravity Structure				
	Gravity System: load bearing walls Roof: timber truss		truss depth, purlin type and cladding	
	Floors: concrete flat slab Beams: timber		slab thickness (mm) type	
	Columns: other (note)		typical dimensions (mm x mm) timber (only present in some units)
	Walls: fully filled concrete masonry		#N/A	
Lateral load resisting stru	ucture Lateral system along: fully filled CMU	Note: Define along and	across in note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Ductility assumed, µ:	2.00 detailed report!		
	Period along: Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	0.10 ##### enter height above at H3	estimate or calculation? estimate estimate or calculation?	ed
maximun	m interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
	Lateral system across: fully filled CMU		note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Ductility assumed, µ: Period across:	2.00 0.10 ##### enter height above at H3		od
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
maximun	m interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
Separations:	north (mm):	leave blank if not relevan	*	
	east (mm):		1	
	south (mm): west (mm):			
Non-structural elements				
	Stairs:		describe	
	Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal		describe describe	
	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed			
	Services(list):			
Available documentation	on Architectural full		original designer name/date Christch	aurch City Council 1995-1996
	Structural partial		original designer name/date Christch	
	Mechanical none Electrical none		original designer name/date original designer name/date	
	Geotech report none		original designer name/date	
Damage				
Site:	Site performance: good		Describe damage:	
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2)				
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
<u>olte:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed		notes (if applicable):	
<u>oite:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
<u>olle:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u>	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
(refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
(refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: inone apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio:		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building:	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Offerential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at:	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building:	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio:		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): MBS (before) - % NBS (after))	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio:	(0	notes (if applicable): notes	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio:	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): MBS (before) - % NBS (after))	2iling cracking
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio:	(0	notes (if applicable): notes	>iling cracking
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral Spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ?: yes	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <u>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</u> % NBS (before) Describe: <u>minor ce</u>	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding:	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio:	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <u>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</u> % NBS (before) Describe: Describe: Describe:	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs:	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: no	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <u>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</u> % NBS (before) Describe: Describe: Describe:	eiling cracking
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding:	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio:	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <u>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</u> % NBS (before) Describe: Describe: Describe:	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: [ves Damage?: [no Damage?: [ves Damage?: [ves Damage?: [ves	(0	notes (if applicable): notes	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Offerential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: green Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: no Damage?: yes	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): NBS (before) - % NBS (after)) % NBS (before) Describe: minor ce Describe: minor ce	
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le Ini	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: no Damage?: no Damage?: yes avel of repair/strengthening required: ninor non-structural Building Consent required: ninor non-structural no terim occupancy recommendations: full occupancy	0% Damage _ Ratio = (%	notes (if applicable): notes	racking and damage
(refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: no Damage?: no Damage?: yes Damage?: yes Damage?: yes	(0	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe:	racking and damage
(refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le Ini	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral Spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: no Damage?: no Damage?: yes avel of repair/strengthening required: Building Consent required: none Assessed %NBS before e'quakes: Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	0% Damage _ Ratio = (% 0% Damage _ Ratio = (% 0% ##### %NBS from IEP below 27% ##### %NBS from IEP below 100% ##### %NBS from IEP below	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: Desc	racking and damage
(refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le Ini Along	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio:	0% Damage _ Ratio = (?) 0% Damage _ Ratio = (?) 0% ##### %NBS from IEP below 27% ##### %NBS from IEP below	notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: Desc	racking and damage

2010.000 2.1g.1000.11.g	Evaluation Summary Data			V1.14
Location	Duilding Marrie Obert Long Hausing Operation		Deviewer	Ann Halliday
	Building Name: Clent Lane Housing Comp	Unit No: Street	Reviewer: Mary CPEng No:	67073
	Building Address: Legal Description:	62 Cobham Street	Company: <u>Opus</u> Company project number: 6-0C3	International Consultants Ltd. 331.00
	· · ·	Degrees Min Sec	Company phone number: (03) 36	
	GPS south:	43 33 22.40	Date of submission:	28-Feb-14
	GPS east:	172 36 36.32	Inspection Date: Revision:	2-Dec-13 1
	Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRO 1091		Is there a full report with this summary? yes	
Site				
	Site slope: flat Soil type:		Max retaining height (m): Soil Profile (if available):	
	Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D		. , ,	
	Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m): Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):		If Ground improvement on site, describe:	
	Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m):	11.00
Building	No. of storeys above ground:	1 single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
	Ground floor split? no Storeys below ground		Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
	Foundation type: strip footings		if Foundation type is other, describe:	
	Building height (m): Floor footprint area (approx):	3.00 height from ground 126	to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	
	Age of Building (years):	36	Date of design: 1976.	1992
	Strengthening present? no		If so, when (year)? And what load level (%g)?	
	Use (ground floor): multi-unit residential Use (upper floors):		Brief strengthening description:	
	Use notes (if required):			
	Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2			
Gravity Structure	Gravity System: load bearing walls			
	Roof: timber truss Floors: concrete flat slab		truss depth, purlin type and cladding slab thickness (mm)	
	Beams: timber		type	
	Columns: other (note) Walls: fully filled concrete mason	TV	typical dimensions (mm x mm) <u>timbe</u> #N/A	er (only present in some units)
Lateral load resisting st		·		
Laterar load resisting st	Lateral system along: fully filled CMU	Note: Define along and	d across in note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Ductility assumed, µ: Period along:	2.00 detailed report! 0.10 ##### enter height above at H3	31 estimate or calculation?	ated
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
maximu	um interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
	Lateral system across: <u>fully filled CMU</u> Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00	note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Period across:	0.10 ##### enter height above at H3	31 estimate or calculation? estim	ated
maximu	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): um interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation? estimate or calculation?	
Separations:				
	north (mm):	leave blank if not relevar	nt	
	east (mm):south (mm):			
	west (mm):			
Non-structural elements	ts Stairs:			
	Wall cladding: exposed structure		describe	
	Roof Cladding: <u>Metal</u> Glazing: timber frames		describe	
	Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):			
Available documentat				
	Architectural full Structural partial		original designer name/date Chris original designer name/date Chris	
	Mechanical none		original designer name/date	
	Electrical none Geotech report none		original designer name/date original designer name/date	
Damage <u>Site:</u>	Site performance: good		Describe damage:	
(refer DEE Table 4-2)				
	Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
	Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
	Differential lateral spread: none apparent		notes (if applicable):	
	Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent		notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
Building:				
	Current Placard Status: green			
Along	Damage ratio:	0%	Describe how damage ratio arrived at:	
	Describe (summary):			
Across	Damage ratio:	$\frac{0\%}{Damage} Ratio = \frac{0\%}{2}$	$\frac{\% NBS (before) - \% NBS (after))}{\% NBS (before)}$	
	Describe (summary):		% NBS (before)	
Diaphragms	Damage?: yes		Describe: minor	r ceiling cracking
CSWs:	Damage?: no		Describe:	
	Damage?: no		Describe:	
Pounding:			Describe	r cracking and damage
Pounding:				
	Damage?: yes			
Pounding:				
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Damage?: yes		Describe:	
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Damage?: <mark>yes</mark>		Describe: Describe: Describe:	
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Damage?: yes	27% ##### %NBS from IEP below	Describe:	alent Static
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations L	Damage?: yes	27% ##### %NBS from IEP below 27%	Describe: Describe:	alent Static
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations L	Damage?: yes Level of repair/strengthening required: minor non-structural Building Consent required: no Interim occupancy recommendations: full occupancy Assessed %NBS before e'quakes: Assessed %NBS after e'quakes: Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	27% 100% ##### %NBS from IEP below	Describe: Describe: If IEP not used, please detail Equiv	alent Static
Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations L Along	Damage?: yes	27%	Describe: Describe: If IEP not used, please detail Equiv	alent Static

Location			
	Building Name: Clent Lane Housing Complex	Unit No: Street	Reviewer: Mary Ann Halliday CPEng No: 67073
	Building Address: Legal Description:	62 Cobham Street	Company: Opus International Consultants Ltd. Company project number: 6-QC331.00
	- · ·	Degrees Min Sec	Company phone number: (03) 363 5400
	GPS south:	43 33 22.40	Date of submission: 28-Feb-14
	GPS east:	172 36 36.32	Inspection Date: 2-Dec-13 Revision: 1
Building Uni	ique Identifier (CCC): PRO 1091	ls	there a full report with this summary? yes
Site			
	Site slope: flat Soil type:		Max retaining height (m): Soil Profile (if available):
	Class (to NZS1170.5): D		
	terway (m, if <100m): sliftop (m, if < 100m):	If G	around improvement on site, describe:
Proximity to cli	iff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m): 11.00
Building No. of st	toreys above ground:	1 single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):
c	Ground floor split? no Storeys below ground		bund floor elevation above ground (m):
	Foundation type: strip footings		if Foundation type is other, describe:
Floor fo	Building height (m): otprint area (approx):	3.00 height from ground to level of upper 168	most seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):
Ag	ge of Building (years):	36	Date of design: 1976-1992
Str	rengthening present? no		If so, when (year)? And what load level (%g)?
	Use (ground floor): multi-unit residential Use (upper floors):		Brief strengthening description:
	se notes (if required):		
	level (to NZS1170.5): IL2		
Gravity Structure	Gravity System: load bearing walls		
	Roof: timber truss Floors: concrete flat slab		truss depth, purlin type and claddingslab thickness (mm)
	Beams: timber		type
	Columns: other (note) Walls: fully filled concrete masonry		typical dimensions (mm x mm) timber (only present in some units) #N/A
Lateral load resisting structure			
L	Lateral system along: fully filled CMU		note total length of wall at ground (m):
	Ductility assumed, μ: Period along:	2.00 detailed report! 0.10 ##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated
Total de maximum interstorey de	eflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?
	ateral system across: fully filled CMU Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00	note total length of wall at ground (m):
	Period across: eflection (ULS) (mm):	0.10 ##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated estimate or calculation?
maximum interstorey de			estimate or calculation?
Separations:			
	north (mm): east (mm):	leave blank if not relevant	
	south (mm):		
	west (mm):		
Non-structural elements	Stairs:		
	Wall cladding: exposed structure Roof Cladding: Metal		describe describe
	Glazing: timber frames		
	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed		
	Glazing: timber frames		
Available documentation	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):		
Available documentation	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list):		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996
Available documentation	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date
Available documentation	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996
Available documentation	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural Mechanical Mechanical none Electrical none		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date
Damage	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Mechanical Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date
	Glazing: timber frames Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good		original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Original designer name/date Describe damage:
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed		original designer name/date original designer name/date
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date Describe damage: Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date original designer name/date Original designer name/date original designer n
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report None Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent Coround cracks: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Differ Building:	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report None Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent Coround cracks: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Differ Building: Cu Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Inone apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio:		original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Differ Building: Cu Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: Inone observed Liquefaction: Lateral Spread: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Inone apparent	(% NBS (hafo	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date Describe damage: Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Origi
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Differ Building: Cu Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: Inone observed Differential settlement: Inone observed Differential settlement: Inone observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage ratio: Damage ratio: Damage ratio:	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Notes (if applicable):<
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Along Across	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): 	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Discribe Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Net (if applicable): Original designer name/date Net (if applicable): Original designer name/date <
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Differ Building: Cu Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural full Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: None observed ifferential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Ground cracks: Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Notes (if applicable):<
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Along Across	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): 	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Discribe Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Net (if applicable): Original designer name/date Net (if applicable): Original designer name/date <
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along I Across Diaphragms	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: None observed ifferential settlement: Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefactori none apparent Cone apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date orits (if applicable): Original d
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along Across Diaphragms CSWs:	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Liquefaction: Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Cone apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: none platent plat	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Notes (if applicable): Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Describe how damage ratio arrived at: Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Describe: Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Describe: Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along I Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding:	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed none observed none observed none apparent Liquefaction Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Carcund cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: none Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?:	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Orisinal designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Nets (if applicable): Original designer name/date Nets (if applicable):
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along I Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding:	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed none observed none observed none apparent Liquefaction Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Carcund cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: none Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?: None Damage?:	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Orisinal designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Original designer name/date notes (if applicable): Original designer name/date Nets (if applicable): Original designer name/date Nets (if applicable):
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Along Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed none observed none observed none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: [yes] rengthening required: minor non-structural	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 notes (if applicable): Notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: notes (if applicable): Describe: notes (if applicable): Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: Describe: <
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str Building	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent Cround cracks: none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: yes	\bigcirc Damage Ratio = $\frac{(\% NBS (before))}{(\% NBS (before))}$	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 notes (if applicable): Notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe: notes (if applicable): Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 Describe Now damage ratio arrived at: Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Along Along Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str Buildin Interim occupance Along Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed none observed none observed inone observed none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? Ves Damage? (no Damage? (ves Damage? (v	0% Damage _ Ratio = (% NBS (befo % N 0% % N 27% ##### %NBS from IEP below	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Along Along Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str Buildin Interim occupance Along Along	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural partial Structural partial none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed none observed one apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent crential attrat spread: none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: pamage?:	$Damage _Ratio = \frac{(\% NBS (befo))}{\% NS}$	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Building: Cu Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str Building Interim occupand Along Assessed %N Assessed %N Assessed %N Assessed %N	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed ifferential settlement: none observed none apparent Liquefaction none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: pama	0% Damage _ Ratio = (% NBS (befo 0% % N 100% ##### %NBS from IEP below	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:
Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) D Building: Cu Along Along Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Level of repair/str Buildin Interim occupanc Along Assessed %N Assessed %N Assessed %N Assessed %N Assessed %N	Glazing: Ceilings: plaster, fixed Services(list): Architectural Structural partial Mechanical none Electrical none Geotech report Site performance: good Settlement: none observed inferential settlement: none observed inone apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent none apparent Damage to area: Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes Damage?: pamage?: no Damage?: yes Damage?: yes No Damage?: yes No Damage?: yes No No No No No No No No No No	0% Damage _ Ratio = (% NBS (befo 0% % N 0% % N	original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date Christchurch City Council, 1995-1996 original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:

Location				
	Building Name: Clent Lane Housing Cor	nolex (Block F)	Reviewer: Mary Ann Ha	Illiday
	Building Address:	Unit No: Street 62 Cobham Street	CPEng No:	67073
	Legal Description:		Company: Opus Interna Company project number: 6-0C331.00	
		Degrees Min Sec	Company phone number: (03) 363 5400	
	GPS south: GPS east:	43 33 22.40 172 36 36.32	Date of submission: Inspection Date:	28-Feb-14 2-Dec-13
			Revision:	1
	Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRO 1091		Is there a full report with this summary? yes	
Site	Other Laws That			
	Site slope: flat Soil type:		Max retaining height (m): Soil Profile (if available):	
	Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m):		If Ground improvement on site, describe:	
	Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):			11.00
	Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m):	11.00
Building				
Dunung	No. of storeys above ground:	1 single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
	Ground floor split? no Storeys below ground	0	Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
	Foundation type: strip footings	3.00 height from ground	if Foundation type is other, describe: to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	
	Building height (m): Floor footprint area (approx):	336		
	Age of Building (years):	36	Date of design: 1976-1992	
	Strongthoning procent?		If so, when (year)?	
	Strengthening present? no		If so, when (year)? And what load level (%g)?	
	Use (ground floor): multi-unit residential Use (upper floors):		Brief strengthening description:	
	Use notes (if required):			
	Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2			
Gravity Structure	Gravity System: load bearing walls			
	Roof: timber truss Floors: concrete flat slab		truss depth, purlin type and cladding slab thickness (mm)	
	Beams: timber		type	
	Columns: other (note) Walls: fully filled concrete maso	unry	typical dimensions (mm x mm) <u>timber (only p</u> #N/A	present in some units)
Lateral land resisting str				
Lateral load resisting str	Lateral system along: fully filled CMU	Note: Define along and	d across in note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Ductility assumed, µ: Period along:	2.00 detailed report! 0.10 ##### enter height above at H3	31 estimate or calculation? estimated	
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
maximui	m interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
	Lateral system across: fully filled CMU Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00	note total length of wall at ground (m):	
	Period across:	0.10 ##### enter height above at H3		
maximu	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): m interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):		estimate or calculation?	
Separations:	north (mm):	leave blank if not relevar	nt	
	east (mm): south (mm):			
	west (mm):			
Non-structural elements				
	Stairs: Wall cladding: exposed structure		describe	
	Roof Cladding: Metal Glazing: timber frames		describe	
	Ceilings: plaster, fixed			
	Services(list):			
Available documentati	on			
	Architectural full		original designer name/date Christchurch	City Council 1995-1996
	Structural partial			
	Mechanical none		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date	
	Electrical none		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date	
			original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date	
	Electrical none Geotech report none		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date	
Damage <u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Electrical none		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date	
Site:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable):	
Site:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
Site:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
Site:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if a	
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable):	
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at:	
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio:		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if a	
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Ground cracks: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary):	(0	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at:	
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Caround cracks: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio:		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if a	City Council, 1995-1996
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefactori none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?: yes		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Oescribe damage:	City Council, 1995-1996
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across Diaphragms CSWs:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?; yes Damage?; no		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: name/date notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): NBS (before) - % NBS (after)) % NBS (before) Describe: minor ceiling Describe: minor ceiling	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefactori none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:	City Council, 1995-1996
<u>Site:</u> (refer DEE Table 4-2) <u>Building:</u> Along Across Diaphragms CSWs:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage?; yes Damage?; no		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: name/date notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): NBS (before) - % NBS (after)) % NBS (before) Describe: minor ceiling Describe: minor ceiling	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural:	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefactori none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefactori none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no		original designer name/date Christchurch original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage:	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no Damage? ino Damage? yes		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: $\frac{\% NBS (before) - \% NBS (after))}{\% NBS (before)}$ Describe: Describe	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? inc Dama	Damage _ Ratio = (?	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: $\frac{\% NBS (before) - \% NBS (after))}{\% NBS (before)}$ Describe: Descri	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Current Placard Status: green Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no Damage? ino Damage? yes		original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: $\frac{\% NBS (before) - \% NBS (after))}{\% NBS (before)}$ Describe: Describe	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations Le Ir Along	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Lateral Spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Current Placard Status: green Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no Damage? ino Damage? yes evel of repair/strengthening required: minor non-structural Building Consent required: full occupancy Assessed %NBS before e'quakes: Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	0% Damage _ Ratio = (?) 0% Damage _ Ratio = (?) 0% 27% ##### %NBS from IEP below 27%	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <i>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</i> <i>% NBS (before)</i> Describe: minor ceiling Describe: Des	City Council, 1995-1996
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) Building: Along Across Diaphragms CSWs: Pounding: Non-structural: Recommendations	Electrical none Geotech report none Site performance: good Settlement: none observed Differential settlement: none observed Liquefaction: none apparent Liquefaction: none apparent Differential lateral spread: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage to area: none apparent Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage ratio: Describe (summary): Damage? yes Damage? no Damage? no Damage? yes evel of repair/strengthening required: minor non-structural Building Consent required: minor non-structural no Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	0% Damage _ Ratio = (% 0% Reserved and (%	original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date original designer name/date Describe damage: notes (if applicable): notes (if applicable): Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <i>% NBS (before) - % NBS (after))</i> <i>% NBS (before)</i> Describe: minor ceiling Describe: Des	City Council, 1995-1996



Opus International Consultants Ltd 20 Moorhouse Avenue PO Box 1482, Christchurch Mail Centre, Christchurch 8140 New Zealand

t: +64 3 363 5400 f: +64 3 365 7858 w: www.opus.co.nz