

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

PRK_1507_BLDG_013 EQ2

South Hagley – Netball Toilets

Hagley Park, Christchurch Central



QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 13 December 2012



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
PRK_1507_BLDG_013 EQ2
South Hagley – Netball Toilets
Hagley Park, Christchurch Central

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 13 December 2012

Sinclair Knight Merz
142 Sherborne Street
Saint Albans
PO Box 21011, Edgeware
Christchurch, New Zealand
Tel: +64 3 940 4900
Fax: +64 3 940 4901
Web: www.skmconsulting.com

COPYRIGHT: The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Sinclair Knight Merz Limited. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Sinclair Knight Merz constitutes an infringement of copyright.

LIMITATION: This report has been prepared on behalf of and for the exclusive use of Sinclair Knight Merz Limited's Client, and is subject to and issued in connection with the provisions of the agreement between Sinclair Knight Merz and its Client. Sinclair Knight Merz accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for or in respect of any use of or reliance upon this report by any third party.

Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Key Damage Observed	2
1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses	2
1.4. Indicative Building Strength (from IEP and CSW assessment)	2
1.5. Recommendations	2
2. Introduction	3
3. Compliance	4
3.1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)	4
3.2. Building Act	5
3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy	6
3.4. Building Code	7
4. Earthquake Resistance Standards	8
5. Building Details	10
5.1. Building description	10
5.2. Gravity Load Resisting system	10
5.3. Seismic Load Resisting system	10
5.4. Geotechnical Conditions	10
6. Damage Summary	12
7. Initial Seismic Evaluation	13
7.1. The Initial Evaluation Procedure Process	13
7.2. Available Information, Assumptions and Limitations	15
7.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses	15
7.4. Qualitative Assessment Results	15
8. Further Investigation	17
9. Conclusion	18
10. Limitation Statement	19
11. Appendix 1 – Photos	20
12. Appendix 2 – IEP Reports	25
13. Appendix 3 – CERA Standardised Report Form	35
14. Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study	37



Document history and status

Revision	Date issued	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Revision type
A	21/08/2012	Colin Paverd	Nick Calvert	21/08/2012	Draft for Client Approval
B	13/12/2012	Nick Calvert	Nick Calvert	13/12/2012	Final for Issue

Distribution of copies

Revision	Copy no	Quantity	Issued to
A	1	1	CCC
B	1	1	CCC

Printed:	13 December 2012
Last saved:	13 December 2012 10:56 AM
File name:	ZB01276.127_CCC_PRK_1507_BLDG_013_EQ2_Qualitative Assmt_B.docx
Author:	Willow Patterson-Kane
Project manager:	Nick Calvert
Name of organisation:	Christchurch City Council
Name of project:	Christchurch City Council Structures Panel
Name of document:	South Hagley – Netball Toilets Qualitative Assessment
Document version:	B
Project number:	ZB01276.127

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Background

A Qualitative Assessment was carried out on the building located in South Hagley Park near the netball courts, in Christchurch Central. The building is single storey and is currently utilised as a toilet block. It is constructed from concrete walls with brick cladding on the exterior and it appears to have a timber-framed ceiling. The roof is assumed to be lightweight, with a glazed dome in the centre. The toilet block seems to be attached to the Christchurch Netball Centre building, however the common wall is assumed to be connected to the main timber-framed structure of the Centre through secondary elements. Therefore the toilet block will be treated as a separate structure. An aerial photograph illustrating this area is shown below in Figure 1. Detailed descriptions outlining the buildings age and construction type is given in Section 5 of this report.



■ Figure 1 Aerial Photograph of the toilet block in South Hagley Park

The qualitative assessment includes a summary of the building damage as well as an initial assessment of the current seismic capacity compared with current seismic code loads using the Initial Evaluation Procedure (IEP).

This Qualitative report for the building structure is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011 and a visual inspection on 8 May 2012.

1.2. Key Damage Observed

Key damage observed includes:-

- Gaps opening up between bricks and mortar at central column on north wall.
- Cracked glass on dome in centre of roof.
- Cracking in timber beam at roof level on southwest corner.

1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No potential critical structural weaknesses have been identified for this building.

1.4. Indicative Building Strength (from IEP and CSW assessment)

Based on the information available, and using the NZSEE Initial Evaluation Procedure, the buildings original capacity has been assessed to be in the order of 79%. The damage observed during the site investigation was not significant, therefore the post earthquake capacity will not change as a result of earthquake damage.

The building has been assessed to have a seismic capacity greater than 67% NBS and is therefore not a potential earthquake risk.

1.5. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- a) The current placard status of the building of Green 1 remain as is.
- b) We consider that barriers around the building are not necessary.

2. Introduction

Sinclair Knight Merz was engaged by Christchurch City Council to prepare a qualitative assessment report for the building located near the netball courts at South Hagley Park following the magnitude 6.3 earthquake which occurred in the afternoon of the 22nd of February 2011 and the subsequent aftershocks.

The Qualitative Assessment uses the methodology recommended in the Engineering Advisory Group draft document “Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury”, issued 19 July 2011. The qualitative assessment includes a summary of the building damage as well as an initial assessment of the likely current Seismic Capacity compared with current seismic code requirements.

A qualitative assessment involves inspections of the building and a desktop review of existing structural and geotechnical information, including existing drawings and calculations, if available.

The purpose of the assessment is to determine the likely building performance and damage patterns, to identify any potential critical structural weaknesses or collapse hazards, and to make an initial assessment of the likely building strength in terms of percentage of new building standard (%NBS).

This report describes the structural damage observed during our inspection and indicates suggested remediation measures. The inspection was undertaken from floor levels and was a visual inspection only. Our report reflects the situation at the time of the inspection and does not take account of changes caused by any events following our inspection. A full description of the basis on which we have undertaken our visual inspection is set out in Section 7.

The NZ Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) Initial Evaluation Procedure (IEP) was used to assess the likely performance of the building in a seismic event relative to the New Building Standard (NBS). 100% NBS is equivalent to the strength of a building that fully complies with current codes. This includes a recent increase of the Christchurch seismic hazard factor from 0.22 to 0.3¹.

At the time of this report, no intrusive site investigation, detailed analysis, or modelling of the building structure had been carried out. The building description below is based on our visual inspections.

¹ <http://www.dbh.govt.nz/seismicity-info>

3. 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.

3.1. 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 carry out a full structural survey before the building is re-occupied.

We understand that CERA will 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). It is anticipated that CERA will adopt the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011. This document sets out a methodology for both qualitative and quantitative assessments.

The qualitative assessment is a desk-top and site inspection assessment. It is based on a thorough visual inspection of the building coupled with a review of available documentation such as drawings and specifications. The quantitative assessment involves analytical calculation of the buildings strength and may require non-destructive or destructive material testing, geotechnical testing and intrusive investigation.

It is anticipated that factors determining the extent of evaluation and strengthening level required will include:

- The importance level and occupancy of the building
- The placard status and amount of damage
- The age and structural type of the building

- Consideration of any critical structural weaknesses
- The extent of any earthquake damage

3.2. Building Act

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

3.2.1. 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 any alteration. This effectively means that a building cannot be weakened as a result of an alteration (including partial demolition).

3.2.2. Section 115 – Change of Use

This section requires that the territorial authority (in this case Christchurch City Council (CCC)) be satisfied that the building with a new use complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code 'as near as is reasonably practicable'. Regarding seismic capacity 'as near as reasonably practicable' has previously been interpreted by CCC as achieving a minimum of 67%NBS however where practical achieving 100%NBS is desirable. The New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) recommend a minimum of 67%NBS.

3.2.3. Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

The definition of dangerous building in the Act was extended by the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2010, and it now defines a building as dangerous if:

- 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
- 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
- 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
- there is a risk that that other property could collapse or otherwise cause injury or death; or
- a territorial authority has not been able to undertake an inspection to determine whether the building is dangerous.

3.2.4. Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings

This section defines a building as earthquake prone 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 ground shaking 33% of the shaking used to design an equivalent new building.

3.2.5. 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.

3.2.6. Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy

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

3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy

Christchurch City Council adopted their Earthquake Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Building Policy in 2006. This policy was amended immediately following the Darfield Earthquake of the 4th September 2010.

The 2010 amendment includes the following:

- A process for identifying, categorising and prioritising Earthquake Prone Buildings, commencing on 1 July 2012;
- A strengthening target level of 67% of a new building for buildings that are Earthquake Prone. Council recognises that it may not be practicable for some repairs to meet that target. The council will work closely with building owners to achieve sensible, safe outcomes;
- A timeframe of 15-30 years for Earthquake Prone Buildings to be strengthened; and,
- 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.

We anticipate that any building with a capacity of less than 33%NBS (including consideration of critical structural weaknesses) will need to be strengthened to a target of 67%NBS of new building standard as recommended by the Policy.

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.

3.4. 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.

After the February Earthquake, on 19 May 2011, Compliance Document B1: Structure was amended to include increased seismic design requirements for Canterbury as follows:

- a) Hazard Factor increased from 0.22 to 0.3 (36% increase in the basic seismic design load)
- b) Serviceability Return Period Factor increased from 0.25 to 0.33 (80% increase in the serviceability design loads when combined with the Hazard Factor increase)

The increase in the above factors has resulted in a reduction in the level of compliance of an existing building relative to a new building despite the capacity of the existing building not changing.



4. 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 new building standard load requirements have been determined in accordance with the current earthquake loading standard (NZS 1170.5:2004 Structural design actions - Earthquake actions - New Zealand).

The likely capacity of this building has been derived in accordance with the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) guidelines ‘Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes’ (AISPBE), 2006. These guidelines provide an Initial Evaluation Procedure that assesses a buildings capacity based on a comparison of loading codes from when the building was designed and currently. It is a quick high-level procedure that can be used when undertaking a Qualitative analysis of a building. The guidelines also provide guidance on calculating a modified Ultimate Limit State capacity of the building which is much more accurate and can be used when undertaking a Quantitative analysis.

The New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering has proposed a way for classifying earthquake risk for existing buildings in terms of %NBS and this is shown in Figure 2 below.

Description	Grade	Risk	%NBS	Existing Building Structural Performance	Improvement of Structural 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) This is for each TA to decide. Improvement is not limited to 34%NBS.	100%NBS desirable. Improvement should achieve at least 67%NBS
Moderate Risk Building	B or C	Moderate	34 to 66	Acceptable legally. Improvement recommended		Not recommended. Acceptable only in exceptional circumstances
High Risk Building	D or E	High	33 or lower	Unacceptable (Improvement	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

■ **Figure 2: NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE Guidelines**

Table 1 below provides an indication of the risk of failure for an existing building with a given percentage NBS, relative to the risk of failure for a new building that has been designed to meet current Building Code criteria (the annual probability of exceedance specified by current earthquake design standards for a building of ‘normal’ importance is 1/500, or 0.2% in the next year, which is equivalent to 10% probability of exceedance in the next 50 years).



■ **Table 1: %NBS compared to relative risk of failure**

Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS)	Relative Risk (Approximate)
>100	<1 time
80-100	1-2 times
67-80	2-5 times
33-67	5-10 times
20-33	10-25 times
<20	>25 times

5. Building Details

5.1. Building description

The building is located near the netball courts in South Hagley Park. The toilet block is part of the one building on this site. The building is divided into the three-storey Christchurch Netball Centre and the one storey toilet block. Although the toilet block seems to be attached to the Christchurch Netball Centre building, the common wall appears to be connected to the main timber-framed structure of the Centre, located within the brick and glazed exterior walls, through secondary elements. Therefore the toilet block will be treated as a separate structure. It is constructed from concrete walls with brick cladding on the exterior and it appears to have a timber-framed ceiling. The roof is assumed to be lightweight, with a glazed dome in the centre. The ground floor appears to be supported on a concrete slab foundation. It is assumed the building was designed and constructed in the 1990's, based on the Christchurch City Council's Hagley Park Management Plan 2007 document.

Our evaluation was based on the visual inspection carried out on 8 May 2012 and a cover meter survey carried out on 14 May 2012. Internal inspection of the Centre was not carried out as it was outside the scope of the assessment and not owned by the Christchurch City Council. Drawings were not available to verify the foundation system, the connection detail between the toilet block and the Centre and the date of construction.

5.2. Gravity Load Resisting system

It appears that the gravity loads are taken by the concrete walls, with direct transfer into the concrete slab foundation below.

5.3. Seismic Load Resisting system

Lateral loads acting across and along the building will be resisted by the concrete walls in shear.

Note that for this building the 'across direction' has been taken as north-south and the 'along direction' has been taken as east-west.

5.4. Geotechnical Conditions

A geotechnical desktop study was carried out for this site. The main conclusions from this report are:

- In accordance with NZS1170.5 the site is likely to be seismic subsoil Class D (deep or soft soil) ground performance and properties.



- Liquefaction risk is expected to be low for this site. No significant evidence that liquefaction occurred on site was found in the aerial photograph taken shortly after the 22 February 2011 earthquake or during the external site walkover conducted by a SKM engineer.

If consent is required for this site, additional investigations are needed in order to determine the ground properties. Additional investigations recommended are:

- Two CPT tests on site to refusal

6. Damage Summary

SKM undertook an inspection on 8 May 2012. The following areas of damage were observed during the time of inspection:

General

- 1) No visual evidence of settlement was noted at this site, therefore a level survey is not required at this stage of assessment.

Building Damage

- 1) Gaps opening up between bricks and mortar at the top of the column in the centre of the north wall.
- 2) Cracking in a glass panel in the dome in the centre of the roof.
- 3) Cracking in the timber beam at roof level on the southwest corner.
- 4) Cracking in a wall tile in the entrance to the female toilets was noted, but due to the localised damage, it is not believed to be earthquake-related, but due to impact load on the door connection anchored to the concrete wall directly behind the tile.

Photos of the above damage can be found in Appendix 1 – Photos.

7. Initial Seismic Evaluation

7.1. The Initial Evaluation Procedure Process

This section covers the initial seismic evaluation of the building as detailed in the NZSEE 'Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes'. The IEP grades buildings according to their likely performance in a seismic event. The procedure is not yet recognised by the NZ Building Code but is widely used and recognised by the Christchurch City Council as the preferred method for preliminary seismic investigations of buildings².

The IEP is a coarse screening process designed to identify buildings that are likely to be earthquake prone. The IEP process ranks buildings according to how well they are likely to perform relative to a new building designed to current earthquake standards, as shown in Table 2. The building rank is indicated by the percent of the required New Building Standard (%NBS) strength that the building is considered to have. Earthquake prone buildings are defined as having less than 33% NBS strength which correlates to an increased risk of approximately 20 times that of 100% NBS³. Buildings that are identified to be earthquake prone are required by law to be followed up with a detailed assessment and strengthening work within 30 years of the owner being notified that the building is potentially earthquake prone⁴.

² <http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/EarthquakeProneDangerousAndInsanitaryBuildingsPolicy2010.pdf>

³ NZSEE 2006, *Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes*, p 2-2

⁴ <http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/EarthquakeProneDangerousAndInsanitaryBuildingsPolicy2010.pdf>



Table 2: IEP Risk classifications

Description	Grade	Risk	%NBS	Structural performance
Low risk building	A+	Low	> 100	Acceptable. Improvement may be desirable.
	A		100 to 80	
	B		80 to 67	
Moderate risk building	C	Moderate	67 to 33	Acceptable legally. Improvement recommended.
High risk building	D	High	33 to 20	Unacceptable. Improvement required.
	E		< 20	

The IEP is a simple desktop study that is useful for risk management. No detailed calculations are done and so it relies on an inspection of the building and its plans to identify the structural members and describe the likely performance of the building in a seismic event. A review of the plans is also likely to identify any critical structural weaknesses. The IEP assumes that the building was properly designed and built according to the relevant codes at the time of construction. The IEP method rates buildings based on the code used at the time of construction and some more subjective parameters associated with how the building is detailed and so it is possible that %NBS derived from different engineers may differ.

This assessment describes only the likely seismic Ultimate Limit State (ULS) performance of the building. The ULS is the level of earthquake that can be resisted by the building without catastrophic failure. The IEP does not attempt to estimate Serviceability Limit State (SLS) performance of the building, or the level of earthquake that would start to cause damage to the building⁵. This assessment concentrates on matters relating to life safety as damage to the building is a secondary consideration. SLS performance of the building can be estimated by scaling the current code levels if required.

The NZ Building Code describes that the relevant codes for NBS are primarily:

- AS/NZS 1170 Structural Design Actions
- NZS 3101:2006 Concrete Structures Standard
- NZS 3404:1997 Steel Structures Standard

⁵ NZSEE 2006, *Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes*, p2-9

7.2. Available Information, Assumptions and Limitations

Following our inspection on 8 May 2012, SKM carried out a preliminary structural review. The structural review was undertaken using the available information which was as follows:

- SKM site measurements, cover meter survey and external and partial internal inspection findings of the building. Please note no intrusive investigations were undertaken.
- There were no drawings available to carry out our review.

The following assumptions and design criteria were used in this assessment:

- Standard design assumptions for typical office and factory buildings as described in AS/NZS1170.0:2002
 - 50 year design life, which is the default NZ Building Code design life.
 - Structure Importance Level 2. This level of importance is described as ‘normal’ with medium or considerable consequence of failure.
 - Ductility level of 1.25 in both directions, based on our assessment and code requirements at the time of design.
 - Site hazard factor, $Z = 0.3$, NZBC, Clause B1 Structure, Amendment 11 effective from 1 August 2011

This IEP was based on our external visual inspection of the building. Since it is not a full design and construction review, it has the following limitations:

- It is not likely to pick up on any original design or construction errors (if they exist)
- Other possible issues that could affect the performance of the building such as corrosion and modifications to the building will not be identified
- The IEP deals only with the structural aspects of the building. Other aspects such as building services are not covered.

7.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No critical structural weaknesses have been identified in this building.

7.4. Qualitative Assessment Results

The building has had its capacity assessed using the Initial Evaluation Procedure based on the information available. The buildings capacity is expressed as a percentage of new building standard (%NBS) and are in the order of that shown below in Table 3. This capacity is subject to confirmation by a quantitative analysis.



Table 3: Qualitative Assessment Summary

<u>Item</u>	<u>%NBS</u>
Likely Seismic Capacity of Building	79

Our qualitative assessment found that the building is not likely to be classed as a potential earthquake risk and probably a 'Low Risk Building' (capacity greater than 67% of NBS). The full IEP assessment form is detailed in Appendix 2 – IEP Reports.

Further investigation is required to confirm our initial findings and establish possible strengthening concepts.



8. Further Investigation

No further investigation is required.

9. Conclusion

A qualitative assessment was carried out on the building located near the netball courts in South Hagley Park in Christchurch Central. The building has sustained minor damage to the external brick column with gaps opening up between the bricks and mortar, cracked glazing in the roof dome and cracking in the timber beam at roof level. The building has been assessed to have a seismic capacity greater than 67% NBS and is therefore not a potential earthquake risk and is likely to be classified as a 'Low Risk Building' (capacity greater than 67% of NBS).

Further investigation is required to confirm our initial findings due to uncertainty about the connection between the toilet block and the Christchurch Netball Centre and to establish possible strengthening concepts. This investigation will require carrying out a quantitative assessment on the building to determine if there is enough capacity in the structural elements to resist the required earthquake demand. If the building is to be strengthened, building consent will likely be required.

It is recommended that:

- a) The current placard status of the building of Green 1 remain as is.
- b) We consider that barriers around the building are not necessary.

10. Limitation Statement

This report has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of, SKM's client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between SKM and the Client. It is not possible to make a proper assessment of this report without a clear understanding of the terms of engagement under which it has been prepared, including the scope of the instructions and directions given to, and the assumptions made by, SKM. The report may not address issues which would need to be considered for another party if that party's particular circumstances, requirements and experience were known and, further, may make assumptions about matters of which a third party is not aware. No responsibility or liability to any third party is accepted for any loss or damage whatsoever arising out of the use of or reliance on this report by any third party.

Without limiting any of the above, in the event of any liability, SKM's liability, whether under the law of contract, tort, statute, equity or otherwise, is limited in as set out in the terms of the engagement with the Client.

It is not within SKM's scope or responsibility to identify the presence of asbestos, nor the responsibility of SKM to identify possible sources of asbestos. Therefore for any property pre-dating 1989, the presence of asbestos materials should be considered when costing remedial measures or possible demolition.

There is a risk of further movement and increased cracking due to subsequent aftershocks or settlement.

Should there be any further significant earthquake event, of a magnitude 5 or greater, it will be necessary to conduct a follow-up investigation, as the observations, conclusions and recommendations of this report may no longer apply. Earthquake of a lower magnitude may also cause damage, and SKM should be advised immediately if further damage is visible or suspected.

11. Appendix 1 – Photos



Photo 1: North elevation of Christchurch Netball Centre building and toilet block



Photo 2: North elevation



Photo 3: West elevation



Photo 4: South elevation



Photo 5: Existing damage to timber at cable level on north wall.



Photo 6: Gaps opening up between masonry and bricks at the top of the column on the north wall.



Photo 7: Concrete ground slab shown.



Photo 8: Concrete wall with external brick cladding and internal tile cladding.



Photo 9: Timber ceiling cladding.



Photo 10: Cracks in the tile believed to have been caused by impact load on the door as it is connected to the concrete directly behind the tile, and no other tile was cracked.



Photo 11: Ceiling under glass dome.



Photo 12: Internal layout of toilet block.



Photo 13: Connection detail at top of glass dome.



Photo 14: Cracked glass panel on west side of dome.



Photo 15: Glass dome in centre of roof.



Photo 16: Timber beam and gutter running along building at roof level.



Photo 17: Existing damage to brickwork on west wall.



Photo 18: Crack in timber beam at roof level on southwest corner.



Photo 19: Existing mortar removal on south wall.



12. Appendix 2 – IEP Reports


Building Name:	<u>South Hagley - Netball Toilets</u>	Ref.	<u>ZB01276.127</u>
Location:	<u>South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central</u>	By	<u>WPK</u>
		Date	<u>10/05/2012</u>

Step 1 - General Information

1.1 Photos (attach sufficient to describe building)



1.2 Sketch of building plan



1.3 List relevant features

The building in South Hagley Park by the netball courts is one storey and is currently in use as a toilet block. It appears to be attached to the Christchurch Netball Centre building. However, the toilet block will be treated as a separate structure as the main Centre structure is timber-framed and located within the brick and glazed external walls. Therefore it is believed to only be connected to the shared wall between the Centre and the toilets through secondary elements. The building consists of concrete walls with external brick cladding and an assumed timber-framed roof. The main lateral load-resisting system appear to be the walls. These act as shear walls in the north-south and east-west direction. The roof structure appears to consist of timber rafters that support a lightweight roof. Internal inspection of the Centre was not carried out as it was outside the scope of the assessment and not owned by the client. The block walls appear to be founded on a concrete slab footing. The building is assumed to have been constructed in the early 1990's, based on the Christchurch City Council's Hagley Park Management Plan 2007 document.

1.4 Note information sources

Tick as appropriate

- Visual Inspection of Exterior
- Visual Inspection of Interior
- Drawings (note type)
- Specifications
- Geotechnical Reports
- Other (list)

Visual inspection of toilet block only

Table IEP-2 Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 2
 (Refer Table IEP - 1 for Step 1; Table IEP - 3 for Step 3, Table IEP - 4 for Steps 4, 5 and 6)

Building Name:	South Hagley - Netball Toilets	Ref.	ZB01276.127
Location:	South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central	By	WPK
Direction Considered:	Longitudinal & Transverse	Date	10/05/2012
(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)			

Step 2 - Determination of (%NBS)b

2.1 Determine nominal (%NBS) = (%NBS)nom

Pre 1935	Seismic Zone;	A	<input type="radio"/>	See also notes 1, 3
1935-1965		B	<input type="radio"/>	
1965-1976		C	<input type="radio"/>	
1976-1992	Seismic Zone;	A	<input type="radio"/>	See also note 2
		B	<input type="radio"/>	
		C	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
1992-2004			<input type="radio"/>	

b) Soil Type

From NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.3	A or B Rock	<input type="radio"/>
	C Shallow Soil	<input type="radio"/>
	D Soft Soil	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
	E Very Soft Soil	<input type="radio"/>

From NZS4203:1992, Cl 4.6.2.2	a) Rigid	<input type="radio"/>
(for 1992 to 2004 only and only if known)	b) Intermediate	<input type="radio"/>

c) Estimate Period, T

building Ht = 4.1 meters

Can use following:

$T = 0.09h_n^{0.75}$	for moment-resisting concrete frames
$T = 0.14h_n^{0.75}$	for moment-resisting steel frames
$T = 0.08h_n^{0.75}$	for eccentrically braced steel frames
$T = 0.06h_n^{0.75}$	for all other frame structures
$T = 0.09h_n^{0.75}/A_c^{0.5}$	for concrete shear walls
$T \leq 0.4\text{sec}$	for masonry shear walls

Ac =	Longitudinal	Transverse	m2
	26	22	
	<input type="radio"/> MRCF	<input type="radio"/> MRCF	
	<input type="radio"/> MRSF	<input type="radio"/> MRSF	
	<input type="radio"/> EBSF	<input type="radio"/> EBSF	
	<input type="radio"/> Others	<input type="radio"/> Others	
	<input checked="" type="radio"/> CSW	<input checked="" type="radio"/> CSW	
	<input type="radio"/> MSW	<input type="radio"/> MSW	

Where h_n = height in m from the base of the structure to the uppermost seismic weight or mass.
 $A_c = \sum A_i(0.2 + L_{wi}/h_n)^2$
 A_i = cross-sectional shear area of shear wall i in the first storey of the building, in m²
 L_{wi} = length of shear wall i in the first storey in the direction parallel to the applied forces, in m
 with the restriction that L_{wi}/h_n shall not exceed 0.9

Longitudinal	Transverse	Seconds
0.1	0.1	

d) (%NBS)nom determined from Figure 3.3

Longitudinal	16.5	(%NBS)nom
Transverse	16.5	(%NBS)nom

Note 1: For buildings designed prior to 1965 and known to be designed as public buildings in accordance with the code of the time, multiply (%NBS)nom by 1.25.	No	Factor	1
For buildings designed 1965 - 1976 and known to be designed as public buildings in accordance with the code of the time, multiply (%NBS)nom by 1.33 - Zone A or 1.2 - Zone B	No	Factor	1
Note 2: For reinforced concrete buildings designed between 1976 -1984 (%NBS)nom by 1.2	No	Factor	1
Note 3: For buildings designed prior to 1935 multiply (%NBS)nom by 0.8 except for Wellington where the factor may be taken as 1.	No	Factor	1

Longitudinal	16.5	(%NBS)nom
Transverse	16.5	(%NBS)nom

Continued over page

Building Name:	South Hagley - Netball Toilets	Ref.	ZB01276.127
Location:	South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central	By	WPK
Direction Considered:	Longitudinal & Transverse	Date	10/05/2012
(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)			

2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor, Factor A
If T < 1.5sec, Factor A = 1

a) Near Fault Factor, N(T,D) 1
(from NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.6)

b) Near Fault Scaling Factor = 1/N(T,D)

Factor A	1.00
----------	------

2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor B

Select Location Christchurch

a) Hazard Factor, Z, for site
(from NZS1170.5:2004, Table 3.3)

Z =	0.3		
Z 1992 =	0.8	Auckland 0.6	Palm Nth 1.2
		Wellington 1.2	Dunedin 0.6
		Christchurch 0.8	Hamilton 0.67

b) Hazard Scaling Factor

For pre 1992 = 1/Z
For 1992 onwards = Z 1992/Z

#

(Where Z 1992 is the NZS4203:1992 Zone Factor from accompanying Figure 3.5(b))

Factor B	3.33
----------	------

2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor C

a) Building Importance Level
(from NZS1170.0:2004, Table 3.1 and 3.2)

2

b) Return Period Scaling Factor from accompanying Table 3.1

Factor C	1.00
----------	------

2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor, D

a) Assessed Ductility of Existing Structure, μ
(shall be less than maximum given in accompanying Table 3.2)

Longitudinal	1.25	μ Maximum = 6
Transverse	1.25	μ Maximum = 6

b) Ductility Scaling Factor

For pre 1976 = k_u
For 1976 onwards = 1
(where k_u is NZS1170.5:2005 Ductility Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3)

Longitudinal	Factor D	1.00
Transverse	Factor D	1.00

2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor E

Select Material of Lateral Load Resisting System

Longitudinal Concrete
Transverse Concrete

a) Structural Performance Factor, S_p
from accompanying Figure 3.4

Longitudinal	S_p	0.90
Transverse	S_p	0.90

b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor

Longitudinal	$1/S_p$	Factor E	1.11
Transverse	$1/S_p$	Factor E	1.11

2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS)_b
(equals (%NSB)_{nom} x A x B x C x D x E)

Longitudinal	61.1	(%NBS) _b
Transverse	61.1	(%NBS) _b

Table IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 3

(Refer Table IEP - 1 for Step 1; Table IEP - 2 for Step 2, Table IEP - 4 for Steps 4, 5 and 6)

Building Name: <u>South Hagley - Netball Toilets</u>	Ref. <u>ZB01276.127</u>
Location: <u>South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central</u>	By <u>WPK</u>
Direction Considered: a) Longitudinal	Date <u>10/05/2012</u>
(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)	

Step 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)
(Refer Appendix B - Section B3.2)

Critical Structural Weakness

Effect on Structural Performance
(Choose a value - Do not interpolate)

Building Score

3.1 Plan Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance
Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor A

3.2 Vertical Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance
Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor B

3.3 Short Columns

Effect on Structural Performance
Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor C

3.4 Pounding Potential

(Estimate D1 and D2 and set D = the lower of the two, or =1.0 if no potential for pounding)

a) Factor D1: - Pounding Effect
Select appropriate value from Table

Note:
Values given assume the building has a frame structure. For stiff buildings (eg with shear walls), the effect of pounding may be reduced by taking the co-efficient to the right of the value applicable to frame buildings.

		Factor D1 <input type="text" value="1"/>		
Table for Selection of Factor D1		Severe	Significant	Insignificant
	Separation	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
	Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.8	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1
	Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	<input type="radio"/> 0.4	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.8

b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect
Select appropriate value from Table

		Factor D2 <input type="text" value="1"/>		
Table for Selection of Factor D2		Severe	Significant	Insignificant
	Separation	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
	Height Difference > 4 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 0.4	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 1
	Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.9	<input type="radio"/> 1
	Height Difference < 2 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1

Factor D

(Set D = lesser of D1 and D2 or..
set D = 1.0 if no prospect of pounding)

3.5 Site Characteristics - (Stability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc)

Effect on Structural Performance

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/> 0.5	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1

Factor E

3.6 Other Factors

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.

Factor F

Record rationale for choice of Factor F:

Based on conservatively assumed out-of-plane bending and shear capacity of reinforced concrete walls, from cover meter survey. F factor not increased to make 100% NBS due to uncertainty about the Netball Centre connection detail.

3.7 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)
(equals A x B x C x D x E x F)

PAR

Building Name:	South Hagley - Netball Toilets	Ref.	ZB01276.127
Location:	South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central	By	WPK
Direction Considered:	b) Transverse	Date	10/05/2012
(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)			

Step 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)
(Refer Appendix B - Section B3.2)

Critical Structural Weakness

Effect on Structural Performance
(Choose a value - Do not interpolate)

Building Score

3.1 Plan Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor A

3.2 Vertical Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor B

3.3 Short Columns

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Factor C

3.4 Pounding Potential

(Estimate D1 and D2 and set D = the lower of the two, or =1.0 if no potential for pounding)

a) Factor D1: - Pounding Effect

Select appropriate value from Table

Note:
Values given assume the building has a frame structure. For stiff buildings (eg with shear walls), the effect of pounding may be reduced by taking the co-efficient to the right of the value applicable to frame buildings.

Factor D1

Table for Selection of Factor D1	Severe	Significant	Insignificant
	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.8	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1
Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	<input type="radio"/> 0.4	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.8

b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect

Select appropriate value from Table

Factor D2

Table for Selection of Factor D2	Severe	Significant	Insignificant
	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
Height Difference > 4 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 0.4	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 1
Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input type="radio"/> 0.9	<input type="radio"/> 1
Height Difference < 2 Storeys	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1

Factor D

(Set D = lesser of D1 and D2 or..
set D = 1.0 if no prospect of pounding)

3.5 Site Characteristics - (Stability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc)

Effect on Structural Performance

Severe	Significant	Insignificant
<input type="radio"/> 0.5	<input type="radio"/> 0.7	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1

Factor E

3.6 Other Factors

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.

Factor F

Record rationale for choice of Factor F:

Based on conservatively assumed out-of-plane bending and shear capacity of reinforced concrete walls, from cover meter survey. F factor not increased to make 100% NBS due to uncertainty about the Netball Centre connection detail.

3.7 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)
(equals A x B x C x D x E x F)

PAR

Building Name:	South Hagley - Netball Toilets	Ref.	ZB01276.127	
Location:	South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central	By	WPK	
Direction Considered:	Longitudinal & Transverse		Date	10/05/2012
(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)				

Step 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS)

	Longitudinal	Transverse
4.1 Assessed Baseline (%NBS)_b (from Table IEP - 1)	61	61
4.2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)	1.30	1.30
4.3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS)_b	79	79
4.4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)		79

Step 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?
(Mark as appropriate)

%NBS ≤ 33 NO

Step 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?

%NBS < 67 NO

Step 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP

Seismic Grade B

Evaluation Confirmed by



Signature

Nick Calvert _____ Name

242062 _____ CPEng. No

Relationship between Seismic Grade and % NBS :

Grade:	A+	A	B	C	D	E
%NBS:	> 100	100 to 80	80 to 67	67 to 33	33 to 20	< 20

CHECK SHEAR CAPACITY OF WALL:

(NBS 3101:2006)

$CCT) = CnCT) \cdot z \cdot NCT, D) - 0.9$ (EQN 3.1(1), NBS 1170.5, 2004) CCT) = 0.9

$CnCT) = 3$

(TABLE 3.1)

$T < 0.4s$ (CONCRETE)
SOIL CLASS D (GEOTECH REPORT)

$z = 0.3$

$Ru = 1.0$

(TABLE 3.5)

IL2 (TABLE 3.2, AS/NBS 1170.0:2002)
DESIGN LIFE = 50 YEARS (ASSUMED)
 $APE = \frac{1}{500}$ (TABLE 3.3, AS/NBS 1170.0:2002)

$NCT, D) = 1.0$

$D > 20km$


(EQN 3.1(3))

ASSUME 1kPa ROOF LOAD:

$W^* = (1kPa \times 0.5 \times 6.35 \times 5.4) + 25kN/m^3 \times 0.23 \times 0.5$
 $\times (6.35 \times 2.4 + 5.4 \times 2.4)$
 $= 100 kN$

$V^* = CCT) W^* = 90 kN$

$V^* = 90 kN$



ASSUME 160 THICK CONCRETE WALL

$$\phi V_u = \phi (V_c + V_s) = 585 \text{ kN} \quad (\text{EQN 7-6}) \quad \phi V_u = 585 \text{ kN}$$

$$\phi = 0.75$$

$$V_c = v_c A_{cv} = 276 \text{ kN}$$

$$v_c = k_a v_b = 0.4 \text{ MPa} \quad (\text{EQN 10-11})$$

$$k_a = 1.0$$

$$v_b \approx 0.08 \sqrt{f'_c} = 0.4 \text{ MPa}$$

$$f'_c \approx 25 \text{ MPa}$$

$$A_{cv} = 160 \times (0.8 \times 5400) = 691200 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$V_s = A_v f_y c \frac{d}{s} = 505 \text{ kN} \quad (\text{EQN 11-19})$$

ASSUME D10 @ 200 c/c

$$\therefore A_v = \pi \times \frac{10^2}{4} = 78 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$f_y = 300 \text{ MPa}$$


$$d = 0.8 \times 5.4 = 4.32 \text{ m}$$

$$s = 200 \text{ mm}$$

$$\therefore V^* < \phi V_u, \quad \therefore \sim 100\% \text{ NBS}$$

$\sim 100\% \text{ NBS}$

CHECK OUT OF PLANE CAPACITY:



$$W^* = C(T) 25 \text{ kN/m}^3 \times 0.23 = 5.2 \text{ kN/m/m}$$

$$M^* = \text{MAX} \left[\frac{WL^2}{8}, \frac{9WL^2}{128} \right] = 5.9 \text{ kNm/m}$$

$M^* = 5.9$
kNm/m

$$\phi M_n = \phi T_j d = 6.7 \text{ kNm/m}$$

$\phi M_n = 6.7$
kNm/m

$$\phi = 0.75$$

$$T = A_s f_y = 117.6 \text{ kN}$$

$$A_s = \frac{117.6}{250} \times \pi \times \frac{10^2}{4} = 392 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$f_y = 300 \text{ MPa}$$

$$j d = d - \frac{a}{2} = 77 \text{ mm}$$

$$d = 80 \text{ mm}$$

$$a = \frac{T}{0.85 \times f'_c \times b} = 5.5 \text{ mm}$$

$$f'_c \approx 25 \text{ MPa (ASSUMED)}$$

$$M^* < \phi M_n, \therefore \sim 100\% \text{ NBS}$$

$\sim 100\% \text{ NBS}$



13. Appendix 3 – CERA Standardised Report Form

Location		Building Name: <input type="text" value="South Hagley - Netball Toilets"/>	Unit No: <input type="text" value="Street"/>	Reviewer: <input type="text" value="Nick Calvert"/>
Building Address: <input type="text" value="South Hagley Park, Christchurch Central"/>		CPEng No: <input type="text" value="242062"/>		Company: <input type="text" value="SKM"/>
Legal Description: <input type="text"/>		Company project number: <input type="text" value="ZB01276.127"/>		Company phone number: <input type="text" value="09 928 5500"/>
GPS south: <input type="text"/>		Degrees <input type="text"/> Min <input type="text"/> Sec <input type="text"/>		Date of submission: <input type="text"/>
GPS east: <input type="text"/>		Is there a full report with this summary? <input type="text" value="yes"/>		Inspection Date: <input type="text" value="8/05/2012"/>
Building Unique Identifier (CCC): <input type="text"/>				Revision: <input type="text" value="A"/>

Site	Site slope: <input type="text" value="flat"/>	Max retaining height (m): <input type="text"/>
Soil type: <input type="text"/>	Soil Profile (if available): <input type="text"/>	
Site Class (to NZS1170.5): <input type="text" value="D"/>		
Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m): <input type="text"/>	If Ground improvement on site, describe: <input type="text"/>	
Proximity to cliff top (m, if <100m): <input type="text"/>		
Proximity to cliff base (m, if <100m): <input type="text"/>	Approx site elevation (m): <input type="text"/>	

Building	No. of storeys above ground: <input type="text" value="1"/>	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): <input type="text" value="4.10"/>
Ground floor split?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Stores below ground: <input type="text" value="0"/>		Ground floor elevation above ground (m): <input type="text" value="4.10"/>
Foundation type: <input type="text" value="mat slab"/>	Building height (m): <input type="text" value="4.10"/>	if Foundation type is other, describe: <input type="text"/>	height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m): <input type="text" value="4.1"/>
Floor footprint area (approx): <input type="text" value="35"/>	Age of Building (years): <input type="text" value="25"/>		Date of design: <input type="text" value="1976-1992"/>
Strengthening present?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Use (ground floor): <input type="text" value="recreational"/>	If so, when (year)? <input type="text"/>	And what load level (%g)? <input type="text"/>
Use (upper floors): <input type="text"/>	Use notes (if required): <input type="text"/>	Brief strengthening description: <input type="text"/>	
Importance level (to NZS1170.5): <input type="text" value="IL2"/>			

Gravity Structure	Gravity System: <input type="text" value="load bearing walls"/>	Assumed timber rafters & purlins and lightweight steel cladding
Roof: <input type="text" value="timber framed"/>	Floors: <input type="text" value="concrete flat slab"/>	slab thickness (mm): <input type="text" value="Unknown"/>
Beams: <input type="text" value="none"/>	Columns: <input type="text" value="none"/>	overall depth x width (mm x mm): <input type="text" value="None"/>
Walls: <input type="text" value="load bearing concrete"/>		typical dimensions (mm x mm): <input type="text" value="None"/>
		#N/A

Lateral load resisting structure	Lateral system along: <input type="text" value="concrete shear wall"/>	Ductility assumed, μ: <input type="text" value="1.25"/>	Period along: <input type="text" value="0.10"/>	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="10"/>	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text"/>	Note: Define along and across in detailed report!	note total length of wall at ground (m): <input type="text" value="6.35"/>	wall thickness (m): <input type="text" value="0.16"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	Lateral system across: <input type="text" value="concrete shear wall"/>	Ductility assumed, μ: <input type="text" value="1.25"/>	Period across: <input type="text" value="0.10"/>	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="10"/>	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text"/>	0.18 from parameters in sheet	note total length of wall at ground (m): <input type="text" value="5.4"/>	wall thickness (m): <input type="text" value="0.16"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>

Separations:	north (mm): <input type="text"/>	east (mm): <input type="text"/>	south (mm): <input type="text"/>	west (mm): <input type="text"/>	leave blank if not relevant
---------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

Non-structural elements	Stairs: <input type="text"/>	Wall cladding: <input type="text" value="brick or tile"/>	Roof Cladding: <input type="text"/>	Clazing: <input type="text"/>	Ceilings: <input type="text"/>	Services(list): <input type="text" value="Water, sewerage"/>	describe (note cavity if exists) <input type="text" value="Brick cladding exterior with tile interior"/>
--------------------------------	------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

Available documentation	Architectural: <input type="text" value="none"/>	Structural: <input type="text" value="none"/>	Mechanical: <input type="text" value="none"/>	Electrical: <input type="text" value="none"/>	Geotech report: <input type="text" value="partial"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------	--	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	---

Damage Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Site performance: <input type="text"/>	Describe damage: <input type="text"/>
Settlement: <input type="text" value="none observed"/>	Differential settlement: <input type="text" value="none observed"/>	Liquefaction: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/>
Lateral Spread: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/>	Differential lateral spread: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/>	Ground cracks: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/>
Damage to area: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/>		

Building:	Current Placard Status: <input type="text" value="green"/>	
Along	Damage ratio: <input type="text" value="0%"/>	Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <input type="text" value="Current damage noted will not diminish the capacity of the building"/>
Describe (summary):	<input type="text" value="Cracking in timber beam at roof level"/>	
Across	Damage ratio: <input type="text" value="0%"/>	$Damage_Ratio = \frac{(\%NBS\ (before) - \%NBS\ (after))}{\%NBS\ (before)}$
Describe (summary):	<input type="text" value="Gaps opening up between bricks and mortar"/>	
Diaphragms	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text"/>
CSWs:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text"/>
Pounding:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text"/>
Non-structural:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="yes"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value="Gaps opening up between bricks and mortar and cracking in timber beam at roof level."/>

Recommendations	Level of repair/strengthening required: <input type="text" value="minor non-structural"/>	Describe: <input type="text"/>
Building Consent required: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Interim occupancy recommendations: <input type="text" value="full occupancy"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value="Not an immediate collapse hazard."/>
Along	Assessed %NBS before: <input type="text" value="79%"/>	%NBS from IEP below
Assessed %NBS after: <input type="text" value="79%"/>		If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology: <input type="text" value="Qualitative Assessment carried out includes NZSEE IEP (refer to SKM report)."/>
Across	Assessed %NBS before: <input type="text" value="79%"/>	%NBS from IEP below
Assessed %NBS after: <input type="text" value="79%"/>		



14. Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study



Christchurch City Council - Structural Engineering Service

Geotechnical Desk Study

SKM project number	ZB01276
SKM project site number	125, 126, 127, 128
Address	Pavillion and three Toilet Blocks, Hagley Park South
Report date	12 July 2012
Author	Chris Ritchie
Reviewer	Ross Roberts
Approved for issue	Yes

1. Introduction

This report outlines the geotechnical information that Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) has been able to source from our database and other sources in relation to the property listed above. We understand that this information will be used as part of an initial qualitative Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE), and will be supplemented by more detailed information and investigations to allow detailed scoping of the repair or rebuild of the building.

2. Scope

This geotechnical desk top study incorporates information sourced from:

- Published geology
- Publically available borehole records
- Liquefaction records
- Aerial photography
- A preliminary site walkover

3. Limitations


This report was prepared to address geotechnical issues relating to the specific site in accordance with the scope of works as defined in the contract between SKM and our Client. This report has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of, our Client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between SKM and our Client. The findings presented in this report should not be applied to another site or another development within the same site without consulting SKM.

The assessment undertaken by SKM was limited to a desktop review of the data described in this report. SKM has not undertaken any subsurface investigations, measurement or testing of materials from the site. In preparing this report, SKM has relied upon, and presumed accurate, any information (or confirmation of the absence thereof) provided by our Client, and from other sources as described in the report. Except as otherwise stated in this report, SKM has not attempted to verify the accuracy or completeness of any such information.



This report should be read in full and no excerpts are to be taken as representative of the findings. It must not be copied in parts, have parts removed, redrawn or otherwise altered without the written consent of SKM.

4. Site location




■ **Figure 1 – Site location (courtesy of LINZ <http://viewers.geospatial.govt.nz>)**

The structures are located within South Hagley with entrance to site located on Deans Avenue, Riccarton Avenue and Hagley Avenue.




5. Review of available information

5.1 Geological maps



■ Figure 2 – Regional geological map (Forsyth et al, 2008). Site marked in yellow.



■ **Figure 3 – Local geological map (Brown et al, 1992). Site marked in yellow.**

The site is shown to be underlain by Holocene deposits comprising predominantly alluvial sand and silt overbank deposits of the Springston Formation.



5.2 Liquefaction map



■ **Figure 4 – Liquefaction map (Cubrinovski & Taylor, 2011). Site marked in yellow.**

Following the 22 February 2011 event drive through reconnaissance was undertaken from 23 February until 1 March by M Cubrinovski and M Taylor of Canterbury University. Their findings show low to moderate liquefaction on Deans Avenue and Moorhouse Avenue and no liquefaction on western Moorhouse and to the east.

5.3 Aerial photography



- **Figure 5 – Aerial photography from 24 Feb 2011 (<http://viewers.geospatial.govt.nz/>)**

Aerial photography shows little evidence for surface liquefaction after the 22 February 2011 event.

5.4 CERA classification

A review of the LINZ website (<http://viewers.geospatial.govt.nz/>) shows that the site is:

- Zone: Green
- DBH Technical Category TC2 to the west, TC to the north and east



5.5 Historical land use

Reference to historical documents (eg Appendix A) shows that the site next to land that was recorded as marshland or swamp in 1856. It is therefore possible that soft or liquefiable ground would be present near the site. A previous watercourse is marked running southwest northeast through the park.

5.6 Existing ground investigation data



■ **Figure 6 – Local boreholes from Project Orbit and SKM files (<https://canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com/>)**

Where available logs from these investigation locations are attached to this report (Appendix B), and the results are summarised in Appendix C.



5.7 Council property files

Council property files were not available for the site at the time of writing this report.

5.8 Site walkover

An external site walkover was conducted by an SKM engineer on 3 May 2012. Four buildings were assessed during the walk over.

5.8.1 PRK_1507_BLDG_001_EQ2 - Pavilion/Shelter

The Pavilion was noted to be a masonry block building with sheet metal roof, slab on grade foundations. From the external inspection, cracking and spalling in concrete footing under masonry walls was observed on the west side of the building. Minor cracking in external concrete ground slab was also noted.

Some patches in grass were observed to the west of the building which may be evidence of liquefied material being ejected to the surface. No apparent land damage was observed on the site.



■ **Figure 7 Overview of structures – Pavilion**



5.8.2 PRK_1507_BLDG_010_EQ2 – Hospital Toilets

The building was a masonry block construction with sheet metal roof and timber frames. The ground floor appeared to be supported on slab on grade foundation. Cracking and spalling of concrete footing was noted on the south east corner and some cracks were observed in external concrete ground slab.

No evidence of land damage was visible during the external inspection; however, the patchy grass present to the south of the building suggests that some liquefied material was ejected at surface due to the 22 February earthquake.



■ Figure 8 Overview of structures – Hospital toilet

5.8.3 PRK_1507_BLDG_013 EQ2 – Netball Toilets

The toilet block was observed to comprise concrete walls with brick cladding and a timber-framed ceiling. The foundation was noted to be a slab on grade foundation and the roof appeared to be lightweight construction with a glazed skylight in the centre. The toilet block appeared to be attached to the Christchurch Netball Centre building. There were some gaps in the mortar between bricks at the footing and at the top of the wall.

Resealed patches were observed on the nearby netball courts, likely as a result of services being broken underneath. Surface cracks were also noted which had been sealed with resin. No evidence of liquefaction or land damage was visible during the external site inspection.



■ **Figure 9 Overview of structures – Netball toilets**

5.8.4 PRK_1507_BLDG_014_EQ2 – Rugby toilets

The building was observed to be a masonry block building with sheet metal roof, slab on grade foundations. Some minor cracks in the masonry wall and external concrete slab were observed during the external inspection of the site. There was no evidence of surface expression of liquefaction or any land damage around the site.



■ **Figure 10 Overview of structures – Rugby toilets**

6. Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Site geology

An interpretation of the most relevant local investigation suggests that the site is underlain by:

Depth range (mBGL)	Soil type
0 – 5	Sands/silts/clays
5-12	Sands/Gravels
12-25	Sands/Silts
25+	Gravels

6.2 Seismic site subsoil class

The site has been assessed as NZS1170.5 Class D (deep or soft soil).

As described in NZS1170, the preferred site classification method is from site periods based on four times the shear wave travel time through material from the surface to the underlying rock. The next preferred methods are from borelogs including measurement of geotechnical properties or by evaluation of site periods from Nakamura ratios or from recorded earthquake motions. Lacking this information,



classification may be based on boreholes with descriptors but no geotechnical measurements. The least preferred method is from surface geology and estimates of the depth to underlying rock.

In this case the absence of deep boreholes near the site has resulted in the use of the least preferred method. It is therefore possible that site specific investigation could revise the site class.

6.3 Building Performance

Although detailed records of the existing foundations are not available, the performance to date suggests that they are adequate for their current purpose.

6.4 Ground performance and properties

Liquefaction risk is expected to be low to moderate on this site. Little surface evidence of liquefaction was noted from the aerial photograph taken shortly after the 22 February earthquake and during the external site walkover undertaken by a SKM engineer. Some liquefaction was however noted during the reconnaissance performed by Canterbury University.

Due to the variability of ground conditions found across the site, an estimation of the ground properties has not been provided in this desk study. Additional, investigations closer to each building would be required to perform a full quantitative DEE.

6.5 Further investigations

If a quantitative DEE is to be performed for the structures on site, intrusive geotechnical investigations are required to provide a reliable estimate of shallow ground properties. Additional investigations recommended are:

- Two hand augers to a minimum depth of 3 m are required near buildings 1, 10 and 13 as shown in figure 6 if a quantitative DEE is to be performed for the structures
- One borehole to a depth of 20m with SPT at intervals of 1.5 m is required near building 14
- CPTs are expected to be unsuitable as they are likely reach refusal at shallow depths as gravel layers are inferred to be present between 5 to 12 m

7. References

Brown LJ, Weeber JH, 1992. Geology of the Christchurch urban area. Scale 1:25,000. Institute of Geological & Nuclear Sciences geological map 1.

Cubrinovski & Taylor, 2011. Liquefaction map summarising preliminary assessment of liquefaction in urban areas following the 2010 Darfield Earthquake.


Forsyth PJ, Barrell DJA, Jongens R, 2008. Geology of the Christchurch area. Institute of Geological & Nuclear Sciences geological map 16.

Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) geospatial viewer (<http://viewers.geospatial.govt.nz/>)

EQC Project Orbit geotechnical viewer (<https://canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com/>)



Appendix A – Christchurch 1856 land use



The swamps and previous creeks/riders from 1856 have been overlaid onto a map of Christchurch in 2012

- Key**
- Previous creeks/riders
 - Existing creeks/riders
 - New creeks/riders
 - Swamp/Marshland

The SKM logo trade mark is a registered trade mark of Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd.

D:\Documents and Settings\SCastillo\My


Documents\Organice\scastillo\http\dmca.skmconsulting.com\80/sites\ZB01276\DmcaConsult\ZB01276.125.PRK_1507\Deliverables\ZB01276.125 126 127 128 PRK_1190 EQ2-Geotech Desk Study South Hagley.docx



Appendix B – Existing ground investigation logs

Borelog for well M35/11100

Gridref: M35:79577-41151 Accuracy : 2 (1=high, 5=low)
 Ground Level Altitude : 7.83 +MSD
 Driller : McMillan Water Wells Ltd
 Drill Method : Rotary Rig
 Drill Depth : -6.9m Drill Date : 8/03/2006



Borelog for well M35/13525


Gridref: M35:78336-42909 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)

Ground Level Altitude : 8.51 +MSD

Well name : CCC BorelogID 1854


Drill Method : Not Recorded

Drill Depth : -1.91m Drill Date :



Borelog for well M35/13915

Gridref: M35:78915-41189 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)
 Ground Level Altitude : 7.07 +MSD
 Well name : CCC BorelogID 2270
 Drill Method : Not Recorded
 Drill Depth : -5.18m Drill Date :



Borelog for well M35/13916


Gridref: M35:78750-41178 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)

Ground Level Altitude : 6.63 +MSD

Well name : CCC BorelogID 2271

Drill Method : Not Recorded

Drill Depth : -4.88m Drill Date :



Borelog for well M35/11101


Gridref: M35:78704-41193 Accuracy : 2 (1=high, 5=low)

Ground Level Altitude : 6.51 +MSD

Driller : McMillan Water Wells Ltd

Drill Method : Rotary Rig

Drill Depth : -7.75m Drill Date : 8/03/2006





TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 47

Hole Location: Riccarton Ave

SHEET 1 OF 5

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 EARTHQUAKE LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400

CO-ORDINATES 5741361.98 mN DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 16/9/11
 2479634.32 mE DRILL METHOD: HQTT/OB HOLE FINISHED: 17/9/11
 R.L. 7.21 m DRILL FLUID: Mud DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
 DATUM NZMG LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL										ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION													
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION										SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.													
TESTS										ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.													
FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)			COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)			DEFECT SPACING (mm)					
												10	25	50	100	200	50	100	200	50	100	200	
TOPSOIL (Not pre-dug).							7.0	[Graphic Log]	SW	M	L												Fine to medium SAND with some silt and roots, dark brown. Loose, moist. 0.25 to 0.5m no recovery
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)							6.5	[Graphic Log]	MOL	M	F												Organic SILT with trace sand, dark brown. Firm, moist, low plasticity. Sand is fine.
							1.0	[Graphic Log]	SP	M	MD												
*FC							6.0	[Graphic Log]															
							1.5	[Graphic Log]															
							5.5	[Graphic Log]															
							2.0	[Graphic Log]	ML	D	VSt												SILT with trace sand, grey mottled orange brown. Very stiff, dry, low plasticity. Sand is fine. 2.8 to 3.0m no recovery
							3.0	[Graphic Log]	SW	M	MD												Silty, fine to medium SAND, grey mottled orange-brown. Medium dense, moist. 3.45 to 4.25m no recovery
							3.5	[Graphic Log]															
							4.0	[Graphic Log]															
							3.0	[Graphic Log]															
							4.5	[Graphic Log]	GW	M	D												Fine to coarse GRAVEL, grey. Dense, moist. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Fines washed away during drilling process. - contains trace coarse sand 4.6 to 6.3m no recovery
							5.0	[Graphic Log]															

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT.cek



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 47

Hole Location: Riccarton Ave

SHEET 2 OF 5

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 EARTHQUAKE LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400

CO-ORDINATES 5741361.98 mN DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 16/9/11
 2479634.32 mE DRILL METHOD: HQTT/OB HOLE FINISHED: 17/9/11
 R.L. 7.21 m DRILL FLUID: Mud DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
 DATUM NZMG LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL		ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																						
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)			COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)			DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour. ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.			
														10	25	50	5	10	20			50	100	200
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)			13	HQTT				2.0													4.6 to 6.3m no recovery			
								5.5														5.5		
								6.5					MD									- becoming medium dense	6.5	
								7.0														7.05 to 7.7m no recovery	7.0	
				29	HQTT				7.5														7.5	
								8.0														8.1 to 9.1m no recovery	8.0	
								8.5															8.5	
								9.0															9.0	
								9.5															9.5	
								10.0															9.95 to 10.0m no recovery	10.0

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT.ck



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 47

Hole Location: Riccarton Ave

SHEET 3 OF 5

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 EARTHQUAKE	LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY	JOB No: 52000.3400
CO-ORDINATES 5741361.98 mN 2479634.32 mE	DRILL TYPE: Rotary	HOLE STARTED: 16/9/11
R.L. 7.21 m	DRILL METHOD: HQTT/OB	HOLE FINISHED: 17/9/11
DATUM NZMG	DRILL FLUID: Mud	DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
		LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL										ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION															
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)					COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)					DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION ROCK DESCRIPTION Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
														10	25	50	100	200	5	10	20	50	100		
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)			24	HQTT				-3.0	10.5		GW	M	MD											Fine to coarse GRAVEL with trace coarse gravel, grey. Medium dense, moist. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Fines washed away during drilling process. 10.25 to 11.0m no recovery	
CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE & ESTUARINE)				SPT		11/16/13/ 15/12/10 for 70mm N>50 *FC		11.0	11.5		SW	M	VD											Fine to coarse SAND with minor silt, grey. Very dense, moist.	
			100	HQTT				12.0	12.5				D											- becoming dense	
				SPT		3/5/8/ 12/10/10 N=40		12.5	13.0				F											SILT, bluish grey. Firm, moist, low plasticity.	
			76	HQTT		*FC		13.0	13.5		ML	M	F											- contains minor fine sand 13.75 to 14.0m no recovery	
				SPT		0/0/0/ 1/1/2 N=5		14.0	14.5		SW	M	L											Fine to medium SAND with some silt, grey. Loose, moist.	

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT.cek



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 47

Hole Location: Riccarton Ave

SHEET 4 OF 5

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 EARTHQUAKE LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400

CO-ORDINATES 5741361.98 mN 2479634.32 mE DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 16/9/11
 R.L. 7.21 m DRILL METHOD: HQTT/OB HOLE FINISHED: 17/9/11
 DATUM NZMG DRILL FLUID: Mud LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																			
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)			COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)			DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.		
														10	25	100	5	10	25			50	
CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE & ESTUARINE)						*FC		-8.0		ML	M	F										Sandy SILT, bluish grey. Firm, moist, low plasticity. Sand is fine to medium. 15.3 to 15.5m no recovery	
				SPT		2/0/2/1/2/3 N=8		15.5		SW	M	L										Fine to medium SAND with some silt, grey. Loose, moist.	
								-8.5															
								16.0															
								-9.0															
							*FC		16.5														16.6 to 17.0m no recovery
								-9.5															
								17.0					VL										- contains minor silt. Becoming very loose.
							0/0/0/0/1/1 N=2		-10.0														
								17.5															
							-10.5																
							18.0															17.85 to 18.5m no recovery	
							-11.0																
							18.5					MD										- contains trace silt. Becoming medium dense.	
						1/1/2/4/4/4 N=14		-11.5															
						*FC		19.0															
							-12.0																
						*FC		19.5		ML	M	F										SILT with trace sand, bluish grey. Firm, moist, low plasticity. Sand is fine to medium.	
							-12.5			SW	M	L										Fine to medium SAND with some silt, grey. Loose, moist.	
							20.0																

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT eek



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 47

Hole Location: Riccarton Ave

SHEET 5 OF 5

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 EARTHQUAKE	LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY	JOB No: 52000.3400
CO-ORDINATES 5741361.98 mN 2479634.32 mE	DRILL TYPE: Rotary	HOLE STARTED: 16/9/11
R.L. 7.21 m	DRILL METHOD: HQTT/OB	HOLE FINISHED: 17/9/11
DATUM NZMG	DRILL FLUID: Mud	DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
		LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL		ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																			
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)			COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)			DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour. ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
														10	25	50	5	10	20		
CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE & ESTUARINE)				SPT		0/0/1/1/0/1 N=3		-13.0	X	ML	M	S								SILT with some sand, grey. Soft, moist, low plasticity. Sand is fine to medium.	
						*FC		20.5	X												
			100	HQTT				-13.5	X												
								21.0	X												
								-14.0	X		MOL	M	S							Organic SILT with trace roots, dark brown. Soft, moist, low plasticity.	
RICCARTON GRAVELS				SPT		2/4/13/ 22/15 for 65mm N>50		21.5	X	SW	M	VD							Fine to medium SAND with minor silt, grey. Very dense, moist.		
								-14.5	X												
								22.0	X	GW	M	VD							Fine to medium GRAVEL, grey. Very dense, moist. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Fines washed away during drilling process.		
			31	HQTT				-15.0	X												
								22.5	X										22.5 to 23.0m no recovery		
								-15.5	X												
								23.0	X	GW	M	VD							Sandy, fine to coarse GRAVEL, brown. Very dense, moist. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Sand is fine to coarse.		
						10/9/10/ 17/18/5 for 70mm N>50		-16.0	X												
								23.5	X										23.3 to 24.5m no recovery		
								-16.5	X												
								24.0	X												
								-17.0	X												
								24.5	X												
						12/16/ 21/29 for 65mm N>50		-17.5	X												
								25	X										End of borehole at 24.79mbgl. Open Standpipe piezometer installed. Please see attached diagram in Appendix F		

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT eek



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 28

Hole Location: 60 Grove Rd

SHEET 2 OF 6

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 REMEDIATION LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400

CO-ORDINATES 5740707.35 mN 2479140.92 mE DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 26/7/11
 R.L. 8.51 m DRILL METHOD: OB/HQTT HOLE FINISHED: 28/7/11
 DATUM NZMG DRILL FLUID: Mud LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																	
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)			COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)			DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour. ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
														10	25	50	5	10	20		
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)			29	OB				3.0	5.5	X	SP	W	MD							SILT, grey. Very soft, wet, low plasticity. 5.25m to 6.0m no recovery	
				SPT		0/0/0/0/0/0 N=0		2.5	6.0	X	ML	W	VS								
			95	OB				2.0	6.5	X										- fibrous organic material	
					SPT		0/1/1/1/1/2 N=5		1.0	7.5	X			F							7.45m to 7.5m no recovery - becoming firm
			100	OB		*PSD WS	B	8.0		X											
								8.5		X										- fibrous organic material - contains trace roots. Becoming bluish-grey.	
				SPT		2/1/2/2/2/2 N=8		9.0		X											
								9.5		X											
								10.0		X											

T-T DATATEMPLATE.GDT csk



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 28

Hole Location: 60 Grove Rd

SHEET 3 OF 6

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 REMEDIATION LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400

CO-ORDINATES 5740707.35 mN DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 26/7/11
 2479140.92 mE DRILL METHOD: OB/HQTT HOLE FINISHED: 28/7/11
 R.L. 8.51 m DRILL FLUID: Mud DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
 DATUM NZMG LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL										ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																			
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.										SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.																			
TESTS										ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.																			
FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)														
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)										SILT, grey. Very soft, wet, low plasticity. - contains trace wood - contains minor fine sand																			
										0/0/1/0/0/0 N=1										10.5									
										2.5 11.0										11.0									
										2/4/6/8/8/12 N=34										11.5 Fine to coarse SAND with some silt, grey. Medium dense, wet. - contains trace silt. Becoming dense.									
										3.5 12.0										12.0									
										7/13/13/9/9/9 N=40										12.5 12.45m to 12.5m no recovery - contains some fine to coarse gravel, grey. Gravel is subangular to subrounded. 12.7m to 13.4m no recovery									
										71 HQTT										13.0									
										5.0 13.5										13.5 Sandy, fine to coarse GRAVEL, grey. Dense, wet. Gravel is subangular to subrounded. Sand is fine to coarse. 13.7m to 14.0m no recovery									
										CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE ESTUARINE)										14.0 Fine to coarse SAND, grey. Medium dense, wet. 14.2m to 14.45m no recovery									
										2/3/3/5/7/7 N=22										14.5									
*FC																													

T-T DATATEMPLATE.GDT.ckk



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 28

Hole Location: 60 Grove Rd

SHEET 4 OF 6

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 REMEDIATION	LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY	JOB No: 52000.3400
CO-ORDINATES 5740707.35 mN 2479140.92 mE	DRILL TYPE: Rotary	HOLE STARTED: 26/7/11
R.L. 8.51 m	DRILL METHOD: OB/HQTT	HOLE FINISHED: 28/7/11
DATUM NZMG	DRILL FLUID: Mud	DRILLED BY: Pro-Drill
		LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD

GEOLOGICAL										ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION									
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.										SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.									
ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.																			
FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)			
										SW	W	MD						Fine to coarse SAND, grey. Medium dense, wet.	
			SPT		3/4/6/6/9/9 N=30		-7.0	15.5										15.4m to 15.5m no recovery - becoming fine to medium SAND, dense	
			HQTT				-7.5	16.0										- contains minor silt	
		81					-8.0	16.5											
			SPT		2/3/5/ 7/10/10 N=32		-8.5	17.0										16.8m to 17.0m no recovery	
			HQTT				-9.0	17.5											
		76					-9.5	18.0										- contains trace shells	
			SPT		1/0/0/1/1/0 N=2		-10.0	18.5										18.25m to 18.95m no recovery	
			HQTT				-10.5	19.0		SW	M	MD						Interbedded SILT and fine to coarse SAND, bluish grey and grey, moist. Silt has low plasticity. Sand is medium dense.	
		86					-11.0	19.5											
								20										19.85m to 20.0m no recovery	

T-T DATATEMPLATE.GDT csk



TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: CBD 28

Hole Location: 60 Grove Rd



SHEET 6 OF 6


PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH CITY 2011 REMEDIATION LOCATION: CENTRAL CITY JOB No: 52000.3400



CO-ORDINATES 5740707.35 mN 2479140.92 mE DRILL TYPE: Rotary HOLE STARTED: 26/7/11
 R.L. 8.51 m DRILL METHOD: OB/HQTT HOLE FINISHED: 28/7/11
 DATUM NZMG DRILL FLUID: Mud LOGGED BY: CP CHECKED: BMcD


GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																			
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)				COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)				DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour. ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
														10	25	50	100	5	10	20	50		
RICCARTON GRAVELS			33	HQTT				-17.0	25.5													25.0m to 25.7m no recovery	
								-17.0	25.5	GW	W	D										Medium to coarse GRAVEL, grey. Dense, wet. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Fines washed away from drilling.	
				SPT		6/10/14 17/9 for 40mm N>50		-17.5	26.0	GW	W	VD										Sandy, fine to coarse GRAVEL, mottled brown and grey. Very dense, wet. Gravel is subangular to subrounded. Sand is medium to coarse.	
				33	HQTT				-18.0	26.5													26.4m to 27.2m no recovery
									-18.5	27.0	GW	W	VD										Medium to coarse GRAVEL, grey. Very dense, wet. Gravel is subrounded to subangular. Fines washed away from drilling.
					SPT	13/1415/ 18/18 for 55mm N>501		-19.0	27.5														27.5m to 28.7m no recovery
			33	HQTT				-19.5	28.0														
								-20.0	28.5														
				SPT		4/4/10/ 17/27 for 25mm N>50		-20.5	29.0	GW	W	VS										Sandy, fine to coarse GRAVEL, mottled brown and grey. Very dense, wet. Gravel is subangular to subrounded. Sand is medium to coarse.	
								-21.0	29.5													End of borehole at 29.35mbgl. Open Standpipe piezometer installed. Please see attached diagram in Appendix F.	
								-21.5	30.0														

T-T DATATEMPLATE.GDT.ckk

Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - CCC Ground Investigations				Page: 1 of 2		CPT-CBD-83	
Test Date: 20-Jul-2011		Location: Central City		Operator: Opus		 	
Pre-Drill: 1.5m		Assumed GWL: 2.5mBGL		Located By: Survey GPS			
Position: 2479428mE		5741029.5mN		7.08mRL			
Other Tests:				Comments:			



Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - CCC Ground Investigations				Page: 2 of 2		CPT-CBD-83	
Test Date: 20-Jul-2011		Location: Central City		Operator: Opus		 	
Pre-Drill: 1.5m		Assumed GWL: 2.5mBGL		Located By: Survey GPS			
Position: 2479428mE		5741029.5mN		7.08mRL			
Other Tests:				Comments:			





Appendix C – Geotechnical Investigation Summary



■ **Table 1 Summary of most relevant investigation data**

ID	1	2	3	4	5
Type *	WW	WW	WW	WW	WW
Ref	M35-11100	M35-13525	M35_13915	M35_13916	M35_11101
Depth (m)	6.9	2	5	4.8	7.8
Distance from site (m)					
Ground water level (mBGL)					
Simplified recorded geological profile (depth below ground level to top of stratum, m)	0				
	1				
	2				
	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12				
	13				
	14				
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
25					
Greater depths					

*BH: Borehole, HA: Hand Auger, WW: Water Well, CPT: Cone Penetration Test

Sensitive or organic clay/silt	Clay to silty clay	Clayey silt to silt	Silty sand to silt
Clayey sand	Sand	Gravelly sand or gravel	

VL = very loose, L = loose, MD = medium dense, D = dense, VD = very dense
 VS = very soft, So = soft, F = firm, St = stiff, VS = very stiff, H = hard

The SKM logo trade mark is a registered trade mark of Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd.



ID	6	7	8
Type *	CPT	BH	BH
Ref	CBD 83	CBD 47	CBD 28
Depth (m)	5.7	24.79	29.35
Distance from site (m)			
Ground water level (mBGL)	2.5	-	-
Simplified recorded geological profile (depth below ground level to top of stratum, m)	0	N/A	
	1	MD	S
	2	VS	L
	3	MD	L
	4	D	L - MD
	5	D	VS
	6	MD	VS
	7	MD	VS - F
	8	MD	F
	9	MD	F
	10	MD	VS
	11	VD	D
	12	D	D
	13	F	D
	14	L	MD
	15	F	MD - D
	16	L	D
	17	VL	D
	18	MD	D
	19	MD	MD
	20	St	MD
	21	VD	MD
	22	VD	VD
	23	VD	VD
	24	VD	VD
25		VD	
Greater depths			

*BH: Borehole, HA: Hand Auger, WW: Water Well, CPT: Cone Penetration Test

Sensitive or organic clay/silt	Clay to silty clay	Clayey silt to silt	Silty sand to silt
Clayey sand	Sand	Gravelly sand or gravel	

VL = very loose, L = loose, MD = medium dense, D = dense, VD = very dense
 VS = very soft, So = soft, F = firm, St = stiff, VS = very stiff, H = hard

The SKM logo trade mark is a registered trade mark of Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd.