Christchurch City Council

PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2
Scott Park Ferrymead – Storage Shed
2 Main Road

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT
FINAL

- Rev B
- 24 September 2013

Christchurch City Council
PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2
Scott Park Ferrymead – Storage Shed
2 Main Road

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 24 September 2013

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

Contents

Document history and status

Revision	Date issued	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Revision type
A	27 July 2012	TW Robertson	NM Calvert	27 July 2012	Draft for Client Approval
B	24 Sept. 2013	NM Calvert	NM Calvert	24 Sept. 2013	Final for Issue

Approval

	Signature	Date	Name	Title
Author		24/09/2013	Nigel Chan	Structural Engineer
Approver		24/09/2013	Nick Calvert	Senior Structural Engineer

Distribution of copies

Revision	Copy no	Quantity	Issued to
A	1	1	Christchurch City Council
B	1	1	Christchurch City Council

Printed:	24 September 2013
Last saved:	24 September 2013 04:09 PM
File name:	PRK 1409 BLDG 009.docx
Author:	Nigel Chan
Project manager:	Nick M. Calvert
Name of organisation:	Christchurch City Council
Name of project:	Christchurch City Council Structures Panel
Name of document:	PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2 Qualitative Assessment Report
Document version:	B
Project number:	ZB01276.174

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Background

A Qualitative Assessment was carried out on the building PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2 located at 2 Main Road, Ferrymead. The building is a small single storey shed. It is constructed from masonry with a timber framed corrugated iron clad roof. A map showing the location of the building 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 showing location of PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2**

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 visual inspections on 19th June 2012.

1.2. Key Damage Observed

No exterior damage was observed

1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses

Liquifaction risk is high at this site. The effect this has on the structural performance is significant. It has not been taken as severe due to the compact nature of the structure.

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 85%NBS and post earthquake capacity in the order of 85%NBS. This assessment has been made without structural drawings and is accordingly limited.

The building has been assessed to have a seismic capacity in the order of 85% NBS and is therefore not potentially earthquake prone.

Please note that structural strengthening is required by law for buildings that are confirmed to have a seismic capacity of less than 34% NBS.

1.5. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

a) There is no damage to the building that would cause it to be unsafe to occupy.
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 PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ2 located at 2 Main Road, Ferrymead 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 document "Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury" (part 2 revision 5 dated 19/07/2011 and part 3 draft revision dated 13/12/2011). 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 0.3[1].

At the time of this report, no intrusive site investigation, detailed analysis, or modelling of the building structure had been carried out. Construction drawings were not made available. The building description below is based on a review of the drawings and our visual inspections.

---

[1] http://www.dbh.govt.nz/seismicity-info

3. Compliance

This section contains a 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 34%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

Building PRK_1409_BLDG_009 is a small single storey structure located at 2 Main Road, Ferrymead. The building is constructed from masonry with a timber frame roof and light weight corrugated iron clad roof. The structure consists of a main structure with a gable roof, and an adjacent lean-to. An outdoor toilet facility is also attached to the main structure. The masonry walls are supported on a concrete foundation

Our evaluation was based on the exterior inspection on 19th June 2012. Based on the apparent ageing of this building we estimate that it was constructed sometime in the 1980's, therefore we have assumed a post-1976 construction date for the purposes of our assessment.

5.2. Gravity Load Resisting system

The roof structure consists of a timber beams spanning between the masonry walls supported on the concrete foundation

5.3. Seismic Load Resisting system

For the purposes of this report the longitudinal direction of the building is defined as being the north-south direction and the transverse direction is defined as being in the east-west direction.

Lateral load on the building is carried by the masonry walls by shear in the longitudinal and transverse direction.

5.4. Geotechnical Conditions

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

- The site has been assessed as NZS1170.5 Class D (deep or soft soil) from surface geology.
- Liquefaction risk is high at this site.
- It is expected that a degree of settlement is likely to have occurred as a result of the severe liquefaction on site. It is, however, not clear whether the settlement was within the tolerable level for the structure.

Unless a change of use is intended for the site we do not believe that any further geotechnical investigations are required. Specific ground investigation should be undertaken if significant alterations or new structures are proposed. If any excavations are required on the site further investigation of the potential for contamination should be undertaken. The full geotechnical desktop study can be found in Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study.

6. Damage Summary

SKM undertook inspections on 19th June 2012. The following was observed during the time of inspection:

1) No external damage was observed during our site inspection.
2) Evidence of possible settlement was noted at this site, from the level of liquefaction that occurred. A level survey is not required at this stage of assessment due to the size of the structure.

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 buildings[2].

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 grade is indicated by the percent of the required New Building Standard (%NBS) strength that the building is considered to have. A building is earthquake prone for the purposes of this Act if, having regard to its condition and to the ground on which it is built, and because of its construction, the building—

a) will have its ultimate capacity exceeded in a moderate earthquake (as defined in the regulations); and
b) would be likely to collapse causing—
    i. injury or death to persons in the building or to persons on any other property; or
    ii. damage to any other property.

A moderate earthquake is defined as 'in relation to a building, an earthquake that would generate shaking at the site of the building that is of the same duration as, but that is one-third as strong as, the earthquake shaking (determined by normal measures of acceleration, velocity and displacement) that would be used to design a new building at the site.'

An earthquake prone building will have an increased risk that its strength will be exceeded due to earthquake actions of approximately 10 times (or more) than that of a building having a capacity in excess of 100% NBS (refer Table 1)[3]. Buildings in Christchurch City that are identified as being 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 prone[4].

---

[2] http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/EarthquakeProneDangerousAndInsanitaryBuildingsPolicy2010.pdf
[3] NZSEE June 2006, *Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes*, p 2-13
[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 collapse or other forms of 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 building[5]. This assessment concentrates on matters relating to life safety as damage to the building is a secondary consideration.

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

- AS/NZS 1170 Structural Design Actions
- NZS 3101:2006 Concrete Structures Standard
- NZS 3404:1997 Steel Structures Standard
- NZS4230:2004 Design of Reinforced Concrete Masonry Structures
- NZS 3603:1993 Timber Structures Standard
- NZS 3604:2011 Timber Framed Buildings

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

7.2. Design Criteria and Limitations

Following our inspection on the 2nd 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 and inspection findings of the building. Please note no intrusive investigations were undertaken.
- Structural drawings were not available

The design criteria used to undertake the assessment include:

- 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 1. This level of importance is described as structures presenting a low degree of hazard to life and other property, which is appropriate given that it is being used as a storage shed.
  - Ductility level of 1.25 in the longitudinal and transverse direction, 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 visual inspection of the building and a review of the available structural drawings. 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.
- The IEP does not involve a detailed analysis or an element by element code compliance check.

7.3. Survey

Evidence of possible settlement was noted at this site, from the level of liquefaction that occurred. This building is a small structure and is adjacent to land which is zoned TC2 under the CERA Residential Technical Categories Map. The combination of these factors means that we do not recommend that any survey be undertaken at this point.

7.4. Critical Structural Weaknesses

Liquifaction risk is high at this site. The effect this has on the structural performance is significant. It has not been taken as severe due to the compact nature of the structure.

7.5. Qualitative Assessment Results

The building has had its capacity assessed using the Initial Evaluation Procedure based on the information available. The buildings capacity expressed as a percentage of new building standard (%NBS) is in order of that shown below in Table 3: Qualitative Assessment Summary.

Table 3: Qualitative Assessment Summary

Item	%NBS
Likely Seismic Capacity of Building	85

Our qualitative assessment found that the building is likely to be classed as a 'Low Risk Building' (capacity above 67% of NBS). The full IEP assessment form is detailed in Appendix 2 – IEP Reports.

This assessment has been made with the assumption that the building was constructed post 1976. This assumption was difficult to assert as was based on visual inspection without original drawings. There is a possibility that the building was constructed pre 1976. If it was found that the building was built pre 1976 the seismic capacity of the building would reduce to 29%, which would classify it as an earthquake prone building.

8. Further Investigation

A cover meter survey is recommended. This will determine the spacing of the vertical reinforcement which is important to confirm our assumption on the age of the building.

9. Conclusion

A qualitative assessment was carried out on the building PRK_1409_BLDG_009, located at the 2 Main Road. This building has been assessed to have a likely seismic capacity of 85% and is therefore not potentially earthquake prone (capacity greater than 67%NBS). The building is considered to be 'low risk building'.

Due to the likely seismic rating of this building and the lack of any structural damage no further investigation is required.

It is recommended that

a) There is no damage to the building that would cause it to be unsafe to occupy.
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: South Elevation	Photo 2: West Elevation
	
Photo 3: Internal view of shed	Photo 4: East Elevation (building is behind the hedges)

12. Appendix 2 – IEP Reports

Table IEP-1 **Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 1** Page 1

(Refer Table IEP - 2 for Step 2; Table IEP - 3 for Step 3, Table IEP - 4 for Steps 4, 5 and 6)

Building Name:	**PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead**	Ref.	**ZB01276.174**
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
		Date	27/07/2012

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 is a small single storey shed. It is constructed from masonry with a timber framed corrugated iron clad roof.
Based on the apparent ageing of the building it appears the building was constructed in the 1980s

1.4 Note information sources

Tick as appropriate

Visual Inspection of Exterior	✓	
Visual Inspection of Interior		
Drawings (note type)		Arch/Strut
Specifications		
Geotechical Reports		
Other (list)		

No drawings were available

Sinclair Knight Merz

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)

SKM Page 2

Building Name:	PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead	Ref.	ZB01276.174
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
Direction Considered:	Longitudinal & Transverse	Date	27/07/2012

(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			○	See also notes 1, 3
1935-1965			○	
1965-1976	Seismic Zone;	A	○	
		B	○	
		C	○	See also note 2
1976-1992	Seismic Zone;	A	○	
		B	◉	
		C	○	
1992-2004			○	

b) Soil Type

From NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.3

A or B Rock	○
C Shallow Soil	○
D Soft Soil	◉
E Very Soft Soil	○

From NZS4203:1992, Cl 4.6.2.2
(for 1992 to 2004 only and only if known)

a) Rigid	◉	N-A
b) Intermediate	○	

c) Estimate Period, T

building Ht = 3.6 meters

	Longitudinal	Transverse	
Ac =			m2

Can use following:

		Longitudinal	Transverse
$T = 0.09h_n^{0.75}$	for moment-resisting concrete frames	○ MRCF	○ MRCF
$T = 0.14h_n^{0.75}$	for moment-resisting steel frames	○ MRSF	○ MRSF
$T = 0.08h_n^{0.75}$	for eccentrically braced steel frames	○ EBSF	○ EBSF
$T = 0.06h_n^{0.75}$	for all other frame structures	○ Others	○ Others
$T = 0.09h_n^{0.75}/A_c^{0.5}$	for concrete shear walls	○ CSW	○ CSW
T <= 0.4sec	for masonry shear walls	◉ MSW	◉ MSW

Where hn = height in m from the base of the structure to the uppermost seismic weight or mass.
Ac = ΣAi(0.2 + Lwi/hn)2
Ai = cross-sectional shear area of shear wall i in the first storey of the building, in m2
lwi = length of shear wall i in the first storey in the direction parallel to the applied forces, in m
with the restriction that lwi/hn shall not exceed 0.9

Longitudinal	Transverse	
0.4	0.4	Seconds

d) (%NBS)nom determined from Figure 3.3

Longitudinal	16.5	$(\%NBS)_{nom}$
Transverse	16.5	$(\%NBS)_{nom}$

		Factor
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	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	1
Note 2: For reinforced concrete buildings designed between 1976 -1984 (%NBS)nom by 1.2	No	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	1

Longitudinal	16.5	$(\%NBS)_{nom}$
Transverse	16.5	$(\%NBS)_{nom}$

Continued over page

Table IEP-2 **Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 2 continued** Page 3

Building Name:	**PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead**	Ref.	**ZB01276.174**
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
Direction Considered:	**Longitudinal & Transverse**	Date	27/07/2012

(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** 1
(from NZS1170.0:2004, Table 3.1 and 3.2)

b) **Return Period Scaling Factor from accompanying Table 3.1** — **Factor C** 2.00

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_{μ}
For 1976 onwards = 1
(where k_{μ} 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 Masonry Block
Transverse Masonry Block

a) **Structural Performance Factor, S_p**
from accompanying Figure 3.4

Longitudinal	Sp	0.90
Transverse	Sp	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	122.2	(%NBS)b
Transverse	122.2	(%NBS)b

Sinclair Knight Merz

Table IEP-3 **Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 3** Page 4

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

Building Name:	PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead	Ref.	ZB01276.174
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
Direction Considered:	a) Longitudinal	Date	27/07/2012

(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
	Severe	Significant	Insignificant		
3.1 Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	Factor A	1
Comment					
3.2 Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	Factor B	1
Comment					
3.3 Short Columns Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	Factor C	1
Comment					

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 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	○ 0.7	○ 0.8	◉ 1
Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	○ 0.4	○ 0.7	○ 0.8

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

Factor D2 1

Table for Selection of Factor D2	Severe	Significant	Insignificant
Separation	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
Height Difference > 4 Storeys	○ 0.4	○ 0.7	◉ 1
Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	○ 0.7	○ 0.9	○ 1
Height Difference < 2 Storeys	○ 1	○ 1	○ 1

Factor D 1

(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)

	Severe	Significant	Insignificant		
Effect on Structural Performance	○ 0.5	◉ 0.7	○ 1	**Factor E**	0.7

3.6 Other Factors

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum. **Factor F** 1

Record rationale for choice of Factor F:

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

PAR 0.7

Sinclair Knight Merz

Table IEP-3 **Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 3** Page 5

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

Building Name:	PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead	Ref.	ZB01276.174
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
Direction Considered:	b) Transverse	Date	27/07/2012

(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
	Severe	Significant	Insignificant		
3.1 Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	**Factor A**	1
Comment					
3.2 Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	**Factor B**	1
Comment					
3.3 Short Columns Effect on Structural Performance	○	○	◉	**Factor C**	1
Comment					

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 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	○ 0.7	○ 0.8	◉ 1
Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	○ 0.4	○ 0.7	○ 0.8

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

Factor D2 1

Table for Selection of Factor D2

	Severe	Significant	Insignificant
Separation	0<Sep<.005H	.005<Sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
Height Difference > 4 Storeys	○ 0.4	○ 0.7	○ 1
Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	○ 0.7	○ 0.9	○ 1
Height Difference < 2 Storeys	○ 1	○ 1	◉ 1

Factor D 1

(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		
	○ 0.5	◉ 0.7	○ 1	**Factor E**	0.7

3.6 Other Factors

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum. **Factor F** 1

Record rationale for choice of Factor F:

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

PAR 0.7

Sinclair Knight Merz

Table IEP-4 — **Initial Evaluation Procedure – Steps 4, 5 and 6** — Page 6

(Refer Table IEP - 1 for Step 1; Table IEP - 2 for Step 2, Table IEP - 3 for Step 3)

Building Name:	PRK_1409_BLDG_009 EQ 2 Scott Park Ferrymead	Ref.	ZB01276.174
Location:	2 Main Road	By	Nigel Chan
Direction Considered:	Longitudinal & Transverse	Date	27/07/2012

(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)	122	122
4.2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)	0.70	0.70
4.3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS)$_b$	85	85
4.4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)		85

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 — A

Evaluation Confirmed by [signature] Signature

TREVOR ROBERTSON — Name

28892 — 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

Sinclair Knight Merz

13. Appendix 3 – CERA Standardised Report Form

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data V1.11

Location

Building Name:	Scott Park Ferrymead - Shed	Reviewer:	**TREVOR ROBERTSON**
	Unit / No: / Street	CPEng No:	**28892**
Building Address:	2 Main Road	Company:	Sinclair Knight Merz
Legal Description:		Company project number:	ZB01276.174
		Company phone number:	03 940 4900
	Degrees / Min / Sec		
GPS south:		Date of submission:	24-Sep
GPS east:		Inspection Date:	19/06/2012
		Revision:	B
Building Unique Identifier (CCC):	PRK_1409_BLDG_009	Is there a full report with this summary?	yes

Site

Site slope:	flat	Max retaining height (m):	
Soil type:	sandy silt	Soil Profile (if available):	
Site Class (to NZS1170.5):	D		
Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m):	25	If Ground improvement on site, describe:	
Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):			
Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):		Approx site elevation (m):	

Building

No. of storeys above ground:	1	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
Ground floor split?			Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
Storeys below ground				
Foundation type:	mat slab		if Foundation type is other, describe:	Assumed
Building height (m):	2.20		height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	3.6
Floor footprint area (approx):	45			
Age of Building (years):	30		Date of design:	1976-1992
Strengthening present?	no		If so, when (year)?	
			And what load level (%g)?	
Use (ground floor):	other (specify)		Brief strengthening description:	
Use (upper floors):				
Use notes (if required):	Storage			
Importance level (to NZS1170.5):	IL1			

Gravity Structure

Gravity System:	load bearing walls		
Roof:	timber framed	rafter type, purlin type and cladding	
Floors:	concrete flat slab	slab thickness (mm)	
Beams:	timber	type	
Columns:			
Walls:	fully filled concrete masonry	#N/A	

Lateral load resisting structure

Lateral system along:	fully filled CMU	**Note: Define along and across in detailed report!**	note total length of wall at ground (m):	6.4
Ductility assumed, μ:	1.25		wall thickness (m):	0.2
Period along:	0.40	0.11 from parameters in sheet	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	5		estimate or calculation?	estimated
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
Lateral system across:	fully filled CMU		note total length of wall at ground (m):	4
Ductility assumed, μ:	1.00		wall thickness (m):	0.2
Period across:	0.40	0.20 from parameters in sheet	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	5		estimate or calculation?	estimated
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	

Separations:

north (mm):		leave blank if not relevant
east (mm):		
south (mm):		
west (mm):		

Non-structural elements

Stairs:			
Wall cladding:	brick or tile	describe (note cavity if exists)	
Roof Cladding:	Metal	describe	
Glazing:			
Ceilings:			
Services(list):			

Available documentation

Architectural	none	original designer name/date	
Structural	none	original designer name/date	
Mechanical	none	original designer name/date	
Electrical	none	original designer name/date	
Geotech report	partial	original designer name/date	Desktop study by SKM dated July 2012

Damage

Site:
(refer DEE Table 4-2)

Site performance:		Describe damage:	
Settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Differential settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Liquefaction:	2-5 m²/100m³	notes (if applicable):	evidence of liquefaction present
Lateral Spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Differential lateral spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Ground cracks:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Damage to area:	slight	notes (if applicable):	

Building:

	Current Placard Status:	green		
Along	Damage ratio:	0%	Describe how damage ratio arrived at:	
	Describe (summary):	No damage observed		
Across	Damage ratio:	0%		
	Describe (summary):	No damage observed		
Diaphragms	Damage?:	no	Describe:	
CSWs:	Damage?:	no	Describe:	
Pounding:	Damage?:	no	Describe:	
Non-structural:	Damage?:	no	Describe:	

$$Damage\_Ratio = \frac{(\%NBS(before) - \%NBS(after))}{\%NBS(before)}$$

Recommendations

	Level of repair/strengthening required:	none	Describe:	
	Building Consent required:	no	Describe:	
	Interim occupancy recommendations:	full occupancy	Describe:	
Along	Assessed %NBS before:	85%	%NBS from IEP below	If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology:
	Assessed %NBS after:	85%		
Across	Assessed %NBS before:	85%	%NBS from IEP below	
	Assessed %NBS after:	85%		

14. Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study

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.globalskm.com

Christchurch City Council - Structural Engineering Service

Geotechnical Desk Study

SKM project number	ZB01276
SKM project site number	172 to 174 inclusive
Address	Scott Park Ferrymead, 2 Main Road
Report date	24 July 2012
Author	Ananth Balachandra
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 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
- Council files
- 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)**

These structures are located on Main Road, Mount Pleasant at grid reference 1576632 E, 5177258 N (NZTM).

5. Review of available information

5.1 Geological maps



- **Figure 2 – Regional geological map (Forsyth et al, 2008). Site marked in red.**



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

The site appears to be underlain by reclamation deposits comprising predominantly volcanic rip-rap and demolition rubble. Sand, silt and peat of drained lagoons and estuaries from the Christchurch formation is present immediately south and south west of the site. To the south east of the site is basalt overlain by a relatively thin layer of loess and colluvium. It is possible that a part of the site is underlain by deposits from the Christchurch formation as opposed to reclamation deposits.

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 Cubrinovsko and M Taylor of Canterbury University. The site is located near the edge of the drive through reconnaissance. However, moderate to severe liquefaction was noted in the area immediately west of the site.

5.3 Aerial photography

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

Severe liquefaction on site and in the surrounding areas could be seen from the aerial photograph. Although there appears to be no significant evidence of lateral spreading, due to scale of liquefaction on site it is expected that some lateral spreading towards the estuary is likely to have occurred.

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: N/A (Urban Non-residential) – properties directly opposite to the site are classified as TC2

5.5 Historical land use

Reference to historical documents (eg Appendix A) show no specific historical land use of the site. However, as geological maps show the site to be located on reclaimed land, it is likely the area was part of the estuary to the North.

5.6 Existing ground investigation data

- **Figure 6 – Local boreholes from Environment Canterbury GIS (http://arcims.ecan.govt.nz/ecanmapping/)**

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

It should be noted that the borehole appears to be located in the area inferred to be underlain by deposits from the Christchurch formation. No additional investigations located in the reclaimed land area (within 500m) were found in publicly available investigation information. As much of the site was inferred to be underlain by reclaimed land, it is expected that investigation located approximately 150m outside the area is likely to provide a very poor indication of the underlying soil on site.

5.7 Council property files

Council property files including building permits, consent documents and drawings for some of the structures on site were available. Relevant documents for this report included documents and drawings for the boat shed and storage shed structures.

It was assumed that the proposed drawing for the rescue boat shed refers to the double garage building PRK_1409_BLDG_008. The drawing shows the garage to be supported on shallow foundation consisting of strip footing measuring 200 mm wide and 300 mm deep beneath external walls and a concrete on grade floor slab.

No detailed drawing showing the foundation solutions for the storage shed at the north corner of the bowl lawns (PRK_1409_BLDG_007) and shed (PRK_1409_BLDG_009) were found in the available council files.

No other relevant ground information was found during the review of available council files.

5.8 Site walkover

A site walkover was conducted by an SKM engineer on 21 June 2012.

The site comprises three separate buildings (the double garage, shed and storage shed) located on the north corner of bowls lawn. The buildings were all masonry block buildings with sheet metal roof. The buildings on site appeared to be supported on concrete slab foundations. . However, detailed drawings for the double garage structure shows the foundation solution to consisting of partially embedded strip footing beneath the walls, which is connected to an on grade slab floor. Therefore, it is possible that the two shed structures on site are also supported on a similar foundation solution.

There was no significant structural damage noted on any of the buildings. The gap between the double garage and shed appeared slightly wider at the base of the building and narrowed with height; however, this is not believed to be as a result of earthquake damage.

Significant evidence of liquefaction was observed during the external site walkover. Piles of sand ejecta and undulating grass land were noted on the bowls lawn. Ground bulges were also evident on nearby petanque courts where silt or sand ejecta domes had been trapped beneath the asphalt. Some ejecta was also observed adjacent to the buildings. No visual evidence of lateral spreading or settlement was noted at the site; however, due to the scale of liquefaction on the site, it is likely that some settlement of the structure would have occurred.

- **Figure 7 Overview of the storage shed (PRK_1409_BLDG_007)**

- **Figure 8 Overview of the double garage (PRK_1409_BLDG_008) referred to as “rescue boat shed” in the council files drawing**

- **Figure 9 Overview of the shed (PRK_1409_BLDG_009)**

6. Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Site geology

An interpretation of the site geology is not provided in this report as no investigation data sufficient near the site and within reclaimed land deposits were available at the time of writing this report.

6.2 Seismic site subsoil class

The site has been assessed as NZS1170.5 Class D (deep or soft soil) or NZS1170.5 Class C (shallow soil) from surface geology. NZS1170.5 Class D should be used as the site subsoil class until further site specific investigations could be undertaken.

Even though significant amount of liquefaction was observed and no investigation on site is available to prove that the site is not underlain by NZS 1170.5 Class E soil (very soft soil), the general performance of the structures on site indicates that the site is unlikely to be Class E.

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 least preferred method has been used. Therefore, it is possible that site specific study could result in a revision to the recommended site subsoil class.

6.3 Building performance

The existing foundations appear to have performed reasonable well considering the level of liquefaction that occurred on site.

However, it is expected that a degree of settlement is likely to have occurred as a result of the severe liquefaction on site. It is, however, not clear whether the settlement was within the tolerable level for the structure. Therefore, it could not be said whether the current foundations would be adequate if an event similar in magnitude to the 22 February 2011 earthquake were to occur without a more detailed assessment of the settlement and examination of any structural damage that occurred as a consequence.

6.4 Ground performance and properties

Liquefaction risk for the site is high. There was no available investigation data to determine the material used to form the reclaimed land inferred to be present beneath the site. However, the significant evidence of liquefaction noted in the aerial photograph, reconnaissance performed by Canterbury University and the external site walkover undertaken by a SKM suggest that severe liquefaction occurred on site as a result of the 22 February earthquake event.

As composition of the reclaimed land is not known, an estimate of ground properties that could be used for a quantitative DEE could not be provided in this report.

6.5 Further investigations

If a quantitative DEE is to be undertaken for the structures on site, additional investigations are required to perform a more detailed liquefaction assessment and likely geotechnical damage and to estimate shallow ground properties. Additional investigations recommended are:

- Two boreholes to a minimum depth of 20m with SPT at intervals of 1.5 m. However, depending on the deposits used to form the reclaimed SPT may not be suitable and whether these tests are conducted would be left to the judgement of the supervising engineer. It is recommended that one borehole is undertaken near Main Road and other at the back of the site to ascertain the profile of reclaimed land
- CPTs are not expected to be suitable as boulders are likely to be present within reclaimed land deposits. Additionally, a gravel layer was inferred to be present approximately 10 to 11 m BGL within the Christchurch formation. Therefore, it is unlikely that a CPT will provide investigation details to the depth required

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/)

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ SKM

Appendix A – Christchurch 1856 land use



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

Key

- Previous creeks/rivers
- Existing creeks/rivers
- New creeks/rivers
- Swamp/Marshland

Appendix B – Existing ground investigation logs

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ SKM

Borelog for well M36/9035

Environment Canterbury Regional Council

Gridref: M36:86557-38743 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)
Ground Level Altitude : 2 +MSD
Well name : CCC BorelogID 2277
Drill Method : Not Recorded
Drill Depth : -13.97m Drill Date : 1/01/1965

Scale(m)	Water Level	Depth(m)	Full Drillers Description	Formation Code
			blue clay and sand and shells	
-5				
		-8.54m	blue sand and silt	
-10				
		- 11.3m	with some gravel	
		- 12.8m	sand and gravel and shells	
		- 13.9m	boulders	
		- 14.2m		

Appendix C – Geotechnical Investigation Summary

▪ Table 1 Summary of most relevant investigation data

ID		1
Type *		BH
Ref		M36/9035
Depth (m)		14.0
Distance from site (m)		140
Ground water level (mBGL)		N/A
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