



**Whakahoa Village Units Block C**  
BU 2680-003 EQ2  
**Detailed Engineering Evaluation**  
**Quantitative Report**  
Christchurch City Council



*Christchurch City Council*

# **Whakahoa Village Block C**

## **Detailed Engineering Evaluation Quantitative Report**

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

Telephone: +64 3 363 5400

Facsimile: +64 3 365 7858

Date: September 2012

Reference: 6-QUCCC.93

Status: Final

Whakahoa Village Block C  
BU 2680-003 EQ2

Detailed Engineering Evaluation  
Quantitative Report - SUMMARY  
Final

Gowerton Place, Richmond

### **Background**

This is a summary of the quantitative report for the Whakahoa Village Block C building, and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, visual inspections on 21 and 25 March 2012, available drawings and calculations.

### **Key Damage Observed**

There are numerous wall and ceiling cracks through the four Units of Block C. There were also obvious indications of ground movement around the building evidenced by fissuring and ejected silt associated with liquefaction. There has been separation of the block veneer below the entry block lintels.

### **Critical Structural Weaknesses**

No critical structural weaknesses were identified.

### **Indicative Building Strength**

When subject to the current new building standard (NBS) seismic design forces, the ceiling diaphragms in Units 52, 53 and 54 have an assessed capacity of 45 to 60% NBS due to the lack of a direct load path from the diaphragm edge to the bracing wall and reduced diaphragm stiffness.

The reinforced masonry walls have an assessed capacity greater than 100% NBS in both orthogonal directions.

Likewise, the timber walls have a capacity greater than 100% NBS in both orthogonal directions.

The building in its current damaged state has been assessed to have a post-earthquake seismic capacity in the range of 45 – 60% NBS and is therefore classed as a moderate earthquake risk building under the NZSEE classification system.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that:

- a) The hall ceiling areas in Units 52, 53 and 54, adjacent to the bathroom and bedrooms, should be investigated for timber framing damage.
- b) A structural assessment should be undertaken of the lounge and hall ceiling diaphragms for strengthening and provision of an adequate load path to masonry bracing walls.
- c) The building damage relating to cracking to wall or ceiling linings, and out-of-plumb windows and doors should be repaired.
- d) The entry lintels should be secured at the wall ends. A structural investigation should be undertaken to determine the adequacy of support to the entry block lintels.
- e) The carpets be removed and an investigation undertaken of the ground floor slab for cracking and undertake crack repairs where necessary.
- f) Six (6) Cone Penetrometer Tests to a depth of 25m be undertaken to enable a site wide liquefaction assessment.

- g) If the site is assessed to be equivalent to the DBH Technical Category 3, in accordance with the interim guidance, a foundation re-level is likely for the affected units at Whakahoa Village. CCC will need to accept that more damage to the existing concrete slab foundations is likely in future seismic events. Further investigations will be required if any releveling and subsequent structural design is required.



## Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Compliance .....	1
3	Earthquake Resistance Standards .....	4
4	Building Description.....	7
5	Survey.....	8
6	Damage Assessment.....	8
7	Detailed Seismic Assessment.....	9
8	Geotechnical Assessment .....	11
9	Remedial Options .....	13
10	Conclusions .....	13
11	Recommendations.....	13
12	Limitations.....	14
13	References .....	15

**Appendix 1 – Photographs**

**Appendix 2 – Geotechnical Report**

**Appendix 3 – CERA DEE Data Sheet**

## 1 Introduction

Opus International Consultants Limited has been engaged by Christchurch City Council (CCC) to undertake a detailed seismic assessment of the Whakahoa Village Block C, located at Gowerton Place, Richmond, following the M6.3 Christchurch earthquake on 22 February 2011.

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

The seismic assessment and reporting have been undertaken based on the quantitative procedures detailed in the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure (DEEP) document (draft) issued by the Structural Engineering Society (SESOC) on 19 July 2011.

## 2 Compliance

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

### 2.1 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)

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

#### **Section 38 – Works**

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

#### **Section 51 – Requiring Structural Survey**

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

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

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

1. The importance level and occupancy of the building.

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

Any building with a capacity of less than 34% of new building standard (including consideration of critical structural weaknesses) will need to be strengthened to a target of 67% as required by the CCC Earthquake Prone Building Policy.

## 2.2 Building Act

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

### Section 112 - Alterations

This section requires that an existing building complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code to at least the extent that it did prior to the alteration.

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

### Section 115 – Change of Use

This section requires that the territorial authority (in this case Christchurch City Council (CCC)) is satisfied that the building with a new use complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code 'as near as is reasonably practicable'.

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

### Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

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

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

## **Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings**

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

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

## **Section 124 – Powers of Territorial Authorities**

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

## **Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy**

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

### **2.3 Christchurch City Council Policy**

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

The 2010 amendment includes the following:

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

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

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

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

## 2.4 Building Code

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

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

- 36% increase in the basic seismic design load for Christchurch (Z factor increased from 0.22 to 0.3);
- Increased serviceability requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

## 3 Earthquake Resistance Standards

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

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

Description	Grade	Risk	%NBS	Existing Building Structural Performance	Improvement of 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 required under Act)	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

**Figure 1: NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE Guidelines**

Table 1 below compares the percentage NBS to the relative risk of the building failing in a seismic event with a 10% risk of exceedance in 50 years (i.e. 0.2% in the next year). It is noted that the current seismic risk in Christchurch results in a 6% risk of exceedance in the next year.

**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

### 3.1 Minimum and Recommended Standards

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

#### 3.1.1 Occupancy

- The Canterbury Earthquake Order<sup>1</sup> in Council 16 September 2010, modified the meaning of “dangerous building” to include buildings that were identified as being EPB’s. As a result of this, we would expect such a building would be issued with a Section 124 notice, by the Territorial Authority, or CERA acting on their behalf, once

<sup>1</sup> This Order only applies to buildings within the Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District Councils authority

they are made aware of our assessment. Based on information received from CERA to date, this notice is likely to prohibit occupancy of the building (or parts thereof) until its seismic capacity is improved to the point that it is no longer considered an EPB.

### **3.1.2 Cordoning**

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

### **3.1.3 Strengthening**

- Industry guidelines (NZSEE 2006 [2]) strongly recommend that every effort be made to achieve improvement to at least 67%NBS. A strengthening solution to anything less than 67%NBS would not provide an adequate reduction to the level of risk.
- It should be noted that full compliance with the current building code requires building strength of 100%NBS.

### **3.1.4 Our Ethical Obligation**

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

## 4 Building Description

### 4.1 General

The Whakahoa Village Block C building is a single storey reinforced masonry building with a pitched timber framed roof and fixed plasterboard ceiling. The building is founded on reinforced concrete strip footings. Block C contains four residential units, numbers 51-54.



**Figure 2 – Location of Block C on site**

The building comprises four residential apartments and is 15 metres wide in the east-west direction and 38.6 metres long in the north-south direction. The roof height is 2.45m to the ceiling from the ground slab.

The building construction was completed in 2007.

### 4.2 Gravity Load Resisting System

The ground floor construction is a 100mm thick in-situ concrete ground bearing slab.

The roof is a timber framed roof clad in lightweight profiled metal roof sheeting, with a plasterboard ceiling, supported on reinforced concrete masonry or timber framed walls.

### 4.3 Seismic Load Resisting System

Seismic loads in both principal directions are resisted primarily by the reinforced concrete masonry walls, though a number of plasterboard lined walls also provide bracing in both the east-west and the north-south directions. The timber and plasterboard ceiling provides a diaphragm system to distribute the lateral loads to the walls.



## 5 Survey

The building currently has a green placard indicating that the units were not severely damaged.

Copies of the following drawings were referred to as part of the assessment:

- Structural drawings by Powell Fenwick Consultants Limited titled “Gowerton Place Social Housing” (drawing numbers S1.1 – S1.7)
- Architectural drawings by City Solutions titles “Gowerton Place Social Housing” (drawing numbers WD01-01 – WD07-06)

No copies of the design calculations have been obtained for this building.

The drawings have been used to ascertain the structural systems, investigate potential critical structural weaknesses (CSW) wherever possible and identify details which required particular attention.

## 6 Damage Assessment

The majority of the building has performed well under seismic conditions, with localised lining damage due to excessive movements of the building from either liquefaction and/or earthquake loading.

Generally damage has occurred in all units due to differential foundation settlement caused by liquefaction, and racking from seismic loads. This has resulted in cracks in timber wall and ceiling linings, cracks in the concrete floor slabs-on-ground (visible only in the garage), and separation of external block veneer.

There has been significant ceiling damage in Unit 54 in the small central hall area adjacent to the bathroom and bedrooms – refer photo 4 in Appendix 1. The damage is most likely caused by a combination of differential settlement from liquefaction, and seismic loading. This area creates a pinch-point in the ceiling diaphragm between the patio and the garage, which has dragon tie bracing only (no ceiling), exacerbated by a ceiling hatch opening adjacent to the garage. Similar damage has occurred in Units 52 and 53 with the same configuration, but to a much lesser degree. These ceiling areas should be further investigated for timber framing damage.

There are no noticeable permanent out-of-plumb walls or out-of-level floors, except for cases of racked window frames showing gaps between the window frames and walls, and racked door frames. The entry block lintels appear to be supported on the block veneer, and this veneer has separated below the lintel – refer photos 1 and 2 in Appendix 1.

Differential settlements of the floor were not noticeable, and a level survey was not undertaken to verify the degree the floors could be out-of-level.

External to the building, obvious indications of ground movement exist such as fissuring, pavement slab settlement and opening joints, and ejected silt associated with liquefaction. For the geotechnical assessment and recommendations of the site refer to the Geotechnical Desk Study prepared by Opus in Appendix 2.

## 7 Detailed Seismic Assessment

### 7.1 Critical Structural Weaknesses

As outlined in the Critical Structural Weakness and Collapse Hazards draft briefing document, issued by the Structural Engineering Society (SESOC) on 7 May 2011, the term 'Critical Structural Weakness' (CSW) refers to a component of a building that could contribute to increased levels of damage or cause premature collapse of the building.

No critical structural weaknesses have been identified.

### 7.2 Seismic Coefficient Parameters

The seismic design parameters based on current design requirements from NZS1170.5:2004 and the NZBC clause B1 for this building are:

- Site soil class D, clause 3.1.3 NZS 1170.5:2004;
- Site hazard factor,  $Z=0.3$ , B1/VM1 clause 2.2.14B;
- Return period factor  $R_u = 1.0$  from Table 3.5, NZS 1170.5:2004, for an Importance Level 2 structure with a 50 year design life;
- $\mu_{max} = 1.25$  and  $S_p = 0.9$  (nominally ductile) for the reinforced concrete masonry walls

### 7.3 Detailed Seismic Assessment Results

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

**Table 2: Summary of Seismic Performance**

Structural Element/System	Failure mode and description of limiting criteria	% NBS based on calculated capacity
Masonry walls in the east-west direction i.e. across the building	In-plane bending and shear capacity of the reinforced concrete masonry bracing walls	>100%
Masonry walls in the north-south direction i.e. along the building	In-plane bending and shear capacity of the reinforced concrete masonry bracing walls	>100%
Timber framed walls in the east-west direction i.e. across the building	In-plane bracing capacity of the timber and Gib lined bracing walls	>100%
Timber framed walls in the north-south direction i.e. along the building	In-plane bracing capacity of the timber and Gib lined bracing walls	>100%

Structural Element/System	Failure mode and description of limiting criteria	% NBS based on calculated capacity
Ceiling diaphragm to hall area adjacent bathroom and bedrooms of Units 52, 53 and 54	Flexural capacity of Gib ceiling diaphragm and shear transfer capacity	45 to 60%

## 7.4 Discussion of Results

The building has a calculated seismic capacity of 45 to 60% NBS. This capacity is based upon an assumption of load distribution by plasterboard ceiling diaphragms to reinforced concrete masonry walls and plasterboard lined timber walls. The structural assessment would indicate that seismic damage to the wall and ceiling linings is likely to be the result of a combination of liquefaction and seismic loading.

Although not specifically detailed in the plans, the plasterboard ceilings generally could be expected to act satisfactorily as diaphragms due to the relatively small spans. However, there is an apparent weakness in the hall areas in Units 52, 53 and 54 adjacent to the bathroom and bedrooms, where there is a much reduced diaphragm depth between the patio and the garage, exacerbated by a ceiling hatch opening. There is also no apparent direct load path of this diaphragm, and the lounge diaphragm, through to the garage masonry bracing wall.

These areas need to be checked for timber framing damage and a structural assessment undertaken for strengthening of the diaphragm and provision of adequate diaphragm load paths, if required.

## 7.5 Limitations and Assumptions in Results

This report is based on an assessment of the building in its undamaged state.

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

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

## 8 Geotechnical Assessment

The full geotechnical assessment completed by Opus is included in this report as Appendix 2. A summary of the geotechnical report is as follows:

### 8.1 General

The Whakahoa Village Residential Housing Units are situated approximately 2km north-east of Christchurch City in the suburb of Richmond. It is a relatively flat site, approximately 220m north-west of the Avon River.

The purpose of the geotechnical study is to assess the current ground conditions, the potential geotechnical hazards that may be present at the site, and determine whether further subsurface geotechnical investigations are necessary.

This Geotechnical Desk Study has been prepared in accordance with the Engineering Advisory Group's Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Revision 5, 19 July 2011. This Geotechnical Desk Study forms parts of a Detailed Engineering Evaluation prepared by Opus, and has been undertaken without the benefit of any site specific investigations and is therefore preliminary in nature.

### 8.2 Expected Ground Conditions

A review of the Environmental Canterbury (ECan) Wells database showed three wells located within approximately 100m of the property boundary. Material logs available from these wells in addition to EQC CPT tests have been used to infer the ground conditions at the site, as shown in the table below.

Stratigraphy	Thickness (m)	Depth Encountered from (m) below ground
TOPSOIL	0.2-0.5	0
SAND (not present in M35/16568)	0-0.75	0.2-0.5
SILT	1.2-1.5	0.5-1.0
SAND	20.3-21.0	1.8-2.5
Clayey SILT	1.5	22.8
GRAVELS (Riccarton)	-	24.3

The groundwater level was recorded as 1.2m-2.5m bgl in the borehole records.

### 8.3 Liquefaction Hazard

Examination of post-earthquake aerial photos taken by New Zealand Aerial Mapping (refer Project Orbit) identified evidence of significant quantities of liquefied soils ejected at the ground surface of the site after the 22 February 2011 and 13 June 2011 events but not after the 4 September 2010 or 23 December 2011 events.

A preliminary CLiq analysis has been performed using the CPT-RCH-37 and CPT-RCH-50 data sets located 100m south east and 170m west of the site, respectively. A summary of the results of the analysis are presented in the table below.

CPT	Distance from site boundary (m)	Direction	Event	Inferred Liquefiable Layers (bgl)	Total Liquefaction Induced Subsidence (mm)
CPT-RCH-37	100	South East	ULS (0.35g)	-Ground Water Level to 4m -Thin lenses at 7m and 11m	60
CPT-RCH-50	170	West	ULS (0.35g)	-Ground Water level to 7m -8.5m to 13.5m	190

#### 8.4 Site Walkover Inspection

A walkover inspection of the exterior of the buildings of Blocks A to E and surrounding land was carried out by an Opus Geotechnical Engineer on 14 May 2012. The following observations were made:

- Significant heave in the pavement up to 300mm is evident around the Whakahoa Village buildings.
- Liquefaction ejected soil is located in several gardens around the Whakahoa Village complex.
- A door frame in unit 54 (Block C) appears to be skewed by 10mm, likely due to differential settlement of foundations.
- The concrete driveways of unit 43 (west end of Block A) and unit 54 (south end of Block C) have cracked and have been offset vertically by up to 20mm (relative to the driveway) and laterally by 10mm directly outside of the garage doors.
- Cracking and settlement has occurred at several locations in the paved footpath in-between Blocks A, B and C.

#### 8.5 Discussion

Due to the reinforced masonry block construction of the units, the structural form is not directly recognised in the DBH guidance document. Therefore, appropriate remedial solutions will be dependent on the integrity of the superstructure and liaison with the Structural Engineer.

No evidence of cracking in the floor slabs and perimeter footing were observed. Areas able to be inspected were limited due to the carpeted flooring and shrubbery.

The CLiq analysis based on the CPTs 170m west and 100m south east of the building indicated that there is possible total settlement of up to 190mm during an Ultimate Limit State seismic event. Liquefiable layers have been identified from the ground water level up to 13.0m bgl. The CPT results correlate with the observed differential settlement observed on site.

If the existing units are to be retained, a building consent may be necessary for any required remedial works. Site specific investigations comprising of approximately 6 Cone Penetrometer Tests (CPT's) to a depth of 20m are recommended to be undertaken to enable a site wide liquefaction assessment and combined with shallow investigations to identify potential revelling/remedial solutions.

## 9 Remedial Options

Investigations are required to assess if any remedial work is required to the wall supports to the entry block lintels. Repairs are required throughout four units to internal wall and ceiling linings.

The hall ceiling areas adjacent to the bathroom and bedrooms in Units 52, 53 and 54 should be investigated for strengthening, provision of diaphragm load path to bracing walls, and possible framing repairs.

The floor slabs should be fully investigated for cracking and repaired where necessary.

## 10 Conclusions

- (a) The building in its post-earthquake state has a seismic capacity of between 45 and 60% NBS and is therefore classed as a moderate earthquake risk building under the NZSEE classification system.
- (b) Further structural investigations are required to the entry lintel and the timber framing to the damaged internal ceilings, if the building is to be strengthened.
- (c) Remedial repair works to cracked wall and ceiling linings and slabs are required.
- (d) Further geotechnical investigations are required to assess liquefaction potential and ground bearing across the entire site.

## 11 Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- (a) The hall ceiling areas in Units 52, 53 and 54, adjacent the bathroom and bedrooms, should be investigated for timber framing damage.
- (b) A structural assessment should be undertaken of the lounge and hall ceiling diaphragms for strengthening and provision of an adequate load path to masonry bracing walls.

- (c) The building damage relating to cracking of wall or ceiling linings, and out-of-plumb windows and doors should be repaired.
- (d) The entry lintels should be secured at the wall ends. A structural investigation should be undertaken to determine the adequacy of support to the entry block lintels and remedial work undertaken if necessary.
- (e) The carpets should be removed and an investigation undertaken of the ground floor slab for cracking and undertake crack repairs where necessary.

The following three geotechnical recommendations were also made in the report for Block A and are repeated herein. They are not additional to the recommendations in the Block A report.

- (f) Two hand auger/scalas should be undertaken surrounding the west side of Block A to assess the bearing capacity of the underlying material.
- (g) Six (6) Cone Penetrometer Tests to a depth of 25m be undertaken to enable a site wide liquefaction assessment.
- (h) If the site is assessed to be equivalent to the DBH Technical Category 3, in accordance with the interim guidance, a foundation re-level is likely for the affected units at Whakahoa Village. CCC will need to accept that more damage to the existing concrete slab foundations is likely in future seismic events. Further investigations will be required for detailed design.

## **12 Limitations**

- (a) This report is based on an inspection of the structure with a focus on the damage sustained from the 22 February 2011 Canterbury Earthquake and aftershocks only. Some non-structural damage is mentioned but this is not intended to be a comprehensive list of non-structural items.
- (b) Our professional services are performed using a degree of care and skill normally exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable consultants practicing in this field at the time.
- (c) This report is prepared for the CCC to assist with assessing remedial works required for council buildings and facilities. It is not intended for any other party or purpose.
- (d) The geotechnical assessment has been prepared solely for the benefit of CCC as our client with respect to the particular brief given to us. Data or opinions in this report may not be used in other contexts by any other party or for any other purpose.
- (e) It is recognised that the passage of time affects the information and assessment provided in this document. Opus's opinions are based upon information that existed at the time of the production of this report. It is understood that the Services provided allowed Opus to form no more than an opinion on the actual conditions of the site at the

time the site was visited and cannot be used to assess the effect of any subsequent changes in the quality of the site, or its surroundings or any laws or regulations.

### 13 References

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



## **Appendix 1 – Photographs**



Photo 1 – Block veneer supporting block lintel and veneer separation at entry



Photo 2 – Block lintel on veneer / separation of veneer at entry



Photo 3 – Crack in ceiling lining



Photo 4 –Cracking to ceiling and wall linings





Photo 5 - Separation of wall framing and window frame



Photo 6 – Crack in wall lining at door opening



Photo 7 – Crack in wall lining at door openings





Photo 8 – Crack in garage floor



Photo 9 – Differential settlement or heave in patio slab

## **Appendix 2 – Geotechnical Report**



21 June 2012

Michael Sheffield  
Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 2522  
Addington  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140



6-QUCCC.93

Dear Michael

## **Whakahoa Village - Geotechnical Desk Study**

### **1. Introduction**

The Christchurch City Council (CCC) has requested Opus International Consultants (Opus) provide a geotechnical desktop study and walkover inspection of the Whakahoa Village (Gowerton Place) Residential Housing Units following the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence initiated by the 4 September 2010 earthquake.

The purpose of the geotechnical study is to assess the current ground conditions, the potential geotechnical hazards that may be present at the site, and determine whether further subsurface geotechnical investigations are necessary.

This Geotechnical Desk Study has been prepared in accordance with the Engineering Advisory Group's Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Revision 5, 19 July 2011.

This Geotechnical Desk Study forms parts of a Detailed Engineering Evaluation prepared by Opus, and has been undertaken without the benefit of any site specific investigations and is therefore preliminary in nature.

### **2. Desktop Study**

#### ***2.1 Site Description***

The Whakahoa Village Residential Housing Units are situated approximately 2km north-east of Christchurch City in the suburb of Richmond. It is a relatively flat site, approximately 220m north-west of the Avon River.

The housing development was constructed in 2007 and comprises 10 units of a single storey configuration and 8 units in a two storey configuration. The units are predominantly constructed of reinforced concrete masonry blocks with timber veneer being used in some areas.

#### ***2.2 Available Building Drawings***

Design drawings prepared by Powell Fenwick for Whakahoa Village were sourced from the CCC property file (refer to extract contained in Appendix C).

The drawings indicate the buildings foundations are reinforced concrete perimeter strip footings founded 525mm to 725mm below the finished floor slab level, with a 100mm thick reinforced concrete floor slab laid on compacted tailings or hard fill.

### **2.3 Regional Geology**

The published geological map of the area, (Geology of the Christchurch Urban Area 1:25,000, Brown and Weeber, Map 1, 1992) indicates the site is at the boundary between two surficial geological units; that being sand of fixed and semi-fixed dunes and beaches belonging to the Christchurch Formation and alluvial gravel sand and silt overbank deposits belonging to the Yaldhurst member of the Springston Formation.

A groundwater table depth of approximately 1m has been shown on the published map by Brown and Weeber (1992).

### **2.4 Earthquake Commission Subsurface Investigations**

Three Cone Penetrometer Tests (CPT's) have been completed within 170m of the site on behalf of the Earthquake Commission (EQC). The CPT's indicate the soils comprise silty SAND/sandy SILT layers to 1.6m depth, underlain by clayey SILT to 1.9m, before transitioning into clean and/or silty SAND to the end of the test holes at approximately 12m depth (Refer Appendix D). Note that CPT-RCH-38 refused on a possible shallow dense sand, gravel layer or obstruction at approximately 4.0m below ground level (bgl), which was not encountered in the remaining CPT's

In addition to the CPT's, two boreholes were completed on behalf of the Earthquake Commission within approximately 280m from the site. Due to their location and distance from the site, these EQC boreholes have not been used to infer the underlying geology.

### **2.5 Expected Ground Conditions**

A review of the Environmental Canterbury (ECan) Wells database showed three wells located within approximately 100m of the property boundary (refer to Appendix D). Material logs available from these wells in addition to the EQC CPT tests have been used to infer the ground conditions at the site, as shown in table 1 below.

**Table 1: Inferred Ground Conditions**

<b>Stratigraphy</b>	<b>Thickness (m)</b>	<b>Depth Encountered from (m) below ground</b>
TOPSOIL	0.2-0.5	0
SAND (not present in M35/16568)	0-0.75	0.2-0.5
SILT	1.2-1.5	0.5-1.0
SAND	20.3-21.0	1.8-2.5
clayey SILT	1.5	22.8
GRAVELS (Riccarton)	-	24.3

The groundwater level was recorded as 1.2m-2.5m bgl in the borehole records.

### **2.6 Liquefaction Hazard**

The 2004 Environment Canterbury Solid Facts Liquefaction Study indicates the site is in an area designated as having 'moderate liquefaction ground damage potential'. According to this study, based on a low groundwater table, ground damage from liquefaction is expected to be moderate and may be affected by 100mm to 300mm of ground subsidence.

Examination of post-earthquake aerial photos taken by New Zealand Aerial Mapping (refer Project Orbit) identified evidence of significant quantities of liquefied soils ejected at the ground surface of the site after the 22 February 2011 and 13 June 2011 events but not after the 4 September 2010 or 23 December 2011 events.

The Tonkin and Taylor Reconnaissance indicated evidence of liquefaction was observed at the site after the 22 February 2011 and 13 June 2011 events.

Following the recent strong earthquakes in Canterbury, the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA, 2012) has zoned land in the greater Christchurch area according to its ground performance in future large earthquakes.

The residential properties from Vogel Street to the Avon River, 120m south east of the Whakahoa Village complex, are zoned “Red” which is evaluated as not being practical to rebuild, repair or reoccupy. Refer to the Land Recovery Zone Map in Appendix B.

The Department of Building and Housing has sub-divided the CERA “Green” residential land on the flat in Christchurch into technical categories. The three technical categories are summarised in Table 2 which has been adapted from the Department of Building and Housing guidance document (DBH, 2011).

**Table 2: Technical Categories based on Expected Land Performance**

<b>Foundation Technical Category</b>	<b>Future land performance expected from liquefaction</b>	<b>Expected SLS land settlement</b>	<b>Expected ULS land settlement</b>
TC 1	Negligible land deformations expected in a future small to medium sized earthquake and up to minor land deformations in a future to large earthquake.	0-15mm	0-25mm
TC 2	Minor land deformations possible in a future small to medium sized earthquake and up to moderate land deformations in a future moderate to large earthquake.	0-50mm	0-100mm
TC 3	Moderate land deformations possible in a future small to medium sized earthquake and significant land deformations in future moderate to large earthquake.	>50mm	>100mm

Whakahoa Village has been zoned as N/A-Urban Non-residential, as it is council owned land. The neighbouring residential properties have been zoned as Green-TC3 “blue zone”, which is determined to have a moderate to significant risk of land damage due to liquefaction in future significant earthquakes.

A preliminary CLiq analysis has been performed using the CPT-RCH-37 and CPT-RCH-50 data sets located 100m south east and 170m west of the site, respectively. A summary of the results of the analysis are presented in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Results from a brief CLiq analysis**

CPT	Distance from site boundary (m)	Direction	Event	Inferred Liquefiable Layers (bgl)	Total Liquefaction Induced Subsidence (mm)
CPT-RCH-37	100	South East	ULS (0.35g)	-Ground Water Level to 4m -Thin lenses at 7m and 11m	60
CPT-RCH-50	170	West	ULS (0.35g)	-Ground Water level to 7m -8.5m to 13.5m	190

### 3. Site Walkover Inspection

A walkover inspection of the exterior of the buildings of Block A to E and surrounding land was carried out by an Opus Geotechnical Engineer on 14 May 2012. The following observations were made (refer to the Site Walkover Plan and Site Photographs attached to this report):

- Significant heave in the pavement up to 300mm is evident around the Whakahoa Village buildings (Figures 5, 6 and 10).
- Liquefaction ejected soil is located in several gardens around the Whakahoa Village complex (Figure 8).
- A door frame in unit 54 (Block C) appears to be skewed by 10mm, likely due to differential settlement of foundations (Figure 7).
- The concrete driveways of unit 43 (west end of Block A) and unit 54 (south end of Block C) have cracked and have been offset vertically by up to 20mm (relative to the driveway) and laterally by 10mm directly outside of the garage doors (Figure 3).
- Cracking and settlement has occurred at several locations in the paved footpath in-between Blocks A, B and C (Figure 11).
- Gaps of up to 50mm wide have formed on the north and south sides of Block A (Figures 4, 11 and 12).
- The footpath along the east side of Block B has settled by approximately 20mm (Figure 9).
- The units located on the west side of the stairs in Block A appear to have differentially settled compared to the units on the east side (Figure 14).
- No evidence of differential settlement or cracking was observed around Blocks D and E.

## 4. Level Survey

A summary of the level survey undertaken by Opus Surveyors on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2012 are given in Table 4. Refer to Level Survey results in Appendix F.

**Table 4: Results from the Level Survey**

Block	Unit	Differential Settlement <sup>1,2</sup>
A	40,41	50mm (centre)
A	42,43	120mm (west)

*Notes: (1) Floor slab levels rounded to the nearest 10mm  
(2) Direction of fall indicated in brackets*

## 5. Discussion

As a result of the 4<sup>th</sup> September 2010 Canterbury Earthquake and the following aftershocks; cracking, heaving and settlement has occurred in Whakahoa Village.

Liquefaction has occurred in the Whakahoa Village complex and the wider vicinity in both the February 2011 and June 2011 earthquakes. This is evident due to the large amounts of ground heave in paved areas, liquefaction induced settlement, and liquefaction observed from aerial photographs.

The apparent settlement of the footpath along the east side of Block B appears to be due to liquefaction subsidence of the underlying soils. Up to 300mm of ground heave has occurred around the village, which is inferred to result from ejected soils accumulating under an impermeable surface, such as asphalt.

Due to the ground motion during the seismic events, the lateral movement that Block A has undergone may have caused the soils to consolidate resulting in the gaps observed on both the north and south sides of Block A.

It is unknown whether up to 10mm of vertical skew of the door in Unit 54 (Block C) is attributed to settlement or structural damage due to the shaking. A level survey is recommended of Block C to determine whether differential settlement has occurred.

A level survey has been undertaken on the ground floor and first floor of Block A, as it had sustained the majority of the damage. The results have been assessed by separating Block A into two areas divided by the staircase in the centre of the building. The results from the eastern units (40 and 41) showed differential settlement to up to 50mm, with a low point in the centre of Unit 40. Whereas, the units on the western side (42 and 43) showed differential settlement of up to 120mm, with the direction of fall towards the west.

The buildings at the site are two storey reinforced concrete masonry block. The Department of Building and Housing New Zealand guidance documents for repairing and rebuilding foundations in Technical Category 3 (DBH, 2012) is likely to be applicable for the buildings at this site. The guidance indicates that for concrete floor slab on grade (type C2) which is out of level between 50mm to 150mm, with cracks in the floor slab less than 3mm width; a foundation re-level is required.

Due to the reinforced masonry block construction of the units, the structural form is not directly recognised in the DBH guidance document. Therefore, appropriate remedial

solutions will be dependent on the integrity of the super structure and liaison with the Structural Engineer.

No evidence of cracking in the floor slabs and perimeter footing were observed. Areas able to be inspected were limited due to the carpeted flooring and shrubbery.

The level survey results are consistent with the observations of differential settlement of the western units of Block A. Observations include pavement cracking of the driveway outside the western most unit (unit 43) separating from the stair well.

There is an open swale 10m east of Block A and B retained by a timber pole retaining wall. The depth of the swale invert relative to Whakahoa Village is approximately 1.5m. This open face represents a potential hazard for lateral spreading. The Avon River is located 150m south east of the Whakahoa Village. There has been no evidence of cracking on the site associated with lateral spreading.

The CLiq analysis based on the CPTs 170m west and 100m south east of the building indicated that there is possible total settlement of up to 190mm during an Ultimate Limit State seismic event. Liquefiable layers have been identified from the ground water level up to 13.0m bgl. The CPT results correlate with the observed differential settlement observed on site.

The peak ground accelerations (PGA) applied for the Ultimate Limit State (ULS) and Serviceability Limit State (SLS) seismic events at the site are based upon extensive probabilistic modelling by GNS Science and observations of land and building damage caused during the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence. The values used are recommended in Appendix C of the Department of Building and Housing guidance document (DBH, April 2012). The PGA are based on a Class D soil type (deep or soft soils), importance level 2 (IL2), and a design life of 50 years for the structure.

GNS Science indicates an elevated risk of seismic activity is expected in the Canterbury region as a result of the earthquake sequence following the 4 September 2010 earthquake. Recent advice (Geonet) indicates there is currently a 14% probability of another Magnitude 6 or greater earthquake occurring in the next 12 months in the Canterbury region. Ground damage similar to what has been observed is anticipated in such an event, dependent on the location of the epicentre. It is expected that the probability of occurrence is likely to decrease with time, following periods of reduced seismic activity.

The differential settlement that appears to have occurred to Block A relative to the footpath may be attributed to a temporary loss of bearing capacity during the seismic shaking. Shallow investigations including Hand Augers and Scalas should be undertaken to confirm the bearing capacity of the underlying material.

If the existing units are to be retained, a building consent will be necessary for remedial works. Remedial works will include re-levelling of Block A Site specific investigations comprising of approximately 6 Cone Penetrometer Tests (CPT's) to a depth of 20m are recommended to be undertaken to enable a site wide liquefaction assessment (refer to Appendix G) and combined with shallow investigations to identify potential releveling/remedial solutions.



## 6. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- A level survey should be undertaken in Block C to confirm whether differential settlement has occurred.
- Two hand auger/scalas are undertaken surrounding the west side of Block A to assess the bearing capacity of the underlying material.
- Six (6) Cone Penetrometer Tests to a depth of 25m be undertaken to enable a site wide liquefaction assessment.
- If the site is assessed to be equivalent to the DBH Technical Category 3, in accordance with the interim guidance, a foundation re-level is likely for the affected units at Whakahoa Village. CCC will need to accept that more damage to the existing concrete slab foundations is likely in future seismic events. Further investigations will be required for detailed design.

## 7. Limitation

This report has been prepared solely for the benefit of Christchurch City Council as our client with respect to the particular brief given to us. Data or opinions in this desk study may not be used in other contexts, by any other party or for any other purpose.

It is recognised that the passage of time affects the information and assessment provided in this document. Opus's opinions are based upon information that existed at the time of the production of this Desk Study. It is understood that the Services provided allowed Opus to form no more than an opinion on the actual conditions of the site at the time the site was visited and cannot be used to assess the effect of any subsequent changes in the quality of the site, or its surroundings or any laws or regulations.

## 8. Reference

Brown, LJ; Webber, JH 1992: Geology of the Christchurch Urban Area. Scale 1:25,000. Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences geological map, 1 sheet + 104p.

Environment Canterbury, Canterbury Regional Council (ECan) website:

ECan Well Card

<http://ecan.govt.nz/services/online-services/tools-calculators/Pages/well-card.aspx>

ECan 2004: The Solid Facts on Christchurch Liquefaction. Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch, 1 sheet.

Project Orbit, 2011: Interagency/organisation collaboration portal for Christchurch recovery effort. <https://canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com/SitePages/Home.aspx>

GNS Science reporting on Geonet Website: <http://www.geonet.org.nz/canterbury-quakes/aftershocks/> updated on 28 May 2012.

'Interim recommendations for PGA values for geotechnical design in Canterbury':  
Department of Building and Housing New Zealand (2012) *Appendix C: Interim guidance for repairing and rebuilding foundations in Technical Category 3.*

Appendices:

Appendix A: Site Photographs

Appendix B: Land Recovery Zones, Site Location and Walkover Plans

Appendix C: Available Structural Drawings

Appendix D: Earthquake Commission Subsurface Investigations

Appendix E: Environment Canterbury Borehole Logs

Appendix F: Level Survey

Appendix G: Site Investigation Location Plan



**Appendix A:  
Site Photographs**



Figure 1: South elevation of Block A.



Figure 2: East elevation of Block B, C and D.



**Figure 3: Up to 10mm lateral and 20mm of vertical movement.**



**Figure 4: Up to 30mm of lateral movement.**






**Figure 5: Up to 200mm of heave in pavement south west of Block A.**



**Figure 6: Up to 300mm of heave in the pavement along the western boundary.**



**Figure 7: The bedroom door has skewed by up to 10mm.**



**Figure 8: Liquefaction ejected material is evident in gardens around the site.**





**Figure 9: Approximately 20mm of vertical settlement in footpath outside Block B.**



**Figure 10: Heave in the pavement along the western boundary.**





Figure 11: A gap up to 50mm is evident between the asphalt and concrete patio north of Block A.



Figure 12: A gap up to 50mm is evident between a garden and concrete patio north of Block A.







Figure 13: Liquefaction induced settlement of the park benches east of the site.



Figure 14: Separation between west side of Block A and the stair well.



**Appendix B:  
Land Recovery Zones, Site Location and Walkover plans**



SOURCE: canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com (Accessed on 5/06/12)



Opus International Consultants Ltd  
 Christchurch Office  
 20 Moorhouse Ave  
 PO Box 1482  
 Christchurch, New Zealand  
 Tel: +64 3 363 5400 Fax: +64 3 365 7857

**Project:** Whakahoa Village  
 Geotechnical Desktop Study

**Project No.:** 6-QUCCC.93

**Client:** Christchurch City Council

**Land Recovery Zones**

**Drawn:** Opus Geotechnical Engineer

**Date:** 5/06/2012





0 100m  
Approximate Scale: 1:1850 (A3)

Key:

- EQC CPT
- EQC Borehole
- Ecan Borehole

BH	ECan Ref
1	M35/16806
2	M35/16805
3	M35/16568
4	M35/1893

BH/CPT	EQC Ref
5	CPT-RCH-37
6	CPT-RCH-38
7	BH-RCH-09
8	BH-AVS-01
9	CPT-RCH-50

SOURCE: 1) canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com (Accessed on 19/04/12)  
2) http://arcims.ecan.govt.nz/ecanmapping/ (Accessed on 19/04/12)



Opus International Consultants Ltd  
Christchurch Office  
20 Moorhouse Ave  
PO Box 1482  
Christchurch, New Zealand  
Tel: +64 3 363 5400 Fax: +64 3 365 7857


**Project:** Whakahoa Village  
Geotechnical Desktop Study  
**Project No:** 6-QUCCC.93  
**Client:** Christchurch City Council

## Site Location Plan

**Drawn:** Opus Geotechnical Engineer

**Date:** 27/04/2012





Observed Ground Heave  
 Swale



 Opus International Consultants Ltd  
 Christchurch Office  
 20 Moorhouse Ave  
 PO Box 1482  
 Christchurch, New Zealand  
 Tel: +64 3 363 5400 Fax: +64 3 365 7857

**Project:** Whakahoa Village  
 Geotechnical Desktop Study  
**Project No:** 6-QUCCC.93  
**Client:** Christchurch City Council


### Site Walkover Plan

**Drawn:** Opus Geotechnical Engineer  
**Date:** 14/05/2012


**Appendix C:  
Available Structural Drawings**



FOUNDATION PLAN - GROUP A  
1:100



1 1:100  
2 1:100  
3 1:100  
4 1:100  
5 1:100  
6 1:100



7 1:100  
8 1:100  
9 1:100

ISSUE	DATE	AMENDMENT	CHECKED
1	28.06.06	Consent Issue	
2	15.09.06	Tender Issue	
4	01.12.06	Construction Issue	

DESIGNED	CHK	06/06
DRAWN	BLS	06/06
CHECKED	JLK	06/06

SET	JOB NO.	SHEET NO.	ISSUE
	051363	S1.2	A

THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT ©  
DATE PRINTED:

**POWELL FENWICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED**  
Your local engineering partner.

1183, Avondale Park  
100 Railway Ave, Christchurch  
1000, Christchurch  
Tel: 03 378 0000  
Fax: 03 378 0001  
www.powell-fenwick.co.nz

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY SOLUTIONS**













**GOWERTON PLACE SOCIAL HOUSING**  
35 Warwick Street, Christchurch

FOUNDATION PLAN & DETAILS  
GROUP A



CONTRACTOR MUST VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS ON SITE

SCALE: 1:100






NOTE: The ground level is shown as a line of 1200 above the floor of this corner of Unit B. The contractor is required to match perimeter ground level.



FOUNDATION PLAN - GROUP B  
1/100



FOUNDATION PLAN - GROUP C  
1/100

ISSUE	DATE	AMENDMENT	CHECKED
1	28.06.06	Consent Issue	
2	15.09.06	Tender Issue	
4	01.12.06	Construction Issue	



Your quality engineering partner.



**GOWERTON PLACE SOCIAL HOUSING**  
35 Warwick Street, Christchurch


**FOUNDATION PLAN & DETAILS**  
GROUP B & C

CONTRACTOR MUST VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS ON SITE



DESIGNED	J-K	06/06
DRAWN	BLS	06/06
CHECKED		

SET	JOB NO.	SHEET NO.	ISSUE
	051363	S1.3	A

THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT ©  
DATE PRINTED:



FOUNDATION PLAN - GROUPS D & E  
1/100



NOTE 1: The ground level shown above is a maximum of 1400mm below FFL at the end of Unit D. Reinforcement is required to match perimeter ground level.

Tolerances or controlled

4	01.12.06	Construction Issue	CHECKED
2	15.09.06	Tender Issue	
1	28.06.06	Consent Issue	
ISSUE	DATE	AMENDMENT	

**POWELL FENWICK CONSULTANTS LIMITED**  
 Your daily engineering partner.

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**GOWERTON PLACE SOCIAL HOUSING**  
 35 Warwick Street, Christchurch

FOUNDATION PLANS  
 GROUPS D & E

DESIGNED	JK	06/06
DRAWN	BLS	06/06
CHECKED		

CONTRACTOR MUST VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS ON SITE

SCALES:  
 1/100, 1/20

SET	JOB NO.	SHEET NO.	ISSUE
	051363	S1.4	A

THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT ©

DATE PRINTED:



**Appendix D:  
Earthquake Commissions Subsurface Investigations**



# TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: RCH 09

Hole Location: On reserve  
opposite 33 Pavit St

SHEET 1 OF 4

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH 2011 EARTHQUAKE LOCATION: RICHMOND JOB No: 52000.3200

CO-ORDINATES 5742886.62 mN 2482155.38 mE DRILL TYPE: Direct Push HOLE STARTED: 23/9/11  
 R.L. 4.46 m DRILL METHOD: Sonic Vibration HOLE FINISHED: 24/9/11  
 DATUM NZMG DRILL FLUID: N/A LOGGED BY: TH 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)					
HAND DIG FILL. (Pothole for services check and backfilled.)										FILL: Borehole drilled through pre-dug and backfilled pothole.									
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)										Silty, fine SAND with trace rootlets, grey mottled orange brown. Medium dense, moist.									
		0	PRE-DUG			4.0	0.5											0.5	
		100	SONIC VIBR.			3.5	1.0		SP	M	MD							1.0	
			SPT			3.0	1.5											1.5	
		100	SONIC VIBRATION			2.5	2.0		ML	M	St							2.0	
			SPT			2.0	2.5											2.5	
		100	SONIC VIBRATION			1.5	2.0		SW	W	L							2.5	
			SPT			1.0	2.5		ML	W	F							2.5	
		86	SONIC VIBRATION			0.5	3.0		SW	W	VL							3.0	
			SPT			0.0	3.5		ML	W	S							3.5	
			SPT			-0.5	4.0											4.0	
			SPT			-0.5	4.5											4.5	

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT eek



# TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

**BOREHOLE No:** RCH 09

Hole Location: On reserve  
opposite 33 Pavit St

**SHEET 2 OF 4**

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH 2011 EARTHQUAKE	LOCATION: RICHMOND	JOB No: 52000.3200
CO-ORDINATES 5742886.62 mN 2482155.38 mE	DRILL TYPE: Direct Push	HOLE STARTED: 23/9/11
R.L. 4.46 m	DRILL METHOD: Sonic Vibration	HOLE FINISHED: 24/9/11
DATUM NZMG	DRILL FLUID: N/A	DRILLED BY: DCN LOGGED BY: TH 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 CONDITION	WEATHERING	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	50	100	5	10	20	50			
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)			100	SONIC VIBRATION					-1.0	5.5														Fine to medium SAND, dark grey. Medium dense, wet.	
				SPT		*FC	B		-1.5	6.0														- thin lense of non-plastic silt	
				SONIC VIBRATION					-2.0	6.5															- sand becoming fine to coarse
			100	SONIC VIBRATION					-2.5	7.0															
				SPT		*FC	B		-3.0	7.5		ML	W	VSt											SILT with some sand, grey. Very stiff, wet, non plastic. Sand is fine.
				SONIC VIBRATION					-3.5	8.0		SW	W	MD											Fine to medium SAND, dark grey. Medium dense, wet.
			SPT					-4.0	8.5																
			SPT					-4.5	9.0		SW	W	MD												Gravelly, fine to medium SAND, dark grey. Medium dense, wet. Gravel is fine to coarse, rounded to subrounded.
			SONIC VIBR.					-5.0	9.5																
								-5.5	10																
								-5.5	10																

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT.cek



# TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: RCH 09

Hole Location: On reserve  
opposite 33 Pavit St

SHEET 3 OF 4

PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH 2011 EARTHQUAKE LOCATION: RICHMOND JOB No: 52000.3200

CO-ORDINATES 5742886.62 mN 2482155.38 mE DRILL TYPE: Direct Push HOLE STARTED: 23/9/11

R.L. 4.46 m DRILL METHOD: Sonic Vibration HOLE FINISHED: 24/9/11

DATUM NZMG DRILL FLUID: N/A LOGGED BY: TH 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	100		
YALDHURST MEMBER OF THE SPRINGSTON FORMATION (ALLUVIAL)				SPT		*PSD WS	Ø	-6.0	10.5		SW	W	MD								Gravelly, fine to medium SAND, dark grey. Medium dense, wet. Gravel is fine to coarse, rounded to subrounded.
				SPT		4/6/17 N=28		-6.5	11.0												
			100	SONIC VIBRATION				-7.0	11.5												
				SPT		5/3/4 N=7		-7.5	12.0												12.0 to 12.45m no recovery
CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE & ESTUARINE)				SPT				-8.0	12.5		SW	W	L								Fine to coarse SAND, grey. Loose, wet.
				SPT				-8.5	13.0												
			100	SONIC VIBRATION				-9.0	13.5												SILT with some gravel, sand and shells, grey. Stiff, saturated, low plasticity. Gravel is fine, subrounded. Sand is fine to coarse.
				SPT		4/4/10 N=14		-9.5	14.0												13.8 to 13.95m no recovery
				SPT				-9.5	14.0		SW	W	MD								Fine to coarse SAND with trace shells, dark grey. Medium dense, wet.
				SPT				-10.0	14.5												14.5 to 14.65m contains some very closely spaced silt lenses

T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT eek



# TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No: RCH 09


Hole Location: On reserve  
opposite 33 Pavit St


SHEET 4 OF 4



PROJECT: CHRISTCHURCH 2011 EARTHQUAKE	LOCATION: RICHMOND	JOB No: 52000.3200
CO-ORDINATES 5742886.62 mN 2482155.38 mE	DRILL TYPE: Direct Push	HOLE STARTED: 23/9/11
R.L. 4.46 m	DRILL METHOD: Sonic Vibration	HOLE FINISHED: 24/9/11
DATUM NZMG	DRILL FLUID: N/A	DRILLED BY: DCN
		LOGGED BY: TH
		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 CONDITION	WEATHERING	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	50	5	10	20			50
CHRISTCHURCH FORMATION (MARINE & ESTUARINE)				SPT		8/17/28 N=45		-11.0	15.5		SW	W	D									14.9 to 15.0m contains some very closely spaced silt laminae - becoming dense	
			100	SONIC VIBRATION				-11.5	16.0													- thin bed of shells and gravel. Gravel is fine, subrounded.	
				SPT		12/16/18 N=34		-12.5	17.0														
			100	SONIC VIBRATION				-13.0	17.5														
				SPT		9/27/23 for 95mm N>50		-13.5	18.0					VD									- becoming very dense
			87	SONIC VIBRATION				-14.0	18.5														
				SPT		*FC	B	-15.0	19.5														19.35 to 19.5m no recovery
				SPT		13/20/30/ for 135mm N>50		-15.5	20														<b>End of borehole at 19.9mbgl.</b> Open standpipe piezometer installed. Please see attached diagram in Appendix C.



T-T DATA TEMPLATE.GDT.cek


<b>Project:</b> Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations			<b>Page:</b> 1 of 1	<b>CPT-RCH-37</b>	
<b>Test Date:</b> 30-May-2011	<b>Location:</b> Richmond	<b>Operator:</b> Geotech			
<b>Pre-Drill:</b> 1.2m	<b>Assumed GWL:</b> 2.5mBGL	<b>Located By:</b> Survey GPS			
<b>Position:</b> 2482472.1mE 5742941.2mN 3.87mRL	<b>Coord. System:</b> NZMG & MSL				
<b>Other Tests:</b>			<b>Comments:</b>		



<b>Project:</b> Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations			<b>Page:</b> 1 of 1	<b>CPT-RCH-38</b>	
<b>Test Date:</b> 31-May-2011	<b>Location:</b> Richmond	<b>Operator:</b> Opus		 	
<b>Pre-Drill:</b> 1.2m	<b>Assumed GWL:</b> 2mBGL	<b>Located By:</b> Survey GPS			
<b>Position:</b> 2482415.4mE	5742846.8mN	3.24mRL	<b>Coord. System:</b> NZMG & MSL		
<b>Other Tests:</b> Seismic downhole			<b>Comments:</b>		



<b>Project:</b> Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations			<b>Page:</b> 1 of 1	<b>CPT-RCH-50</b>	
<b>Test Date:</b> 31-May-2011	<b>Location:</b> Richmond	<b>Operator:</b> Geotech		 	
<b>Pre-Drill:</b> 1.2m	<b>Assumed GWL:</b> 2mBGL	<b>Located By:</b> Survey GPS			
<b>Position:</b> 2482150.1mE 5743002.7mN 4.44mRL	<b>Coord. System:</b> NZMG & MSL				
<b>Other Tests:</b>			<b>Comments:</b>		





**Appendix E:  
Environment Canterbury Borehole Logs**

**Unknown No:** M35/16568

**Well Name:** CCC BorelogID 6129

**Owner:** CCC borelog



**Street of Well:** Warwick Street

**Locality:** Richmond

**NZGM Grid Reference:** M35:82292-42865 QAR 3

**NZGM X-Y:** 2482292 - 5742865

**Location Description:**

**ECan Monitoring:**

**Well Status:** Filled in

**File No:**

**Allocation Zone:** Christchurch/West Melton

**Uses:** Foundation/Investigation Bore

**Drill Date:** 17 Jul 2006

**Well Depth:** 2.00m -GL

**Initial Water Depth:** -1.20m -MP

**Diameter:**

**Water Level Count:** 0

**Strata Layers:** 3

**Aquifer Tests:** 0

**Isotope Data:** 0

**Yield/Drawdown Tests:** 0

**Measuring Point Ait:** 7.43m MSD QAR 4

**GL Around Well:** 0.00m -MP

**MP Description:**

**Driller:**

**Drilling Method:**

**Casing Material:**

**Pump Type:** None Installed

**Yield:**

**Drawdown:**

**Specific Capacity:**

**Highest GW Level:**

**Lowest GW Level:**

**First Reading:**

**Last Reading:**

**Calc. Min. GWL:**

**Last Updated:** 05 Dec 2008

**Last Field Check:**

**Screens:**

**Screen Type:**

**Top GL:**

**Bottom GL:**

**Aquifer Type:** Water Table

**Aquifer Name:** Christchurch Formation

# Borelog for well M35/16568


Gridref: M35:82292-42865 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)

Ground Level Altitude : 7.43 +MSD

Well name : CCC BorelogID 6129

Drill Method : Not Recorded

Drill Depth : -2m Drill Date : 17/07/2006



**Unknown No:** M35/16805

**Well Name:** CCC BorelogID 6486

**Owner:** CCC borelog



**Street of Well:** Stanmore Road

**Locality:** Richmond

**NZGM Grid Reference:** M35:82276-43042 QAR 3

**NZGM X-Y:** 2482276 - 5743042

**Location Description:**

**ECan Monitoring:**

**Well Status:** Filled in

**File No:**

**Allocation Zone:** Christchurch/West Melton

**Uses:** Foundation/Investigation Bore

**Drill Date:** 15 Nov 2006

**Well Depth:** 3.10m -GL

**Initial Water Depth:** -2.50m -MP

**Diameter:**

**Water Level Count:** 0

**Strata Layers:** 7

**Aquifer Tests:** 0

**Isotope Data:** 0

**Yield/Drawdown Tests:** 0

**Measuring Point Ait:** 7.47m MSD QAR 4

**GL Around Well:** 0.00m -MP

**MP Description:**

**Driller:**

**Drilling Method:**

**Casing Material:**

**Pump Type:**

**Yield:**

**Drawdown:**

**Specific Capacity:**

**Highest GW Level:**

**Lowest GW Level:**

**First Reading:**

**Last Reading:**

**Calc. Min. GWL:**

**Last Updated:** 01 Sep 2009

**Last Field Check:**

**Screens:**

**Screen Type:**

**Top GL:**


**Bottom GL:**

**Aquifer Type:** Water Table

**Aquifer Name:** Christchurch Formation

# Borelog for well M35/16805

Gridref: M35:82276-43042 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)  
 Ground Level Altitude : 7.47 +MSD  
 Well name : CCC BorelogID 6486  
 Drill Method : Not Recorded  
 Drill Depth : -3.1m Drill Date : 15/11/2006



**Unknown No:** M35/16806

**Well Name:** CCC BorelogID 6487

**Owner:** CCC borelog



**Street of Well:** Stanmore Road

**Locality:** Richmond

**NZGM Grid Reference:** M35:82262-43060 QAR 3

**NZGM X-Y:** 2482262 - 5743060

**Location Description:**

**ECan Monitoring:**

**Well Status:** Filled in

**File No:**

**Allocation Zone:** Christchurch/West Melton

**Uses:** Foundation/Investigation Bore

**Drill Date:** 15 Nov 2006

**Well Depth:** 3.15m -GL

**Initial Water Depth:** -1.70m -MP

**Diameter:**

**Measuring Point Ait:** 7.48m MSD QAR 4

**GL Around Well:** 0.00m -MP

**MP Description:**

**Driller:**

**Drilling Method:**

**Casing Material:**

**Pump Type:**

**Yield:**

**Drawdown:**

**Specific Capacity:**

**Aquifer Type:** Water Table

**Aquifer Name:** Christchurch Formation

**Water Level Count:** 0

**Strata Layers:** 11

**Aquifer Tests:** 0

**Isotope Data:** 0

**Yield/Drawdown Tests:** 0

**Highest GW Level:**

**Lowest GW Level:**

**First Reading:**

**Last Reading:**

**Calc. Min. GWL:**

**Last Updated:** 01 Sep 2009

**Last Field Check:**

**Screens:**


**Screen Type:**

**Top GL:**

**Bottom GL:**

# Borelog for well M35/16806

Gridref: M35:82262-43060 Accuracy : 3 (1=high, 5=low)  
 Ground Level Altitude : 7.48 +MSD  
 Well name : CCC BorelogID 6487  
 Drill Method : Not Recorded  
 Drill Depth : -3.15m Drill Date : 15/11/2006





**Bore or Well No:** M35/1893

**Well Name:**

**Owner:** RICHMOND SCHOOL



**Street of Well:** STANMORE ROAD

**Locality:** RICHMOND

**NZGM Grid Reference:** M35:822-429 QAR 4

**NZGM X-Y:** 2482200 - 5742900

**Location Description:** OLD SCHOOL  
SITE, RECREATION  
RESERVE

**ECan Monitoring:**

**Well Status:** Not Used

**File No:**

**Allocation Zone:** Christchurch/West Melton

**Uses:**

**Drill Date:** 30 Jan 1993

**Well Depth:** 82.20m -GL

**Initial Water Depth:** 6.70m -MP

**Diameter:** 76mm

**Water Level Count:** 0

**Strata Layers:** 13

**Aquifer Tests:** 0

**Isotope Data:** 0

**Yield/Drawdown Tests:** 0

**Measuring Point Ait:** 4.60m MSD QAR 3

**GL Around Well:** 0.00m -MP

**MP Description:**

**Driller:** Job Osborne (& Co/Ltd)

**Drilling Method:** Hydraulic/Percussion

**Casing Material:**

**Pump Type:** Unknown

**Yield:** 0 l/s

**Drawdown:** 0 m

**Specific Capacity:**

**Aquifer Type:** Flowing Artesian

**Aquifer Name:** Linwood Gravel

**Highest GW Level:**

**Lowest GW Level:**

**First Reading:**

**Last Reading:**

**Calc. Min. GWL:** 3.10m -MP

**Last Updated:** 21 Sep 2006

**Last Field Check:**

**Screens:**


**Screen Type:**

**Top GL:**


**Bottom GL:**

# Borelog for well M35/1893

Gridref: M35:822-429 Accuracy : 4 (1=high, 5=low)  
 Ground Level Altitude : 4.6 +MSD  
 Driller : Job Osborne (& Co/Ltd)  
 Drill Method : Hydraulic/Percussion  
 Drill Depth : -82.19m Drill Date : 30/01/1993



**Appendix F:  
Level Survey**



Ground Floor Block A

Vertical Datum: Assumed  
 Site Benchmark: South West Corner MH Surround (Gowerton Place)  
 RL: 0.000m


Rev	Description	By	Check	Date

	Christchurch Office P O Box 1482 Christchurch 8143, New Zealand +64 3 363 9400		Whakahoia Village Ground Floor Level Survey	
	Drawn By J. Morrice	Designed By S. Decker	Checked By S. Decker	Date 6/13/66/252/2604/R0
Project No. 60UCCC 93/055C	Date Not to Scale	Drawing No. 6/1366/252/2604/R0	Sheet No. 1/2	Revision R0

Original Sheet Size A1 (841x594) Plot Date 19/09/12 @ 15:30 p:\projects\6-quake\1\docx\_mechanical\whakahoia\survey\drawings\whakahoia block a level survey.dwg - Ground Floor

**Appendix G:  
Site Investigation Location Plan**





Cone Penetrometer Test



Hand Auger/Scala



Opus International Consultants Ltd  
 Christchurch Office  
 20 Moorhouse Ave  
 PO Box 1482  
 Christchurch, New Zealand  
 Tel: +64 3 363 5400 Fax: +64 3 365 7857

**Project:** Whakahoa Village  
 Geotechnical Desktop Study  
**Project No:** 6-QUCCC.93  
**Client:** Christchurch City Council

### Site Investigation Plan

**Drawn:** Opus Geotechnical Engineer

**Date:** 14/05/2012

## **Appendix 3 – CERA DEE Data Sheet**



<b>Location</b>		Building Name: <input type="text" value="Whakahoia Village Block C"/>	Unit No: <input type="text" value=""/>	Street: <input type="text" value="Gowerton Place, Richmond"/>	Reviewer: <input type="text" value="Michael Gibbs"/>
Building Address: <input type="text" value="Block C"/>		Legal Description: <input type="text" value=""/>			CPEng No: <input type="text" value="232386"/>
GPS south: <input type="text" value=""/>		Degrees: <input type="text" value="43"/>	Min: <input type="text" value="31"/>	Sec: <input type="text" value="12.10"/>	Company: <input type="text" value="Ous International Consultants"/>
GPS east: <input type="text" value=""/>		Degrees: <input type="text" value="172"/>	Min: <input type="text" value="39"/>	Sec: <input type="text" value="27.70"/>	Company project number: <input type="text" value="6-QUCCC.93"/>
Building Unique Identifier (CCC): <input type="text" value="BU 2680-003 EQ2"/>		Date of submission: <input type="text" value="10/09/2012"/>			Company phone number: <input type="text" value="03 363 5400"/>
		Inspection Date: <input type="text" value="20/03/2012"/>			Revision: <input type="text" value="Final"/>
		Is there a full report with this summary? <input type="text" value="yes"/>			

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

<b>Building</b>	No. of storeys above ground: <input type="text" value="1"/>	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): <input type="text" value="14.20"/>
	Ground floor split? <input type="text" value="no"/>		Ground floor elevation above ground (m): <input type="text" value="0.00"/>
	Storeys below ground: <input type="text" value="0"/>		if Foundation type is other, describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Foundation type: <input type="text" value="strip footings"/>	height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m): <input type="text" value=""/>	Date of design: <input type="text" value="2004-"/>
	Building height (m): <input type="text" value="2.45"/>		
	Floor footprint area (approx): <input type="text" value=""/>		
	Age of Building (years): <input type="text" value="5"/>		
	Strengthening present? <input type="text" value="no"/>		If so, when (year)? <input type="text" value=""/>
	Use (ground floor): <input type="text" value="multi-unit residential"/>		And what load level (%g)? <input type="text" value=""/>
	Use (upper floors): <input type="text" value=""/>		Brief strengthening description: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Use notes (if required): <input type="text" value=""/>		
	Importance level (to NZS1170.5): <input type="text" value="IL2"/>		

<b>Gravity Structure</b>	Gravity System: <input type="text" value="load bearing walls"/>	
	Roof: <input type="text" value="timber framed"/>	rafter type, purlin type and cladding: <input type="text" value="140x45 H3.1 Rrafters @ 1200 centres, 70x45 Purlins @ 1000 centres"/>
	Floors: <input type="text" value=""/>	type: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Beams: <input type="text" value="timber"/>	#N/A: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Columns: <input type="text" value=""/>	
	Walls: <input type="text" value="fully filled concrete masonry"/>	

<b>Lateral load resisting structure</b>	Lateral system along: <input type="text" value="fully filled CMU"/>	<b>Note: Define along and across in detailed report!</b>	
	Ductility assumed, μ: <input type="text" value="1.25"/>	##### enter height above at H31	note total length of wall at ground (m): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Period along: <input type="text" value="0.25"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="1"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="1"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	Lateral system across: <input type="text" value="fully filled CMU"/>		note total length of wall at ground (m): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Ductility assumed, μ: <input type="text" value="1.25"/>	##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	Period across: <input type="text" value="0.25"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="1"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>
	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="1"/>		estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/>

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

<b>Non-structural elements</b>	Stairs: <input type="text" value=""/>	
	Wall cladding: <input type="text" value="brick or tile"/>	describe (note cavity if exists): <input type="text" value="10 Series block veneer"/>
	Roof Cladding: <input type="text" value="Metal"/>	describe: <input type="text" value="Profiled metal roofing"/>
	Glazing: <input type="text" value="aluminium frames"/>	
	Ceilings: <input type="text" value="plaster, fixed"/>	
	Services(list): <input type="text" value=""/>	

<b>Available documentation</b>	Architectural: <input type="text" value="full"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text" value="City Solutions, 24/11/2006"/>
	Structural: <input type="text" value="full"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text" value="Powell Fenwick Consultants Ltd, 01/12/2006"/>
	Mechanical: <input type="text" value="none"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Electrical: <input type="text" value="none"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Geotech report: <input type="text" value="none"/>	original designer name/date: <input type="text" value=""/>

<b>Damage</b>	Site performance: <input type="text" value=""/>	Describe damage: <input type="text" value=""/>
Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Settlement: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Differential settlement: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Liquefaction: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Lateral Spread: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Differential lateral spread: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Ground cracks: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>
	Damage to area: <input type="text" value=""/>	notes (if applicable): <input type="text" value=""/>

<b>Building:</b>	Current Placard Status: <input type="text" value="green"/>	
Along	Damage ratio: <input type="text" value="55%"/>	Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Describe (summary): <input type="text" value=""/>	
Across	Damage ratio: <input type="text" value="0%"/>	$Damage\_Ratio = \frac{(\%NBS\ before) - \%NBS\ (after)}{\%NBS\ before}$
	Describe (summary): <input type="text" value=""/>	
Diaphragms	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
CSWs:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
Pounding:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
Non-structural:	Damage?: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>

<b>Recommendations</b>	Level of repair/strengthening required: <input type="text" value="minor structural"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value="wall &amp; ceiling lining repairs, investigate support of entry block lintels, strengthen hall ceiling diaphragms"/>
	Building Consent required: <input type="text" value="no"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
	Interim occupancy recommendations: <input type="text" value="full occupancy"/>	Describe: <input type="text" value=""/>
Along	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes: <input type="text" value="100%"/>	##### %NBS from IEP below
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes: <input type="text" value="45%"/>	
Across	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes: <input type="text" value="100%"/>	##### %NBS from IEP below
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes: <input type="text" value="100%"/>	

<b>IEP</b>	Use of this method is not mandatory - more detailed analysis may give a different answer, which would take precedence. Do not fill in fields if not using IEP.	
Period of design of building (from above): <input type="text" value="2004-"/>	h <sub>n</sub> from above: <input type="text" value="m"/>	
Seismic Zone, if designed between 1965 and 1992: <input type="text" value=""/>	Design Soil type from NZS1170.5:2004, cl 3.1.3: <input type="text" value=""/>	not required for this age of building



Period (from above):	along	across
(%NBS) <sub>nom</sub> from Fig 3.3:	0.249	0.249

Note:1 for specifically design public buildings, to the code of the day: pre-1965 = 1.25; 1965-1976, Zone A =1.33; 1965-1976, Zone B = 1.2; all else 1.0  
 Note 2: for RC buildings designed between 1976-1984, use 1.2  
 Note 3: for buildings designed prior to 1935 use 0.8, except in Wellington (1.0)

	1.00
	1.0
	1.0

	along	across
Final (%NBS) <sub>nom</sub> :	0%	0%

**2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor**

Near Fault scaling factor, from NZS1170.5, cl 3.1.6:

	along	across
Near Fault scaling factor (1/N(T,D), <b>Factor A</b> ):	1	1

**2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor**

Hazard factor Z for site from AS1170.5, Table 3.3:

Z<sub>1992</sub>, from NZS4203:1992  
 Hazard scaling factor, **Factor B**:

**2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor**

Building Importance level (from above):

Return Period Scaling factor from Table 3.1, **Factor C**:

**2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor**

Assessed ductility (less than max in Table 3.2)  along  across

Ductility scaling factor: =1 from 1976 onwards; or =k<sub>d</sub>, if pre-1976, from Table 3.3:

Ductility Scaling Factor, **Factor D**:  along  across

**2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor:**

Sp:  along  across

Structural Performance Scaling Factor **Factor E**:  along  across

**2.7 Baseline %NBS, (NBS)<sub>b</sub> = (%NBS)<sub>nom</sub> x A x B x C x D x E**

%NBS<sub>b</sub>:  along  across

Global Critical Structural Weaknesses: (refer to NZSEE IEP Table 3.4)

3.1. Plan Irregularity, factor A:

3.2. Vertical irregularity, Factor B:

3.3. Short columns, Factor C:

3.4. Pounding potential Pounding effect D1, from Table to right:

Height Difference effect D2, from Table to right:

Therefore, Factor D:

3.5. Site Characteristics

Table for selection of D1	Severe	Significant	Insignificant/none
	Separation	0 < sep < .005H	.005 < sep < .01H
Alignment of floors within 20% of H	0.7	0.8	1
Alignment of floors not within 20% of H	0.4	0.7	0.8

Table for Selection of D2	Severe	Significant	Insignificant/none
	Separation	0 < sep < .005H	.005 < 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

**3.6. Other factors, Factor F**

For ≤ 3 storeys, max value =2.5, otherwise max value =1.5, no minimum

Rationale for choice of F factor, if not 1:

Detail Critical Structural Weaknesses: (refer to DEE Procedure section 6)

List any:  Refer also section 6.3.1 of DEE for discussion of F factor modification for other critical structural weaknesses

**3.7. Overall Performance Achievement ratio (PAR)**

along  across

**4.3 PAR x (%NBS)<sub>b</sub>:**

PAR x Baseline %NBS:  along  across

**4.4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS), (before)**

