

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2
Ruru Lawn Cemetery – Toilets
Raymond Road, Bromley



QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 02 May 2013



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2
Ruru Lawn Cemetery – Toilets
Raymond Road, Bromley

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 02 May 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

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

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



Contents



| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| 1.1. Background | 1 |
| 1.2. Key Damage Observed | 1 |
| 1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses | 1 |
| 1.4. Indicative Building Strength (from IEP and CSW assessment) | 2 |
| 1.5. Recommendations | 2 |
| 2. Introduction | 3 |
| 3. Compliance | 4 |
| 3.1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) | 4 |
| 3.2. Building Act | 5 |
| 3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy | 6 |
| 3.4. Building Code | 7 |
| 4. Earthquake Resistance Standards | 8 |
| 5. Building Details | 10 |
| 5.1. Building description | 10 |
| 5.2. Gravity Load Resisting System | 10 |
| 5.3. Seismic Load Resisting System | 10 |
| 5.4. Geotechnical Conditions | 10 |
| 6. Damage Summary | 11 |
| 6.1. Damage Summary | 11 |
| 7. Initial Seismic Evaluation | 12 |
| 7.1. The Initial Evaluation Procedure Process | 12 |
| 7.2. Available Information, Assumptions and Limitations | 13 |
| 7.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses | 14 |
| 7.4. Qualitative Assessment Results | 14 |
| 8. Further Investigation | 15 |
| 9. Conclusion | 16 |
| 10. Limitation Statement | 17 |
| 11. Appendix 1 – Photos | 18 |
| 12. Appendix 2 – IEP Reports | 19 |
| 13. Appendix 3 – CERA Standardised Report Form | 26 |
| 14. Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study | 28 |



Document history and status

| Revision | Date issued | Reviewed by | Approved by | Date approved | Revision type |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| A | 28/5/2012 | CD Paverd | NM Calvert | 28/5/2012 | Draft for Client Approval |
| B | 02/05/2013 | NM Calvert | NM Calvert | 02/05/2013 | Final Issue |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Approval

| | Signature | Date | Name | Title |
|----------|--|------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Author |  | 02/05/2013 | Kimberly Wylie | Structural Engineer |
| Approver |  | 02/05/2013 | Nick Calvert | Senior Structural Engineer |

Distribution of copies

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

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Printed: | 2 May 2013 |
| Last saved: | 2 May 2013 12:56 PM |
| File name: | ZB01276.44_CCC_PRK_0895_007_EQ2_Qualitative Assmt_B.docx |
| Author: | Kimberley Wylie |
| Project manager: | Nick Calvert |
| Name of organisation: | Christchurch City Council |
| Name of project: | Christchurch City Council Structures Panel |
| Name of document: | ZB01276.45_PRK_0895_007_EQ2_Qualitative Assessment |
| Document version: | B |
| Project number: | ZB01276.044 |

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Background

A Qualitative Assessment was carried out on building PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 located at Ruru Lawn Cemetery, Bromley. This building is a small single storey toilet block. It is constructed from unreinforced masonry walls and a light weight timber framed roof. An aerial photograph illustrating the location of this 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 of Building PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 Located at Ruru Lawn Cemetery**

The qualitative assessment broadly 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 our visual inspections carried out on the 3 April 2012.

1.2. Key Damage Observed

No external or internal damage was observed during our site inspection.

1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No potential critical structural weaknesses were identified for this building.



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

Based on the information available, and using the NZSEE Initial Evaluation Procedure, the original seismic capacity of the building has been assessed to be in the order of 40% NBS. No damage was observed during our site investigation therefore the post earthquake capacity will also be in the order of 40%NBS.

As noted above our analysis indicates that the current seismic capacity of the building is in the order of 40% NBS and therefore is not a potentially earthquake prone buildings. Since the capacity is less than 67% NBS a quantitative assessment is recommended due to the margin of error inherent in the IEP. However due to the size of this structure it is not cost effective to carry out a quantitative assessment or strengthen the structure to current code requirements. If the Council wish to strengthen this building to above 67% NBS we recommend that the building is demolished and replaced with a new structure that meets current code requirements. As a detached building not exceeding 1 storey high, and less than 10m² in area, this structure would also be exempt from the requirement for building consent under Schedule 1 (i) (iv) of the Act.

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 the Christchurch City Council to prepare a qualitative assessment report for the building PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 located at Ruru Lawn Cemetery, Bromley 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”. The qualitative assessment broadly includes a summary of the building damage as well as an initial assessment of the current Likely Seismic Capacity compared with current seismic requirements.

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

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

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

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

At the time of this report, no detailed analysis, or modelling of the building structure had been carried out. No structural drawings were available for this structure therefore the building description outlined in Section 5 is based on our visual inspection only which was carried out on the 3 April 2012.

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

3. Compliance

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

3.1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)

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

Section 38 – Works

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

Section 51 – Requiring Structural Survey

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

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

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

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

- The importance level and occupancy of the building
- The placard status and amount of damage
- The age and structural type of the building
- Consideration of any critical structural weaknesses
- The extent of any earthquake damage

3.2. Building Act

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

3.2.1. Section 112 – Alterations

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

3.2.2. Section 115 – Change of Use

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

3.2.3. Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

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

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

3.2.4. Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings

This section defines a building as earthquake prone if its ultimate capacity would be exceeded in a ‘moderate earthquake’ and it would be likely to collapse causing injury or death, or damage to other property. A moderate earthquake is defined by the building regulations as one that would generate ground shaking 33% of the shaking used to design an equivalent new building.

3.2.5. Section 124 – Powers of Territorial Authorities

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

3.2.6. Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy

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

3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy

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

The 2010 amendment includes the following:

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

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

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

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

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

3.4. Building Code

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

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

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

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

4. Earthquake Resistance Standards

For this assessment, the building's earthquake resistance is compared with the current New Zealand Building Code requirements for a new building constructed on the site. This is expressed as a percentage of new building standard (%NBS). The new building standard load requirements have been determined in accordance with the current earthquake loading standard (NZS 1170.5:2004 Structural design actions - Earthquake actions - New Zealand).

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

5. Building Details

5.1. Building description

Building PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 is a single storey building toilet block located at Ruru Lawn Cemetery. The building is constructed from unreinforced masonry walls and a light weight timber framed roof. The masonry walls have been sprayed with concrete on the inside of the building and the eastern walls has been sprayed on both sides. The cladding to roof is corrugated steel. The masonry walls are supported on concrete foundations. Due to the architecture of this building we believe that it was constructed sometime in the 1960's.

5.2. Gravity Load Resisting System

Our evaluation was based on our visual investigation carried out on the 3 April 2012.

The roof structure consists of timber purlins which are supported on the masonry walls.

5.3. Seismic Load Resisting System

Lateral loads acting across and along this building will be resisted by the masonry walls via shear.

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

5.4. Geotechnical Conditions

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

- Liquefaction risk is low to moderate for this site, with localised liquefaction on site or the liquefaction of the roads more likely to occur.

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. Our full Geotechnical Desktop study is detailed in Appendix 4.



6. Damage Summary

SKM undertook inspections on the 3 April 2012. The following areas of damage were observed during the time of inspection:

6.1. Damage Summary

- 1) No external or internal damage was observed during our site inspection.
- 2) No visual evidence of settlement was noted at this site. Therefore a level survey is not required at this stage of assessment.

7. Initial Seismic Evaluation

7.1. The Initial Evaluation Procedure Process

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

The IEP is a coarse screening process designed to identify buildings that are likely to be earthquake prone. The IEP process ranks buildings according to how well they are likely to perform relative to a new building designed to current earthquake standards, as shown in Table 2: IEP Risk classifications. The building grade is indicated by the percent of the required New Building Standard (%NBS) strength that the building is considered to have. Earthquake prone buildings are defined as having less than 33 %NBS strength which correlates to an increased risk of approximately 10 times that 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 prone⁴.

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

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

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

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



members and describe the likely performance of the building in a seismic event. A review of the plans is also likely to identify any critical structural weaknesses. The IEP assumes that the building was properly designed and built according to the relevant codes at the time of construction. The IEP method rates buildings based on the code used at the time of construction and some more subjective parameters associated with how the building is detailed and so it is possible that %NBS derived from different engineers may differ.

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

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

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

7.2. Available Information, Assumptions and Limitations

Following our inspection on the 3 April 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.
- No structural drawings were available for this building.

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

- The building was built according to good practices at the time.
- The soil on site is class D as described in AS/NZS1170.5:2004, Clause 3.1.3, Soft Soil.
- Standard design assumptions as described in AS/NZS1170.0:2002
 - 50 year design life, which is the default NZ Building Code design life.

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



- Structure importance level 1 since the total floor area is $<30\text{m}^2$ and represents structures presenting a low degree of hazard to life and other property.
- Ductility level of 1.0, 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. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No potential critical structural weaknesses were identified for this building.

7.4. Qualitative Assessment Results

The building has had its capacity assessed using the Initial Evaluation Procedure based on the information available. The buildings capacity expressed as a percentage of new building standard (%NBS) is in the order of that shown below in Table 3. This capacity is subject to confirmation by a quantitative analysis. However due to the size of this building it is not cost effective to carry out a quantitative analysis or strengthen the structure to current code requirements. If the Council wish to strengthen this building to above 67% NBS we recommend that the building is demolished and replaced with a new structure that meets current code requirements

Table 3: Qualitative Assessment Summary

| <u>Item</u> | <u>%NBS</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Likely Seismic Capacity of Building | 40 |

Our qualitative assessment found that the building is likely to be classed as a 'Moderate Risk Building' (capacity greater than 34% but less than 67% of NBS). The full IEP assessment form is detailed in Appendix 2 – IEP Reports.



8. Further Investigation

Due to the size of this structure it is not cost effective to carry out a quantitative assessment or strengthen the structure to current code requirements therefore no further investigation is required at this stage of the assessment.

9. Conclusion

A qualitative assessment was carried out on building PRK_0895_BLDG_007, located at Ruru Lawn Cemetery, Bromley. The building has been assessed to have a likely seismic capacity in the order of 40% NBS and is therefore not potentially earthquake prone (capacity greater than 33% of NBS). Since the capacity is less than 67% NBS a quantitative assessment is recommended due to the margin of error inherent in the IEP. However due to the size of this structure it is not likely to be cost effective to carry out a quantitative assessment or strengthen the structure to current code requirements. If the Council wish to strengthen this building to above 67% NBS we recommend that the building is demolished and replaced with a new structure that meets current code requirements. As a detached building not exceeding 1 storey high, and less than 10m² in area, this structure would also be exempt from the requirement for building consent under Schedule 1 (i) (iv) of the Act.

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: North Elevation



Photo 2: East Elevation



Photo 3: West Elevation



Photo 4: South Elevation



12. Appendix 2 – IEP Reports

Table IEP-1 Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 1

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



Page 1

| | | | |
|----------------|--|------|------------|
| Building Name: | Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 | Ref. | ZB01276.44 |
| Location: | Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch | By | KW |
| | | Date | 4/04/2012 |

Step 1 - General Information**1.1 Photos (attach sufficient to describe building)****1.2 Sketch of building plan****1.3 List relevant features**

This building is a small single storey building that is constructed from unreinforced masonry walls and a light weight timber framed roof. The block walls are founded on concrete strip footings. Due to the architecture of this building we have believe that it was constructed sometime in the 1960's

1.4 Note information sources

Tick as appropriate

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

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |

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)



Page 2

| | | | |
|--|--|------|------------|
| Building Name: | Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 | Ref. | ZB01276.44 |
| Location: | Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch | By | KW |
| Direction Considered: | Longitudinal & Transverse | Date | 4/04/2012 |
| (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 | |
| 1935-1965 | |
| 1965-1976 | Seismic Zone; A |
| | B |
| | C |
| 1976-1992 | Seismic Zone; A |
| | B |
| | C |
| 1992-2004 | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | See also notes 1, 3 |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | See also note 2 |
| <input type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | |
| <input type="radio"/> | |

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 |

| |
|----------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| From NZS4203:1992, Cl 4.6.2.2 | a) Rigid |
| (for 1992 to 2004 only and only if known) | b) Intermediate |

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N-A |
| <input type="radio"/> | |

c) Estimate Period, T

| | | |
|---------------|-----|--------|
| building Ht = | 2.1 | meters |
|---------------|-----|--------|

Can use following:

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

| Longitudinal | Transverse | m2 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|
| Ac = 2.5 | 1.8 | |
| <input type="radio"/> MRCF | <input type="radio"/> MRCF | |
| <input type="radio"/> MRSF | <input type="radio"/> MRSF | |
| <input type="radio"/> EBSF | <input type="radio"/> EBSF | |
| <input type="radio"/> Others | <input type="radio"/> Others | |
| <input type="radio"/> CSW | <input type="radio"/> CSW | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> MSW | <input checked="" type="radio"/> MSW | |

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

| Longitudinal | Transverse | Seconds |
|--------------|------------|---------|
| 0.4 | 0.4 | |

d) (%NBS)nom determined from Figure 3.3

Note 1: For buildings designed prior to 1965 and known to be designed as public buildings in accordance with the code of the time, multiply (%NBS)nom by 1.25.

| | | |
|----|--------|---|
| No | Factor | 1 |
|----|--------|---|

For buildings designed 1965 - 1976 and known to be designed as public buildings in accordance with the code of the time, multiply (%NBS)nom by 1.33 - Zone A or 1.2 - Zone B

| | | |
|----|--------|---|
| No | Factor | 1 |
|----|--------|---|

Note 2: For reinforced concrete buildings designed between 1976 -1984 (%NBS)nom by 1.2

| | | |
|----|--------|---|
| No | Factor | 1 |
|----|--------|---|

Note 3: For buildings designed prior to 1935 multiply (%NBS)nom by 0.8 except for Wellington where the factor may be taken as 1.

| | | |
|----|--------|---|
| No | Factor | 1 |
|----|--------|---|

| Longitudinal | 2.8 | (%NBS)nom |
|--------------|-----|-----------|
| Transverse | 2.8 | (%NBS)nom |

| Longitudinal | 2.8 | (%NBS)nom |
|--------------|-----|-----------|
| Transverse | 2.8 | (%NBS)nom |

Continued over page

Building Name: Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2
 Location: Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch
 Direction Considered: **Longitudinal & Transverse**
 (Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)

Ref. ZB01276.44
 By KW
 Date 4/04/2012

2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor, Factor A

If $T < 1.5\text{sec}$, Factor A = 1

a) Near Fault Factor, $N(T,D)$

(from NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.6)

1

b) Near Fault Scaling Factor

$$= 1/N(T,D)$$

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

2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor B

Select Location

a) Hazard Factor, Z, for site

(from NZS1170.5:2004, Table 3.3)

Z = 0.3

Z 1992 = 0.8

Auckland 0.6 Palm Nth 1.2

Wellington 1.2 Dunedin 0.6

Christchurch 0.8 Hamilton 0.67

b) Hazard Scaling Factor

For pre 1992 = $1/Z$

For 1992 onwards = Z 1992/Z

#

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

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

2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor C

a) Building Importance Level

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

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

μ Maximum = 2

Transverse 1

μ Maximum = 2

b) Ductility Scaling Factor

For pre 1976

$$= k_{\mu}$$

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 *

Transverse **

a) Structural Performance Factor, S_p

from accompanying Figure 3.4

Longitudinal

S_p

1.00

Transverse

S_p

1.00

b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor

Longitudinal

$1/S_p$

Factor E

1.00

Transverse

$1/S_p$

Factor E

1.00

2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, $(\%NBS)_b$

(equals $(\%NSB)_{nom} \times A \times B \times C \times D \times E$)

| | | |
|--------------|------|-------------|
| Longitudinal | 18.7 | $(\%NBS)_b$ |
| Transverse | 18.7 | $(\%NBS)_b$ |

Table IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure – Step 3

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



Page 4

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Building Name: Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 | Ref. ZB01276.44 |
| Location: Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch | By KW |
| Direction Considered: a) Longitudinal | Date 4/04/2012 |
| (Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt) | |

Step 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)

(Refer Appendix B - Section B3.2)

Critical Structural Weakness
Effect on Structural Performance

(Choose a value - Do not interpolate)

Building
Score
3.1 Plan Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

 Factor A
3.2 Vertical Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

 Factor B
3.3 Short Columns

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

 Factor C
3.4 Pounding Potential

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

a) Factor D1: - Pounding Effect

Select appropriate value from Table

Note:

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

 Factor D1

Table for Selection of Factor D1

| | Severe | Significant | Insignificant |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Separation | 0<Sep<.005H | .005<Sep<.01H | Sep>.01H |
| Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.8 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 |
| Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height | <input type="radio"/> 0.4 | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.8 |

b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect

Select appropriate value from Table

 Factor D2

Table for Selection of Factor D2

| | Severe | Significant | Insignificant |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Separation | 0<Sep<.005H | .005<Sep<.01H | Sep>.01H |
| Height Difference > 4 Storeys | <input type="radio"/> 0.4 | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 1 |
| Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.9 | <input type="radio"/> 1 |
| Height Difference < 2 Storeys | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 |

 Factor D

(Set D = lesser of D1 and D2 or..

set D = 1.0 if no prospect of pounding)

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

Effect on Structural Performance

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

 Factor E
3.6 Other Factors

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.

 Factor F

Record rationale for choice of Factor F:

Seismic capacity of building is likely to be governed by the out of plane bending capacity of the masonry walls. The critical out of plane bending capacity of the walls is 40%NBS - refer to attached calculations.

3.7 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)

(equals A x B x C x D x E x F)

 PAR

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------|------------|
| Building Name: | Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 | Ref. | ZB01276.44 |
| Location: | Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch | By | KW |
| Direction Considered: | b) Transverse | Date | 4/04/2012 |

(Choose worse case if clear at start. Complete IEP-2 and IEP-3 for each if in doubt)

Step 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)

(Refer Appendix B - Section B3.2)

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

Building Score
3.1 Plan Irregularity

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

Factor A **1****3.2 Vertical Irregularity**

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

Factor B **1****3.3 Short Columns**

Effect on Structural Performance

Comment

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

Factor C **1****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**

| | | Severe | Significant | Insignificant |
|---|------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | 0<Sep<.005H | .005<Sep<.01H | Sep>.01H |
| Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height | Separation | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.8 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 |
| Alignment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height | | <input type="radio"/> 0.4 | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.8 |

b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect

Select appropriate value from Table

Factor D2 **1**

| | | Severe | Significant | Insignificant |
|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | 0<Sep<.005H | .005<Sep<.01H | Sep>.01H |
| Height Difference > 4 Storeys | Separation | <input type="radio"/> 0.4 | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 1 |
| Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys | | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input type="radio"/> 0.9 | <input type="radio"/> 1 |
| Height Difference < 2 Storeys | | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 |

Factor D **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 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 0.5 | <input type="radio"/> 0.7 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 |

Factor E **1****3.6 Other Factors**

For < 3 storeys - Maximum value 2.5,

otherwise - Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.

Factor F **2.2****Record rationale for choice of Factor F:**

Seismic capacity of building is likely to be governed by the out of plane bending capacity of the masonry walls. The critical out of plane bending capacity of the walls is 40%NBS - refer to attached calculations.

3.7 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)

(equals A x B x C x D x E x F)

PAR **2.2**

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------|------------|
| Building Name: | Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets—PRK_0895_BLDG_007 EQ2 | Ref. | ZB01276.44 |
| Location: | Raymond Road, Bromley, Christchurch | By | KW |
| Direction Considered: | Longitudinal & Transverse | Date | 4/04/2012 |

(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) | 18 | 18 |
| 4.2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) | 2.20 | 2.20 |
| 4.3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS)_b | 40 | 40 |
| 4.4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) | | 40 |

Step 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?

(Mark as appropriate)

%NBS ≤ 33

NO**Step 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?**

%NBS < 67

YES**Step 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP**

Seismic Grade

C

Evaluation Confirmed by



Signature

NICK CALVERT

Name

242062

CPEng. No

Relationship between Seismic Grade and % NBS :

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



13. Appendix 3 – CERA Standardised Report Form

| | |
|--|--|
| Location | |
| Building Name: <input type="text" value="Ruru Lawn Cemetery - Toilets"/> | Unit No: <input type="text" value="Street"/> |
| Building Address: <input type="text" value="Raymond Road"/> | Reviewer: <input type="text" value="Colin Paverd"/> |
| Legal Description: <input type="text"/> | CEng No (UK): <input type="text" value="458369"/> |
| | Company: <input type="text" value="SKM"/> |
| | Company project number: <input type="text" value="ZB01276.44"/> |
| | Company phone number: <input type="text" value="03 940 4900"/> |
| GPS south: <input type="text"/> | Degrees Min Sec |
| GPS east: <input type="text"/> | |
| Building Unique Identifier (CCC): <input type="text" value="PRK_0895_BLDG_007"/> | Date of submission: <input type="text" value="2-May"/> |
| | Inspection Date: <input type="text" value="3/04/2012"/> |
| | Revision: <input type="text" value="B"/> |
| | Is there a full report with this summary? <input type="text" value="yes"/> |

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

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| Building | No. of storeys above ground: <input type="text" value="1"/> | single storey = 1 | Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): <input type="text"/> |
| | Ground floor split? <input type="text" value="no"/> | | Ground floor elevation above ground (m): <input type="text"/> |
| | Storeys below ground: <input type="text" value="0"/> | | |
| | Foundation type: <input type="text" value="strip footings"/> | | If Foundation type is other, describe: <input type="text"/> |
| | Building height (m): <input type="text" value="2.10"/> | height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m): <input type="text" value="2.1"/> | |
| | Floor footprint area (approx): <input type="text" value="5"/> | | Date of design: <input type="text" value="1935-1965"/> |
| | Age of Building (years): <input type="text" value="52"/> | | |
| | Strengthening present? <input type="text" value="no"/> | | If so, when (year)? <input type="text"/> |
| | Use (ground floor): <input type="text" value="public"/> | | And what load level (%g)? <input type="text"/> |
| | Use (upper floors): <input type="text"/> | | Brief strengthening description: <input type="text"/> |
| | Use notes (if required): <input type="text" value="Public Toilet"/> | | |
| | Importance level (to NZS1170.5): <input type="text" value="IL1"/> | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Gravity Structure | Gravity System: <input type="text" value="load bearing walls"/> | rafter type, purlin type and cladding: <input type="text" value="timber purlins (assumed)"/> |
| | Roof: <input type="text" value="timber framed"/> | |
| | Floors: <input type="text"/> | |
| | Beams: <input type="text"/> | |
| | Columns: <input type="text"/> | |
| | Walls: <input type="text" value="load bearing brick"/> | #N/A: <input type="text"/> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Lateral load resisting structure | Lateral system along: <input type="text" value="unreinforced masonry bearing wall - brick"/> | Note: Define along and across in detailed report! | note wall thickness and cavity: <input type="text" value="100mm, no cavity assumed"/> |
| | Ductility assumed, μ : <input type="text" value="1.00"/> | 0.40 from parameters in sheet | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | Period along: <input type="text" value="0.40"/> | | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="5"/> | | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="0"/> | | |
| | Lateral system across: <input type="text" value="unreinforced masonry bearing wall - brick"/> | | note wall thickness and cavity: <input type="text" value="100mm, no cavity assumed"/> |
| | Ductility assumed, μ : <input type="text" value="1.00"/> | 0.00 | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | Period across: <input type="text" value="0.40"/> | | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="5"/> | | estimate or calculation? <input type="text" value="estimated"/> |
| | maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): <input type="text" value="0"/> | | |

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Non-structural elements | Stairs: <input type="text"/> | |
| | Wall cladding: <input type="text" value="brick or tile"/> | describe (note cavity if exists): <input type="text" value="load bearing walls provide cladding"/> |
| | Roof Cladding: <input type="text" value="Metal"/> | describe: <input type="text" value="light weight steel corrugate"/> |
| | Glazing: <input type="text" value="timber frames"/> | |
| | Ceilings: <input type="text"/> | |
| | Services(list): <input type="text"/> | |

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

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Damage | Site performance: <input type="text" value="1"/> | Describe damage: <input type="text"/> |
| Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2) | | |
| Settlement: <input type="text" value="none observed"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Differential settlement: <input type="text" value="none observed"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Liquefaction: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Lateral Spread: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Differential lateral spread: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Ground cracks: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |
| Damage to area: <input type="text" value="none apparent"/> | | notes (if applicable): <input type="text"/> |

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

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Recommendations | Level of repair/strengthening required: <input type="text" value="none"/> | Describe: <input type="text"/> |
| | Building Consent required: <input type="text" value="no"/> | Describe: <input type="text"/> |
| | Interim occupancy recommendations: <input type="text" value="full occupancy"/> | Describe: <input type="text"/> |
| Along | Assessed %NBS before: <input type="text" value="40%"/> | %NBS |
| | Assessed %NBS after: <input type="text" value="40%"/> | |
| Across | Assessed %NBS before: <input type="text" value="40%"/> | %NBS |
| | Assessed %NBS after: <input type="text" value="40%"/> | |
| | | If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology: <input type="text" value="Qualitative Assessment carried out this includes the NZSEEE IEP - refer to SKM report"/> |



14. Appendix 4 – Geotechnical Desktop Study



1. Christchurch City Council - Structural Engineering Service

2. Geotechnical Desk Study

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| SKM project number | ZB01276 |
| SKM project site number | 043 to 048 inclusive |
| Address | Ruru Cemetery, 63 Ruru Rd |
| Report date | 21 May 2012 |
| Author | Ananth Balachandra / Ross Roberts |
| Reviewer | Leah Bateman |
| Approved for issue | Yes |

3. Introduction

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

4. 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

5. 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.

6. Site location




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

The site is located on 63 Ruru Road at grid reference 1574990 E, 5179890 N (NZTM).




7. Review of available information

7.1 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 red.**

The site is shown to be underlain by Holocene deposits comprising predominantly sands of fixed and semi-fixed dunes and beaches from the Christchurch Formation. The area immediately to the west of the site is underlain by peat swamps, now drained, from the Springston Formation.

7.2 Liquefaction map



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

Following the 22 February 2011 event drive through reconnaissance was undertaken from 23 February until 1 March by M Cubrinovski and M Taylor of Canterbury University. Their findings show predominantly liquefaction of roads with no or localised liquefaction in the areas near the site. In parts of the area immediately west of the site low to moderate and moderate and severe liquefaction had been noted.



7.3 Aerial photography



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



■ **Figure 6 – Aerial photography from 24 Feb 2011 (<http://viewers.geospatial.govt.nz/>)**

Significant amount of liquefied material can be seen on Ruru road, running down the northern section of the site, from the aerial photographs. Additionally, localised liquefaction and evidence of sand boils could be seen on adjacent properties.

7.4 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) – with properties to the west categorised as TC2



7.5 Historical land use

Reference to historical documents (eg Appendix A) shows that the site was recorded as marshland or swamp in 1856. Therefore, it is possible that soft or liquefiable soils would be present near the site.

7.6 Existing ground investigation data



- **Figure 7 – Local boreholes from Project Orbit and SKM files (<https://canterburyrecovery.projectorbit.com/>)**

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



7.7 Council property files

Council property files comprising drawings showing the conceptual layout of the cemetery, proposed drawings for the public toilet and consent document for landscaping the cemetery was available and reviewed for this desk study.

The drawings for the public toilet show that the structure was supported on reinforced concrete slab on grade foundation. The concrete floor slab was noted to be approximately 200mm in thickness supported on compacted hardfill. Thickened concrete slab measuring approximately 500mm in thickness, 300mm of which is embedded, was noted beneath the internal and external walls of the structure. Additionally, in the proposed drawing a septic tank was noted to be buried approximately 4m away from the toilet. Therefore, the area near the septic tank may be contaminated.

No other ground condition information or information regarding the foundation details of other structure on site was evident in the available council files.

7.8 Site walkover

An external site walkover was undertaken by a SKM engineer in the week commencing 19 March 2012.

There was no significant sign of land damage or evidence that liquefaction had occurred on site. There were two toilets on site; one was a concrete block structure with the other being a brick structure. Both had metal roofing. The pump house was a timber structure with a felt roof, and the toolshed was constructed using bricks and a metal roof. The office was a portacom.

The toolshed was the only building on the site with any noticeable structural damage. The main damage observed was the cracking of the bricks.



■ **Figure 8 Visible damage to the tool shed**



■ **Figure 9 No visible damage to land or the building**



■ **Figure 10 No visible damage to the pump house**



8. Conclusions and recommendations

8.1 Site geology

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

| Depth range (mBLG) | Soil type |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 0 – 1 | Soft clayey silt and silt |
| 1 – 6 | Medium dense clean sand to silty sand |
| 6 – 13 | Dense clean sand to silty sand |
| 13 - 25+ | Very dense clean sand |

8.2 Seismic site subsoil class

The site has been assessed as NZS1170.5 Class D (deep or soft soil) from adjacent borehole logs with sand and clay material inferred to present below a depth of 60m.

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 second preferred method has been used to make the assessment.

8.3 Building Performance

Only foundation records for the public toilet were available. However, the performance of the structures to date would suggest that the existing foundations are adequate for their purpose. The only building with noted damage was the tool shed structure. However, there was little to no evidence from the site visit showing excessive settlement of the structure or damage to the foundations.

8.4 Ground performance and properties

Liquefaction risk is moderate for this site, with localised liquefaction on site or the liquefaction of the roads more likely to occur.

For the purposes of shallow foundation design, the following parameters are recommended for the shallow materials. It should be noted that the shallow soft clayey silt and silt layer would likely have been removed before the construction of the foundations. This could not be confirmed for all structures; however, the floor slab for the public toilet was noted to be constructed on compacted hardfill. Therefore, following parameters are recommended for the medium dense clean sand to silty sand layer in order to perform a quantitative DEE:



| Parameter | Estimated value |
|---|-----------------|
| Effective angle of friction | 32 degrees |
| Effective Cohesion | 0 kPa |
| Unit weight | 18 kPa |
| Ultimate bearing capacity of a shallow square pad footing | 300 kPa |

NOTE: These parameters should not be relied upon for consent purposes or design work. Site specific investigations would be required in which case to confirm the recommended parameters.

8.5 Further investigations

Unless a change of use is intended for the site we do not believe that any further geotechnical investigations are required.

However, if consent is required or significant alterations to the site are proposed, additional investigations recommended are:

- Two CPTs near the structure to refusal

9. References

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


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/>)



10. Appendix A – Christchurch 1856 land use





11. Appendix B – Existing ground investigation logs

Borelog for well M35/1898

Gridref: M35:851-416 Accuracy : 4 (1=high, 5=low)

Ground Level Altitude : 6.4 +MSD

Driller : not known

Drill Method : Unknown

Drill Depth : -90.5m Drill Date :



| Scale(m) | Water Level | Depth(m) | Full Drillers Description | Formation Code |
|----------|-------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | Artesian | | | |
| -10 | | | Sand | |
| -20 | | | | |
| -25.9m | | | Clay | ch |
| -30 | | | | |
| -33.5m | | | Gravel, water level 0.3m | ch |
| -40 | | | | |
| -50 | | | | |
| -58.8m | | | Clay | ri-br |
| -60.9m | | | Gravel | br |
| -62.1m | | | Clay | br |
| -67.0m | | | Gravel | br |
| -70 | | | | |
| -74.3m | | | Peat | li-1 |
| -76.2m | | | Clay | li-2 |
| -77.7m | | | Gravel, water level 3.0m | li-2 |
| -80 | | | | |
| -85.0m | | | Clay | li-2 |
| -88.3m | | | Gravel, water level 3.6m | li-2 |
| -90 | | | | |
| -90.7m | | | | li-3 |

Borelog for well M35/1869


Gridref: M35:85053-41774 Accuracy : 2 (1=high, 5=low)



Ground Level Altitude : 6.04 +MSD


Driller : not known



Drill Method : Unknown


Drill Depth : -60.29m Drill Date :






| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations | | | | Page: 1 of 1 | | CPT-BRY-20 | |
| Test Date: 9-Aug-2011 | | Location: Bromley | | Operator: Opus | |  |  |
| Pre-Drill: 1.2m | | Assumed GWL: 2mBGL | | Located By: Survey GPS | | | |
| Position: 2484825.2mE | | 5741365.3mN 3.08mRL | | Coord. System: NZMG & MSL | | | |
| Other Tests: | | | | Comments: | | | |






| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations | | | | Page: 1 of 2 | | CPT-BRY-08 | |
| Test Date: 16-Jun-2011 | | Location: Bromley | | Operator: Perry | |  |  |
| Pre-Drill: 1.2m | | Assumed GWL: 0.8mBGL | | Located By: Survey GPS | | | |
| Position: 2485354.4mE | | 5741594.8mN 4.07mRL | | Coord. System: NZMG & MSL | | | |
| Other Tests: | | | | Comments: | | | |



| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations | | | | Page: 2 of 2 | | CPT-BRY-08 | |
| Test Date: 16-Jun-2011 | | Location: Bromley | | Operator: Perry | |  |  |
| Pre-Drill: 1.2m | | Assumed GWL: 0.8mBGL | | Located By: Survey GPS | | | |
| Position: 2485354.4mE | | 5741594.8mN 4.07mRL | | Coord. System: NZMG & MSL | | | |
| Other Tests: | | | | Comments: | | | |



| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Project: Christchurch 2011 Earthquake - EQC Ground Investigations | | | | Page: 1 of 1 | | CPT-BRY-21 | |
| Test Date: 21-Jun-2011 | | Location: Bromley | | Operator: Geotech | |   | |
| Pre-Drill: 1.2m | | Assumed GWL: 2mBGL | | Located By: Survey GPS | | | |
| Position: 2485012.3mE | | 5741737.6mN | | 5.08mRL | | | |
| | | | | Coord. System: NZMG & MSL | | | |
| Other Tests: | | | | Comments: | | | |





12. Appendix C – Geotechnical Investigation Summary



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

| ID | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Type * | | BH | CPT | CPT | CPT | BH |
| Ref | | M35 - 1898 | BRY - 20 | BRY - 08 | BRY - 21 | M35 - 1869 |
| Depth (m) | | 90.5 | 16.5 | 32 | 32 | 60.3 |
| Distance from site (m) | | 0** | 50 | 90 | 0** | 20 |
| Ground water level (mBGL) | | Artesian | 0.8 | 2 | 2 | Artesian |
| Simplified recorded geological profile (depth below ground level to top of stratum, m) | 0 | | VS | N/A | N/A | |
| | 1 | | L | L | MD | |
| | 2 | | MD | So | MD | |
| | 3 | | MD | MD | MD | |
| | 4 | | D | MD | MD | |
| | 5 | | D | L | MD | |
| | 6 | | D | MD | MD | |
| | 7 | | D | MD | D | |
| | 8 | | D | D | D | |
| | 9 | | D | D | D | |
| | 10 | | D | D | D | |
| | 11 | | D | D | | |
| | 12 | | D | D | | |
| | 13 | | VD | D | | |
| | 14 | | VD | D | | |
| | 15 | | VD | VD | | |
| | 16 | | VD | VD | | |
| | 17 | | | VD | | |
| | 18 | | | VD | | |
| | 19 | | | VD | | |
| | 20 | | | VD | | |
| | 21 | | | VD | | |
| | 22 | | | VD | | |
| | 23 | | | VD | | |
| | 24 | | | VD | | |
| | 25 | | | VD | | |
| Greater depths | | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

ZB01276.043-CCC-PRK_0895_BLDG_008 EQ2-Ruru Lawn Cemetery-2012-03-19-RevA.docx