



Walter Park Pavilion Toilets  
Qualitative Engineering Evaluation

**Reference:** 229183  
**Prepared for:**  
Christchurch City Council

Functional Location ID: PRK 0644 BLDG 001 EQ2

Address: 91 Kellys Road, Christchurch

**Revision:** 2

**Date:** 16 October 2012

# Document Control Record

Document prepared by:


Aurecon New Zealand Limited  
 Unit 1, 150 Cavendish Road  
 Casebrook Christchurch 8051  
 PO Box 1061  
 Christchurch 8140  
 New Zealand

**T** +64 3 375 0761  
**F** +64 3 379 6955  
**E** christchurch@aurecongroup.com  
**W** aurecongroup.com

A person using Aurecon documents or data accepts the risk of:

- a) Using the documents or data in electronic form without requesting and checking them for accuracy against the original hard copy version.
- b) Using the documents or data for any purpose not agreed to in writing by Aurecon.

Document control				aurecon		
<b>Report Title</b>		Qualitative Engineering Evaluation				
<b>Functional Location ID</b>		<b>PRK 0644 BLDG 001 EQ2</b>	<b>Project Number</b>		229183	
<b>File Path</b>		P:\ 229183 - Walter Park Pavilion Toilets.docx				
<b>Client</b>		Christchurch City Council		<b>Client Contact</b>		Michael Sheffield
<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Revision Details/Status</b>	<b>Prepared</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Verifier</b>	<b>Approver</b>
1	29 August 2012	Draft	R. So-Beer	R. So-Beer	L. Howard	L. Howard
2	16 October 2012	Final	R. So-Beer	R. So-Beer	L. Castillo	L. Howard
<b>Current Revision</b>		2				

Approval			
<b>Author Signature</b>			
<b>Approver Signature</b>			
<b>Name</b>	Rose So-Beer	<b>Name</b>	Lee Howard
<b>Title</b>	Structural Engineer	<b>Title</b>	Senior Structural Engineer



# Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 General	2
<b>2 Description of the Building</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Building Age and Configuration	2
2.2 Building Structural Systems Vertical and Horizontal	2
2.3 Reference Building Type	2
2.4 Building Foundation System and Soil Conditions	3
2.5 Available Structural Documentation and Inspection Priorities	3
2.6 Available Survey Information	3
<b>3 Structural Investigation</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Summary of Building Damage	3
3.2 Record of Intrusive Investigation	3
3.3 Damage Discussion	3
<b>4 Building Review Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Building Review Statement	3
4.2 Critical Structural Weaknesses	4
<b>5 Building Strength (Refer to Appendix C for background information)</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1 General	4
5.2 Initial %NBS Assessment	4
5.3 Results Discussion	5
<b>6 Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7 Explanatory Statement</b>	<b>5</b>

## Appendices

**Appendix A Site Map and Photos**

**Appendix B References**

**Appendix C Strength Assessment Explanation**

**Appendix D Background and Legal Framework**

**Appendix E Standard Reporting Spread Sheet**

# Executive Summary

This is a summary of the Qualitative Engineering Evaluation for the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets building and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document issued by the Engineering Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, visual inspections, available structural documentation and summary calculations as appropriate.

Building Details		Name				Walter Park Pavilion Toilets			
Building Location ID	PRK 0644 BLDG 001 EQ2				Multiple Building Site	Y			
Building Address	91 Kellys Road, Christchurch				No. of residential units	0			
Soil Technical Category	N/A	Importance Level	2		Approximate Year Built	1995			
Foot Print (m <sup>2</sup> )	120	Storeys above ground	1		Storeys below ground	0			
Type of Construction	Light timber truss roof, metal profiled roofing, concrete blockwork walls, concrete floor slab on grade with strip footings.								
Qualitative L4 Report Results Summary									
Building Occupied	Y	The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is currently in use.							
Suitable for Continued Occupancy	Y	The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is suitable for continued occupation.							
Key Damage Summary	Y	Refer to summary of building damage Section 3.1 report body.							
Critical Structural Weaknesses (CSW)	N	No critical structural weaknesses were identified.							
Levels Survey Results	N	Level survey is not required for this structure.							
Building %NBS From Analysis	>100%	Based on an analysis of bracing capacity and demand.							
Qualitative L4 Report Recommendations									
Geotechnical Survey Required	N	Geotechnical survey not required due to lack of observed ground damage on site.							
Proceed to L5 Quantitative DEE	N	A quantitative DEE is not required for this structure.							
Approval									
Author Signature				Approver Signature					
Name	Rose So-Beer			Name	Lee Howard				
Title	Structural Engineer			Title	Senior Structural Engineer				



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 General

On 17 May 2012 Aurecon engineers visited the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets to carry out a qualitative building damage assessment on behalf of Christchurch City Council. Detailed visual inspections were carried out to assess the damage caused by the earthquakes on 4 September 2010, 22 February 2011, 13 June 2011, 23 December 2011 and related aftershocks.

The scope of work included:

- Assessment of the nature and extent of the building damage.
- Visual assessment of the building strength particularly with respect to safety of occupants if the building is currently occupied.
- Assessment of requirements for detailed engineering evaluation including geotechnical investigation, level survey and any areas where linings and floor coverings need removal to expose structural damage.

This report outlines the results of our Qualitative Assessment of damage to the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, visual inspections, available structural documentation and summary calculations as appropriate.

## 2 Description of the Building

### 2.1 Building Age and Configuration

Built circa 1995, Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is a single storey concrete masonry building. It has timber truss roof with profiled metal roof sheeting supported on timber purlins. The external and internal walls are reinforced concrete blockwork. The building has a concrete floor slab on grade with, we assume, local strip footing under the load bearing walls. Approximately one-third of the length of the building is used as toilets and the remainder is used as a storage area.

The approximate floor area of the building is 120 square metres. It is an importance level 2 structure in accordance with NZS 1170 Part 0:2002.

### 2.2 Building Structural Systems Vertical and Horizontal

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is a very simple structure. Its light timber framed roof is supported on load bearing concrete blockwork walls that transfer loads to the strip footings. Lateral loads are also resisted by the concrete blockwork walls in both directions.

### 2.3 Reference Building Type

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is a blockwork building typical of its age and style. It was not subjected to specific engineering design; rather it was constructed to a reliable formula known to achieve the performance and aesthetic objectives of the time it was built.



## 2.4 Building Foundation System and Soil Conditions

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets has a concrete floor slab on grade with, we assume, local strip foundation under the load bearing walls.

The land and surrounds of Walter Park Pavilion Toilets are zoned TC2 which means that minor to moderate land damage from liquefaction is possible in future significant earthquakes. However, there are no signs in the vicinity of Walter Park Pavilion Toilets of liquefaction bulges or boils and subsidence.

## 2.5 Available Structural Documentation and Inspection Priorities

No architectural or structural drawings were available for the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets for review. This report is solely based on internal and external visual inspections undertaken on 17 May 2012.

## 2.6 Available Survey Information

No floor level or verticality survey information was available at the time of this report and obtaining these is not required as part of the DEE process for this type of building.

# 3 Structural Investigation

## 3.1 Summary of Building Damage

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets was in use at the time the damage assessment was carried out. It has performed well with no structural damage noted from the recent seismic events.

## 3.2 Record of Intrusive Investigation

No damage was noted and therefore, an intrusive investigation was neither warranted nor undertaken for the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets.

## 3.3 Damage Discussion

There was no observed damage to the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets as a result of seismic actions. Buildings of this nature have a high bracing capacity due to the number and configuration of the walls.

# 4 Building Review Summary

## 4.1 Building Review Statement

As noted above no intrusive investigations were carried out for the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets. Because of the generic nature of the building a significant amount of information can be inferred from an external and internal inspection.

## 4.2 Critical Structural Weaknesses

No specific critical structural weaknesses were identified as part of the building qualitative assessment.

# 5 Building Strength (Refer to Appendix C for background information)

## 5.1 General

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is a typical example of its generic toilet block built from concrete blockwork walls with a light weight roof supported by timber trusses. It is of a type of building that, due to its high bracing capacity, has typically performed well. The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is not an exception to this. It has performed well and there is no damage to the building related to the recent seismic activity.

## 5.2 Initial %NBS Assessment

The Walter Park Pavilion Toilets has not been subject to specific engineering design and the initial evaluation procedure or IEP is not an appropriate method of assessment for this building. Nevertheless an estimate of lateral load capacity can be made by adopting assumed values for strengths of existing materials and calculating the capacity of existing walls.

Selected assessment seismic parameters are tabulated in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Parameters used in the Seismic Assessment

Seismic Parameter	Quantity	Comment/Reference
Site Soil Class	D	NZS 1170.5:2004, Clause 3.1.3, Deep or Soft Soil
Site Hazard Factor, Z	0.30	DBH Info Sheet on Seismicity Changes (Effective 19 May 2011).
Return period Factor, $R_u$	1.00	NZS 1170.5:2004, Table 3.5. Importance Level 2 structure with a 50 year design life
Ductility Factor in Transverse Direction, $\mu$	1.25	Concrete blockwork walls
Ductility Factor in Longitudinal Direction, $\mu$	1.25	Concrete blockwork walls

The seismic demand for the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets has been calculated based on the current code requirements of NZS 1170.5:2004. The capacity of the existing walls in the building was calculated from assumed strengths of existing materials and the number and length of walls present for both transverse and longitudinal directions. The seismic demand was then compared with the building capacity (based on NZS4229:1999) in these directions. The building was found to have a sufficient number and length of walls in both transverse and longitudinal directions to achieve a capacity greater than **100% NBS**.



### 5.3 Results Discussion

Basic analysis shows that the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is capable of achieving seismic performance in line with the current code requirements. The results from the assessment of a single storey construction like that of Walter Park Pavilion Toilets that produces a low seismic demand which when combined with well distributed walls providing seismic resistance produces a structure with good seismic performance.

## 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

The land below the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets is zoned as TC2 and as such minor to moderate land damage from liquefaction is possible in future significant earthquakes. Additionally there is no local evidence of settlement and liquefaction in the surrounding land. Therefore, **a geotechnical investigation is currently not considered necessary.**

The building is currently in use and in our opinion the Walter Park Pavilion Toilets **is suitable for continued use.**

## 7 Explanatory Statement

The inspections of the building discussed in this report have been undertaken to assess structural earthquake damage. No analysis has been undertaken to assess the strength of the building or to determine whether or not it complies with the relevant building codes, except to the extent that Aurecon expressly indicates otherwise in the report. Aurecon has not made any assessment of structural stability or building safety in connection with future aftershocks or earthquakes – which have the potential to damage the building and to jeopardise the safety of those either inside or adjacent to the building, except to the extent that Aurecon expressly indicates otherwise in the report.

This report is necessarily limited by the restricted ability to carry out inspections due to potential structural instabilities/safety considerations, and the time available to carry out such inspections. The report does not address defects that are not reasonably discoverable on visual inspection, including defects in inaccessible places and latent defects. Where site inspections were made, they were restricted to external inspections and, where practicable, limited internal visual inspections.

To carry out the structural review, existing building drawings were obtained from the Christchurch City Council records. We have assumed that the building has been constructed in accordance with the drawings.

While this report may assist the client in assessing whether the building should be repaired, strengthened, or replaced that decision is the sole responsibility of the client.

This review has been prepared by Aurecon at the request of its client and is exclusively for the client's use. It is not possible to make a proper assessment of this review 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 Aurecon. The report will 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, Aurecon's liability, whether under the law of contract, tort, statute, equity or otherwise, is limited as set out in the terms of the engagement with the client.

# Appendices



# Appendix A

## Site Map and Photos

### 17 May 2012 – Walter Park Pavilion Toilets Site Photographs

Southern view of the building.



Southwest view of the building.



Northeast view of the building.



Typical timber truss detail.



Internal view of the toilets.



Typical view of the entrance to the toilet.



# Appendix B

## References

1. Department of Building and Housing (DBH), "Revised Guidance on Repairing and Rebuilding Houses Affected by the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence", November 2011
2. New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE), "Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes", April 2012
3. Standards New Zealand, "AS/NZS 1170 Part 0, Structural Design Actions: General Principles", 2002
4. Standards New Zealand, "AS/NZS 1170 Part 1, Structural Design Actions: Permanent, imposed and other actions", 2002
5. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 1170 Part 5, Structural Design Actions: Earthquake Actions – New Zealand", 2004
6. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 3101 Part 1, The Design of Concrete Structures", 2006
7. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 3404 Part 1, Steel Structures Standard", 1997
8. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 3606, Timber Structures Standard", 1993
9. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 3604, Timber Framed Structures", 2011
10. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 4229, Concrete Masonry Buildings Not Requiring Specific Engineering Design", 1999
11. Standards New Zealand, "NZS 4230, Design of Reinforced Concrete Masonry Structures", 2004

# Appendix C

## Strength Assessment Explanation

### New building standard (NBS)

New building standard (NBS) is the term used with reference to the earthquake standard that would apply to a new building of similar type and use if the building was designed to meet the latest design Codes of Practice. If the strength of a building is less than this level, then its strength is expressed as a percentage of NBS.

### Earthquake Prone Buildings

A building can be considered to be earthquake prone if its strength is less than one third of the strength to which an equivalent new building would be designed, that is, less than 33%NBS (as defined by the New Zealand Building Act). If the building strength exceeds 33%NBS but is less than 67%NBS the building is considered at risk.

### Christchurch City Council Earthquake Prone Building Policy 2010

The Christchurch City Council (CCC) already had in place an Earthquake Prone Building Policy (EPB Policy) requiring all earthquake-prone buildings to be strengthened within a timeframe varying from 15 to 30 years. The level to which the buildings were required to be strengthened was 33%NBS.

As a result of the 4 September 2010 Canterbury earthquake the CCC raised the level that a building was required to be strengthened to from 33% to 67% NBS but qualified this as a target level and noted that the actual strengthening level for each building will be determined in conjunction with the owners on a building-by-building basis. Factors that will be taken into account by the Council in determining the strengthening level include the cost of strengthening, the use to which the building is put, the level of danger posed by the building, and the extent of damage and repair involved.

Irrespective of strengthening level, the threshold level that triggers a requirement to strengthen is 33%NBS.

As part of any building consent application fire and disabled access provisions will need to be assessed.

### Christchurch Seismicity

The level of seismicity within the current New Zealand loading code (AS/NZS 1170) is related to the seismic zone factor. The zone factor varies depending on the location of the building within NZ. Prior to the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011 earthquake the zone factor for Christchurch was 0.22. Following the earthquake the seismic zone factor (level of seismicity) in the Christchurch and surrounding areas has been increased to 0.3. This is a 36% increase.

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 building's 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 C1 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	Unacceptable	Not recommended. Acceptable only in exceptional circumstances
High Risk Building	D or E	High	33 or lower	Unacceptable (Improvement	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

Figure C1: NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE Guidelines

Table C1 below compares the percentage NBS to the relative risk of the building failing in a seismic event with a 10% probability 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% probability of exceedance in the next year.

Table C1: Relative Risk of Building Failure In A

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

# Appendix D

## Background and Legal Framework

### Background

Aurecon has been engaged by the Christchurch City Council (CCC) to undertake a detailed engineering evaluation of the building

This report is a Qualitative Assessment of the building structure, and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011.

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).

At the time of this report, no intrusive site investigation, detailed analysis, or modelling of the building structure had been carried out. Construction drawings were made available, and these have been considered in our evaluation of the building. The building description below is based on a review of the drawings and our visual inspections.

### 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.

### 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

## 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 any 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)) 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### **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.

## **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;
- 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.

## **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:

- Hazard Factor increased from 0.22 to 0.3 (36% increase in the basic seismic design load)
- 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.

# Appendix E

## Standard Reporting Spread Sheet

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data

V1.1.1

<b>Location</b>		Building Name: Walter Park Pavilion Toilet	Reviewer: Lee Howard
Building Address: 91 Kellys Road	Unit: 172	Company: Aurecon	CPEng No: 1008889
Legal Description: Lot 1 DP Plan 78544		Company project number: 229183	Company phone number: 03 375 0761
GPS south: 43	Degrees Min Sec: 29 37.70	Date of submission: August	Inspection Date: 17/05/2012
GPS east: 172	38 49.81	Revision: 1	Is there a full report with this summary? <b>yes</b>
Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRK 0644 BLDG 001 EQ2			

<b>Site</b>	Site slope: flat	Max retaining height (m):
	Soil type: mixed	Soil Profile (if available):
	Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D	
	Proximity to waterway (m, if < 100m):	
	Proximity to cliff top (m, if < 100m):	
	Proximity to cliff base (m, if < 100m):	Approx site elevation (m): 0.00

<b>Building</b>	No. of storeys above ground: 1	single storey = 1
	Ground floor split? no	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): 0.00
	Storeys below ground:	Ground floor elevation above ground (m): 0.00
	Foundation type: strip footings	if Foundation type is other, describe:
	Building height (m): 4.80	height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):
	Floor footprint area (approx): 120	Date of design: 1992-2004
	Age of Building (years): 17	
	Strengthening present? no	If so, when (year)?
	Use (ground floor): public	And what load level (%)?
	Use (upper floors):	Brief strengthening description:
	Use notes (if required): toilets	
	Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2	

<b>Gravity Structure</b>	Gravity System: load bearing walls	truss depth, purlin type and cladding: timber purlins
	Roof: timber truss	
	Floors:	
	Beams:	
	Columns:	thickness (mm): 150
	Walls: partially filled concrete masonry	

<b>Lateral load resisting structure</b>	Lateral system along: partially filled CMU	Note: Define along and across in detailed report! enter height above at H31
	Ductility assumed, $\mu$ : 1.25	note total length of wall at ground (m):
	Period along: 0.40	estimate or calculation? <b>estimated</b>
	Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	estimate or calculation?
	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):	estimate or calculation?

7.8

note total length of wall at ground (m):  
estimate or calculation?  
estimate or calculation?  
estimate or calculation?

partially filled CMU  
1.25  
0.40  
##### enter height above at H31

Lateral system across:  
Ductility assumed,  $\mu$ :  
Period across:  
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):  
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):

**Separations:**

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

**Non-structural elements**

Stairs: exposed structure  
Wall cladding: Metal  
Roof Cladding: Metal  
Glazing: plaster, fixed  
Ceilings: plaster, fixed  
Services(list):

describe  
describe  
concrete masonry 15 series block  
profiled metal sheeting

**Available documentation**

Architectural: none  
Structural: none  
Mechanical: none  
Electrical: none  
Geotech report: none

original designer name/date  
original designer name/date  
original designer name/date  
original designer name/date

**Damage**

Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)

Site performance: Good

Settlement: none observed  
Differential settlement: none observed  
Liquefaction: none apparent  
Lateral Spread: none apparent  
Differential lateral spread: none apparent  
Ground cracks: none apparent  
Damage to area: none apparent

Describe damage:  
notes (if applicable):  
notes (if applicable):  
notes (if applicable):  
notes (if applicable):  
notes (if applicable):

**Building:**

Current Placard Status:

Damage ratio: 0%  
Describe (summary):

Damage ratio: 0%  
Describe (summary):

Diaphragms

CSW s:

Pounding:

Non-structural:

Damage?: no  
Damage?: no  
Damage?: no  
Damage?: no

Describe how damage ratio arrived at:

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

Describe:  
Describe:  
Describe:  
Describe:

**Recommendations**

Level of repair/strengthening required:	none
Building Consent required:	no
Interim occupancy recommendations:	full occupancy
Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	100%
Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	100%
Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	100%
Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	100%

Describe:	
Describe:	
Describe:	

0% %NBS from IEP below

If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology:

based on calculations

0% %NBS from IEP below

**IEP**

**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): 1992-2004

$h_n$  from above: m

Seismic Zone, if designed between 1965 and 1992:

Design Soil type from NZS4203:1992, cl 4.6.2.2:

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

along 0.4 across 0.4

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)

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

along 0% across 0%

**2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor**

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

along 1.00 across 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**:

0.30  
0.8  
2.666666667

**2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor**

Building Importance level (from above):  
Return Period Scaling factor from Table 3.1, **Factor C**:

2

**2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor**

Assessed ductility (less than max in Table 3.2)  
Ductility scaling factor: =1 from 1976 onwards, or = $k_{du}$ , if pre-1976, from Table 3.3:

along 1.00 across 1.00

**2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor:**

Ductility Scaling Factor, **Factor D**: 1.00  
Sp: 1.000  
Structural Performance Scaling Factor **Factor E**: 1

1.00  
1.000  
1

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

0%

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**

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

**Table for Selection of D2**

Separation	Severe	Significant	Insignificant/none
Height difference > 4 storeys	0 < sep < .005H	.005 < sep < .01H	Sep > .01H
Height difference 2 to 4 storeys	0.4	0.7	1
Height difference < 2 storeys	0.7	0.9	1
	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

Along	Across
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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)

4.3 PAR x (%NBS)b:

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



**Aurecon New Zealand Limited  
Unit 1, 150 Cavendish Road  
Casebrook Christchurch 8051**

PO Box 1061  
Christchurch 8140  
New Zealand

**T** +64 3 375 0761

**F** +64 3 379 6955

**E** [christchurch@aurecongroup.com](mailto:christchurch@aurecongroup.com)

**W** [aurecongroup.com](http://aurecongroup.com)

Aurecon offices are located in:  
Angola, Australia, Botswana, China,  
Ethiopia, Hong Kong, Indonesia,  
Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mozambique,  
Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria,  
Philippines, Singapore, South Africa,  
Swaziland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda,  
United Arab Emirates, Vietnam.