Christchurch City Council

MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex PRO 0921

Detailed Engineering Evaluation

Quantitative Assessment Report

OPUS

Christchurch City Council

MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex

Quantitative Assessment Report

140 Ensors Road, Waltham,

Prepared By

Andrew Sawers
Building Technologist

Reviewed By

Lachlan Howat
Structural Engineer

Approved for Release By

Mary Ann Halliday
Senior Structural Engineer

Opus International Consultants Ltd
Christchurch Office

20 Moorhouse Avenue
PO Box 1482, Christchurch Mail Centre, Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 3 363 5400
Facsimile: +64 3 365 7858

Date: March 2014
Reference: 6-QC374.00
Status: Final

Summary

MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex
PRO 0921

Detailed Engineering Evaluation
Quantitative Report - Summary
Final

Background

This is a summary of the quantitative report for the MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex, and is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011. This assessment covers the 24 residential units on the site.

Key Damage Observed

The residential units suffered minor damage to non-structural elements. This included cracking of interior wall and ceiling linings. Structural damage to the residential units was generally minor and was limited to some minor hairline cracking of some exterior concrete wall panels. This damage is deemed not to affect the seismic capacity of the structure. The cracking requires repair to avoid corrosion of the steel reinforcing bars.

Level Survey

All floor slopes assessed were less than the 5mm/m limitation set out in the MBIE guidelines [6].

Critical Structural Weaknesses

No critical structural weaknesses were found in any of the buildings.

Indicative Building Strength

Table A: Summary of Seismic Performance by Blocks

Block	NBS%	Floor Levels
PRO 0921 B001 (Block A)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B002 (Block B)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B003 (Block C)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B004 (Block D)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B005 (Block E)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B006 (Block F)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B007 (Block G)	90%	Pass
PRO 0921 B008 (Block H - Garage)	70%	Pass
PRO 0921 B009 (Block I - Garage)	70%	Pass
PRO 0921 B010 (Block J - Garage)	70%	Pass

PRO 0921 B011 (Block K - Garage)	70%	Pass
PRO 0921 B012 (Block L - Garage)	70%	Pass
PRO 0921 B013 (Block M - Garage)	70%	Pass
PRO 0921 B014 (Shed)	90%	Pass

No buildings on the site are considered to be earthquake prone.

The residential units (Blocks A – G) and the shed have capacities of 90% NBS, as limited by the out of plane capacity of the reinforced concrete panel walls. They are deemed to be a 'low risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines.

The garages (Blocks H – M, both timber framed and concrete panel) have capacities of less than 70% NBS, as limited by the capacity of the circular steel poles in bending. They are deemed to be a 'low risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines.

Recommendations
It is recommended that;

- Exterior cracking to the concrete panels be repaired to prevent corrosion of the reinforcement.
- Cosmetic repairs be undertaken as required.
- Header tanks in the ceiling be secured.

Contents

1 Introduction

Opus International Consultants Limited has been engaged by Christchurch City Council to undertake a detailed seismic assessment of the MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex, located at 140 Ensors Road, Waltham, following the Canterbury earthquake sequence since September 2010. The site was visited by Opus International Consultants on 9 October 2013.

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

The seismic assessment and reporting have been undertaken based on the qualitative and quantitative procedures detailed in the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure (DEEP) document (draft) issued by the Structural Engineering Society (SESOC) [2] [3] [4] [5].

2 Compliance

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

2.1 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)

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

Section 38 – Works

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

Section 51 – Requiring Structural Survey

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

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

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

1. The importance level and occupancy of the building.

2. The placard status and amount of damage.

3. The age and structural type of the building.

4. Consideration of any critical structural weaknesses.

Christchurch City Council requires any building with a capacity of less than 34% of New Building Standard (including consideration of critical structural weaknesses) to be strengthened to a target of 67% as required under the CCC Earthquake Prone Building Policy.

2.2 Building Act

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

Section 112 - Alterations

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

The Earthquake Prone Building policy for the territorial authority shall apply as outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Section 115 – Change of Use

This section requires that the territorial authority is satisfied that the building with a new use complies with the relevant sections of the Building Code 'as near as is reasonably practicable'.

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

Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

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

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

Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings

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

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

Section 124 – Powers of Territorial Authorities

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

Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy

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

2.3 Christchurch City Council Policy

Christchurch City Council adopted their Earthquake Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Building Policy in October 2011 following the Darfield Earthquake on 4 September 2010.

The policy includes the following:

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

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

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

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

Where an application for a change of use of a building is made to Council, the building will be required to be strengthened to 67% of New Building Standard or as near as is reasonably practicable.

2.4 Building Code

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

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

- Increase in the basic seismic design load for the Canterbury earthquake region (Z factor increased to 0.3 equating to an increase of 36 – 47% depending on location within the region);
- Increased serviceability requirements.

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

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

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

1.1 Giving Priority to the safety and well-being of the community and having regard to this principle in assessing obligations to clients, employers and colleagues.

1.2 Ensuring that responsible steps are taken to minimise the risk of loss of life, injury or suffering which may result from your engineering activities, either directly or indirectly.

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

3 Earthquake Resistance Standards

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

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

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

Figure 1: NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE Guidelines [2]

Table 1 below compares the percentage NBS to the relative risk of the building failing in a seismic event with a 10% risk of exceedance in 50 years (i.e. 0.2% in the next year).

Table 1: %NBS compared to relative risk of failure

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

3.1 Minimum and Recommended Standards

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

3.1.1 Occupancy

The Canterbury Earthquake Order[1] in Council 16 September 2010, modified the meaning of "dangerous building" to include buildings that were identified as being EPB's. As a result of this, we would expect such a building would be issued with a Section 124 notice, by the Territorial Authority, or CERA acting on their behalf, once they are made aware of our assessment. Based on information received from CERA to date and from the MBIE guidance document dated December 2012 [6], this notice is likely to prohibit occupancy of the building (or parts thereof), until its seismic capacity is improved to the point that it is no longer considered an EPB.

3.1.2 Cordoning

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

3.1.3 Strengthening

Industry guidelines (NZSEE 2006 [2]) strongly recommend that every effort be made to achieve improvement to at least 67%NBS. A strengthening solution to anything less than 67%NBS would not provide an adequate reduction to the level of risk.

It should be noted that full compliance with the current building code requires building strength of 100%NBS.

3.1.4 Our Ethical Obligation

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

[1] This Order only applies to buildings within the Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District Councils authority.

4 Background Information

4.1 Building Descriptions

The site contains 24 residential units which were constructed in 1976. A site plan showing the location of the units, numbered 1 to 24, is shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 shows the location of the site in Christchurch City. The units are grouped together to form blocks of two, three or four units.



Figure 2: Site plan of MacKenzie Avenue Housing Complex.

Figure 3: Location of site relative to Christchurch City CBD (Source: Google Earth).

The residential units have concrete panel walls which are painted externally. The walls and ceilings are lined with plasterboard internally. The roof structure comprises of timber roof framing supporting light-weight metal roofs. Foundations are strip footings under fire walls and around the perimeter of reinforced concrete slabs with 250mm diameter concrete piles reinforced with a #12 rod and tied to the element directly above them (either the floor slab or ground beam depending on the location). The ground beams are not tied to the concrete slabs. The units are separated by 120mm concrete panel fire walls.

The two car garages (Blocks H, I, J, L & M) are timber-framed buildings. The roof structure comprises of timber roof trusses, posts and beams which support light-weight metal roofs. The walls and ceilings are unlined. External walls are clad with fibrous cement sheeting. Foundations consist of a concrete slab.

The larger garages (Block K) have concrete panel walls of similar construction to the residential units, and timber and steel posts. The roof structure comprises of timber roof trusses supporting a light timber roof.

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show typical floor plans of 1 and 2 bedroom residential units while Figure 7 shows a garage bay produced from site measurements by Opus. Figure 6 shows a cross section used in calculations.

There is a small tilt panel shed on site. This is of identical construction to the residential units.



Figure 4: Typical floor plan of 1 bedroom residential unit.



Figure 5: Typical floor plan of 2 bedroom residential unit.



Figure 6: Cross section.



Figure 7: Typical plan of garage block.

4.2 Survey

4.2.1 Post 22 February 2011 Rapid Assessment

A structural (Level 2) assessment of the buildings/property was undertaken on 7 March 2011 by Opus International Consultants.

4.2.2 Level Survey

A full level survey was not deemed to be necessary at MacKenzie Courts as it is located in a TC2 zone. Properties in TC2 zones suffered minor to moderate damage due to liquefaction and/or settlement. In lieu of a full level survey, a laser level was placed in each unit so that differentials in vertical levels could be measured at the extreme ends of the unit. These values could then be used to determine the floor slope of the entire unit. For this site, all floor slopes were less than the 5mm/m limitation imposed by MBIE.

Table 2: Summary of the Level Survey

Block	Unit No.	Comment	Maximum Fall*
A	1	Pass	
	2	Pass	
	3	Pass	
B	4	Pass	
	5	Pass	
C	6	Pass	
	7	Pass	
	8	Pass	
	9	Pass	
D	10	Pass	
	11	Pass	
	12	Pass	
E	13	Pass	
	14	Pass	
	15	Pass	
	16	Pass	
	17	Pass	
F	18	Pass	
	19	Pass	
	20	Pass	
G	21	Pass	
	22	Pass	
	23	Pass	
	24	Pass	

* Values are only recorded if greater than 5mm/m

4.3 Original Documentation

Copies of the following construction drawings were provided by CCC:

- Bill Lovell-Smith, Sullivan & Associates – Community Housing – 24 units – p. 1-9/9 – Site; Plan A Elevations; Plan B Elevations; Block Elevations; Section A-A; Section B-B; Details; Garage Plans and Elevations; Water Reticulation Plan – 1975.
- D.1893 – Christchurch City Council – Ensors Road Community Housing – p. 1-2/2 – Access Road, Car Parks & Paths; Sanitary Sewer & Storm Water Details – 1975.
- 1604 – Bill Lovell-Smith, Sullivan & Associates – Ensors Road – p. 1-6/6 – Precast Concrete Wall Panel Location Plan; Details; Panel Details; Precast Concrete Wall Panels; Garages Plans and Details; Typical Foundation Plan Showing Pile Locations - 1975.

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

Copies of the design calculations were not provided.

5 Damage

This section outlines the damage to the buildings that was observed during site visits. It is not intended to be a complete summary of the damage sustained by the buildings due to the earthquakes. Some forms of damage may not be able to be identified with a visual inspection only.

It is noticeable that none of the residential unit blocks, and individual units, have suffered any significant damage.

Note: Any photo referenced in this section can be found in Appendix A.

5.1 Residual Displacements

The results of the level survey indicate that no significant ground settlement has occurred due to the earthquakes.

5.2 Foundations

Foundation damage was not observed in any of the buildings.

5.3 Primary Gravity Structure

Minor cracking on the exterior concrete wall panels was observed on some units (photo 9). No damage was evident in the roof structure. This damage is deemed minor and not to affect the seismic capacity of the gravity structure.

5.4 Primary Lateral-Resistance Structure

Minimal cracking of plasterboard ceiling diaphragms and wall linings was observed in the units (photo 11). This form of damage is common throughout the units. This damage is deemed minor and not to affect the seismic capacity of the lateral resistance structure.

5.5 Non Structural Elements

Cracking of the exterior cladding of the garages was observed. Splitting between the interior wall linings and the precast panels was commonly observed.

Unsecured plastic header tanks were observed in the ceiling spaces.

5.6 General Observations

The buildings appeared to have performed reasonably well, as would be expected for buildings of this type, during the earthquakes. They have suffered distributed amounts of minor damage which is typical of the construction type and age of construction.

6 Detailed Seismic Assessment

The detailed seismic assessment has been based on the NZSEE 2006 [2] guidelines for the "Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes" together with the "Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Part 2 Evaluation Procedure" [3] draft document prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, and the SESOC guidelines "Practice Note – Design of Conventional Structural Systems Following Canterbury Earthquakes" [5] issued on 21 December 2011.

As the residential units have the same floor plan, the analysis was simplified by conducting the analysis of one multi-unit block with similar cladding and using this for all multi-unit blocks.

6.1 Critical Structural Weaknesses

The term Critical Structural Weakness (CSW) refers to a component of a building that could contribute to increased levels of damage or cause premature collapse of a building.

No CSWs were identified in the buildings.

6.2 Quantitative Assessment Methodology

The assessment assumptions and methodology have been included in Appendix B. A brief summary follows:

Hand calculations were performed to determine seismic forces from the current building codes. These forces were applied globally to the structure and the capacities of the walls were calculated and used to estimate the %NBS. The walls, highlighted in Figure 8 and Figure 9, were used for bracing in their respective directions.



Figure 8: Walls used for bracing in the longitudinal direction.



Figure 9: Walls used for bracing in the transverse direction, single bedroom unit.



Figure 10: Walls used for bracing in the longitudinal direction, 2 bedroom unit.



Figure 11: Walls used for bracing in the transverse direction, 2 bedroom unit.

6.3 Limitations and Assumptions in Results

The observed level of damage suffered by the buildings was deemed low enough to not affect their capacity. Therefore the analysis and assessment of the buildings was based on them being in an undamaged state. There may have been damage to the buildings that was unable to be observed that could cause the capacity of the buildings to be reduced; therefore the current capacity of the buildings may be lower than that stated.

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

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

6.4 Assessment

A summary of the structural performance of the buildings is shown in Table 3. Note that the values given represent the worst performing elements in the building, where these effectively define the building's capacity. Other elements within the building may have significantly greater capacity when compared with the governing elements.

Table 3: Summary of Seismic Performance

Building Description	Critical element	% NBS based on calculated capacity in longitudinal direction	% NBS based on calculated capacity in transverse direction.
Residential Units (Blocks A – G) and Shed	Capacity of the precast concrete panels	90%	90%
Timber Framed Garages (Blocks H, I, J, L & M)	Circular steel poles in bending	70%	70%
Concrete Panel Garages (Block K)	Circular steel poles in bending	70%	100%

7 Geotechnical Summary

CERA indicates that MacKenzie Courts is located in TC2 zone (as shown in Figure 12). This classification suggests future significant earthquakes will cause minor to moderate land damage due to liquefaction and settlement.

Figure 12: CERA Technical Categories map (loc. starred).

There is no evidence to suggest that further geotechnical investigation is warranted for this site.

8 Conclusions

- None of the buildings on site are considered to be Earthquake Prone.
- The residential units (Blocks A – G) and the shed have capacities of 90% NBS, as limited by the out of plane capacity of the reinforced concrete panel walls. They are deemed to be a 'low risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines. Their level of risk is 1-2 times that of a 100% NBS building (Figure 1).
- The garages (Blocks H – M, both timber framed and concrete panel) have capacities of less than 70% NBS, as limited by the capacity of the steel poles in bending. They are deemed to be a 'low risk' in a design seismic event according to NZSEE guidelines. Their level of risk is 2-5 times that of a 100% NBS building (Figure 1).

9 Recommendations

It is recommended that;

- Exterior cracking to the concrete panels be repaired to prevent corrosion of the reinforcement.
- Cosmetic repairs be undertaken as required.
- Header tanks in the ceiling be secured.

10 Limitations

- This report is based on an inspection of the buildings and focuses on the structural damage resulting from the Canterbury Earthquake sequence since September 2010. Some non-structural damage may be described but this is not intended to be a complete list of damage to non-structural items.
- Our professional services are performed using a degree of care and skill normally exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable consultants practicing in this field at this time.
- This report is prepared for the Christchurch City Council to assist in the assessment of any remedial works required for the MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex. It is not intended for any other party or purpose.

11 References

[1] NZS 1170.5: 2004, Structural design actions, Part 5 Earthquake actions, Standards New Zealand.

[2] NZSEE (2006), Assessment and improvement of the structural performance of buildings in earthquakes, New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering.

[3] Engineering Advisory Group, Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury, Part 2 Evaluation Procedure, Draft Prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group, Revision 5, 19 July 2011.

[4] Engineering Advisory Group, *Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Non-residential buildings, Part 3 Technical Guidance*, Draft Prepared by the Engineering Advisory Group, 13 December 2011.

[5] SESOC (2011), Practice Note – Design of Conventional Structural Systems Following Canterbury Earthquakes, Structural Engineering Society of New Zealand, 21 December 2011.

[6] MBIE (2012), Repairing and rebuilding houses affected by the Canterbury earthquakes, Ministry of Building, Innovation and Employment, December 2012.

Appendix A - Photographs

MacKenzie Courts Housing Complex		
No.	Item description	Photo
Residential Units Layout		
1.	Street view	
2.	Typical 2 bedroom unit	

3.	Typical 2 bedroom unit exterior elevation (end)	
4.	Typical 2 bedroom unit exterior elevation (front)	
5.	Typical 1 bedroom unit	

6.	Typical 1 bedroom exterior elevation (entry)	
7.	Typical 1 bedroom exterior elevation (side)	
8.	Typical 1 bedroom exterior elevation (end)	

9.	Cracking on exterior concrete wall panel	
10.	Typical ceiling void	
11.	Typical cracking of wall lining	

12.	Typical garage elevation (front)	
13.	Typical garage elevation (end)	
14.	Typical garage interior	

15.	Garages 10-14 with concrete wall panels and wing walls along the boundary	
16.	Typical internal view of lounge	

Appendix B - Methodology and Assumptions

Seismic Parameters

As per NZS 1170.5:

- T < 0.4s (assumed)
- Soil: Category D
- Z = 0.3
- R = 1.0 (IL2, 50 year)
- N(T,D) = 1.0

For the analyses, a μ of 1.0 was assumed for the reinforced concrete panels and 2.0 for timber framed walls.

Analysis Procedure

As the units are small and have a number of closely spaced walls in both directions, the fibrous plaster board ceilings are assumed to be capable of transferring loads to all walls. It was therefore assumed that a global method could be used to carry the forces down to ground level in each direction. Bracing capacities were found by both assuming and calculating a certain kN/m rating for the walls along each line. Due to the relatively unknown nature of the timber walls, the kN/m rating was taken as 3 kN/m for all timber walls with an aspect ratio (height: length) of less than 2:1. This was scaled down to zero kN/m at an aspect ratio of 3.5:1 as per NZSEE guidelines. The total global capacity of the structures was determined by combining timber and concrete walls in plane.

The concrete panels have been analysed individually for earthquake loading both in plane and out of plane using methods prescribed in NZS 3101 by taking the worst case panel (with the most openings) and applying loads in the relevant directions.

Panel connections were also checked for seismic capacity.

Additional Assumptions

Further assumptions about the seismic performance of the buildings were:

- Foundations and foundation connections had adequate capacity to resist and transfer earthquake loads.
- Connections between all elements of the lateral load resisting systems are detailed to adequately transfer their loads sufficiently and are strong enough so as to not fail before the lateral load resisting elements.

Appendix C – CERA DEE Spreadsheet

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data V1.14

Location

Building Name:	MacKenzie Courts Complex	Reviewer:	Mary Ann Halliday
	Unit / No: / Street	CPEng No:	67073
Building Address:	/ 140 / Ensors	Company:	Opus International Consultants
Legal Description:		Company project number:	6-QC374.00
		Company phone number:	
	Degrees / Min / Sec		
GPS south:	43 / 32 / 42.34	Date of submission:	27-Feb-14
GPS east:	172 / 39 / 49.99	Inspection Date:	9/10/2013
		Revision:	1
Building Unique Identifier (CCC):	PRO0921	Is there a full report with this summary?	yes

Site

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

Building

No. of storeys above ground:	1	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
Ground floor split?	no		Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
Storeys below ground	0			
Foundation type:	strip footings		if Foundation type is other, describe:	
Building height (m):	3.00		height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	
Floor footprint area (approx):	42			
Age of Building (years):	37		Date of design:	1965-1976
Strengthening present?	no		If so, when (year)?	
			And what load level (%g)?	
Use (ground floor):	multi-unit residential		Brief strengthening description:	
Use (upper floors):				
Use notes (if required):				
Importance level (to NZS1170.5):	IL2			

Gravity Structure

Gravity System:	load bearing walls		
Roof:	timber framed	rafter type, purlin type and cladding	
Floors:	concrete flat slab	slab thickness (mm)	
Beams:	none	overall depth x width (mm x mm)	
Columns:	load bearing walls	typical dimensions (mm x mm)	
Walls:	load bearing concrete	#N/A	

Lateral load resisting structure

Lateral system along:	concrete shear wall	**Note: Define along and across in detailed report!**	enter wall data in "IEP period calcs" worksheet for period calculation	
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period along:	0.10	##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
Lateral system across:	concrete shear wall		enter wall data in "IEP period calcs" worksheet for period calculation	
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period across:	0.10	##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	

Separations:

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

Non-structural elements

Stairs:			
Wall cladding:	exposed structure	describe	
Roof Cladding:	Metal	describe	
Glazing:	aluminium frames		
Ceilings:	strapped or direct fixed		
Services(list):			

Available documentation

Architectural	partial	original designer name/date	
Structural	partial	original designer name/date	
Mechanical	none	original designer name/date	
Electrical	none	original designer name/date	
Geotech report	none	original designer name/date	

Damage

Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)

Site performance:	Good	Describe damage:	
Settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Differential settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Liquefaction:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Lateral Spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Differential lateral spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Ground cracks:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Damage to area:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	

Building:

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

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

Recommendations

	Level of repair/strengthening required:	minor non-structural		Describe:	
	Building Consent required:	no		Describe:	
	Interim occupancy recommendations:	full occupancy		Describe:	
Along	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	90%	##### %NBS from IEP below	If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology:	Equivalent Static
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	90%			
Across	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	90%	##### %NBS from IEP below		
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	90%			

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data V1.14

Location

Building Name:	MacKenzie Courts Complex (light garage)	Reviewer:	Mary Ann Halliday
	Unit / No: / Street	CPEng No:	67073
Building Address:	140 / Ensors	Company:	Opus International Consultants
Legal Description:		Company project number:	6-QC374.00
		Company phone number:	
	Degrees / Min / Sec		
GPS south:	43 / 32 / 42.34	Date of submission:	27-Feb-14
GPS east:	172 / 39 / 49.99	Inspection Date:	9/10/2013
		Revision:	1
Building Unique Identifier (CCC):	PRO0921	Is there a full report with this summary?	yes

Site

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

Building

No. of storeys above ground:	1	single storey = 1 / Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):	
Ground floor split?	no	Ground floor elevation above ground (m):	
Storeys below ground	0		
Foundation type:	strip footings	if Foundation type is other, describe:	
Building height (m):	3.00	height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):	
Floor footprint area (approx):	51		
Age of Building (years):	37	Date of design:	1965-1976
Strengthening present?	no	If so, when (year)?	
		And what load level (%g)?	
Use (ground floor):	multi-unit residential	Brief strengthening description:	
Use (upper floors):			
Use notes (if required):			
Importance level (to NZS1170.5):	IL2		

Gravity Structure

Gravity System:	frame system		
Roof:	timber framed	rafter type, purlin type and cladding	
Floors:	concrete flat slab	slab thickness (mm)	
Beams:	timber	type	
Columns:	timber	typical dimensions (mm x mm)	
Walls:	non-load bearing	0	

Lateral load resisting structure

Note: Define along and across in detailed report!

Lateral system along:	lightweight timber framed walls		note typical wall length (m)	
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period along:	0.10	0.00	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
Lateral system across:	lightweight timber framed walls		note typical wall length (m)	
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period across:	0.10	0.00	estimate or calculation?	estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):			estimate or calculation?	

Separations:

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

Non-structural elements

Stairs:			
Wall cladding:	other light	describe	Cement Sheeting
Roof Cladding:	Metal	describe	
Glazing:			
Ceilings:			
Services(list):			

Available documentation

Architectural	partial	original designer name/date	
Structural	partial	original designer name/date	
Mechanical	none	original designer name/date	
Electrical	none	original designer name/date	
Geotech report	none	original designer name/date	

Damage

Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)

Site performance:	Good	Describe damage:	
Settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Differential settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Liquefaction:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Lateral Spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Differential lateral spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Ground cracks:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Damage to area:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	

Building:

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

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

Recommendations

	Level of repair/strengthening required:	minor non-structural	Describe:	
	Building Consent required:	no	Describe:	
	Interim occupancy recommendations:	full occupancy	Describe:	
Along	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	70%	##### %NBS from IEP below / If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology:	Equivalent Static
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	70%		
Across	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	70%	##### %NBS from IEP below	
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	70%		

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data V1.14

Location

Building Name:	MacKenzie Courts Complex (concrete garage)	Reviewer:	Mary Ann Halliday
	Unit / No: / Street	CPEng No:	67073
Building Address:	/ 140 / Ensors	Company:	Opus International Consultants
Legal Description:		Company project number:	6-QC374.00
		Company phone number:	
	Degrees / Min / Sec		
GPS south:	43 / 32 / 42.34	Date of submission:	27-Feb-14
GPS east:	172 / 39 / 49.99	Inspection Date:	9/10/2013
		Revision:	1
Building Unique Identifier (CCC):	PRO0921	Is there a full report with this summary?	yes

Site

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

Building

No. of storeys above ground:	1	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m):
Ground floor split?	no		Ground floor elevation above ground (m):
Storeys below ground	0		
Foundation type:	strip footings		if Foundation type is other, describe:
Building height (m):	3.00		height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):
Floor footprint area (approx):	51		
Age of Building (years):	37		Date of design: 1965-1976
Strengthening present?	no		If so, when (year)?
			And what load level (%g)?
Use (ground floor):	multi-unit residential		Brief strengthening description:
Use (upper floors):			
Use notes (if required):			
Importance level (to NZS1170.5):	IL2		

Gravity Structure

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

Lateral load resisting structure

Lateral system along:	concrete shear wall		**Note: Define along and across in detailed report!**	enter wall data in "IEP period calcs" worksheet for period calculation
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period along:	0.10	#####	enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):				estimate or calculation?
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):				estimate or calculation?
Lateral system across:	concrete shear wall			enter wall data in "IEP period calcs" worksheet for period calculation
Ductility assumed, μ:	2.00			
Period across:	0.10	#####	enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation? estimated
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):				estimate or calculation?
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):				estimate or calculation?

Separations:

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

Non-structural elements

Stairs:			
Wall cladding:	exposed structure	describe	Cement Sheeting
Roof Cladding:	Metal	describe	
Glazing:			
Ceilings:			
Services(list):			

Available documentation

Architectural	partial	original designer name/date	
Structural	partial	original designer name/date	
Mechanical	none	original designer name/date	
Electrical	none	original designer name/date	
Geotech report	none	original designer name/date	

Damage

Site: (refer DEE Table 4-2)

Site performance:	Good	Describe damage:	
Settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Differential settlement:	none observed	notes (if applicable):	
Liquefaction:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Lateral Spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Differential lateral spread:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Ground cracks:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	
Damage to area:	none apparent	notes (if applicable):	

Building:

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

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

Recommendations

	Level of repair/strengthening required:	minor non-structural		Describe:
	Building Consent required:	no		Describe:
	Interim occupancy recommendations:	full occupancy		Describe:
Along	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	70%	##### %NBS from IEP below	If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology: Equivalent Static
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	70%		
Across	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	90%	##### %NBS from IEP below	
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	90%		

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

t: +64 3 363 5400
f: +64 3 365 7858
w: www.opus.co.nz