



CLIENTS | PEOPLE | PERFORMANCE

Women's Toilet Avonhead Cemetery
PRK 0217 BLDG 004
Detailed Engineering Evaluation
Qualitative Report
Version Final

140 Hawthornden Road



Women's Toilet Avonhead Cemetery
PRK 0217 BLDG 004

Detailed Engineering Evaluation
Qualitative Report
Version Final

140 Hawthornden Road

Christchurch City Council

Prepared By
Paul Clarke

Reviewed By
Rob Collins

Date
20th May 2013



Contents

Qualitative Report Summary	i
1. Background	1
2. Compliance	2
2.1 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)	2
2.2 Building Act	3
2.3 Christchurch City Council Policy	4
2.4 Building Code	4
3. Earthquake Resistance Standards	5
4. Building Description	7
4.1 General	7
4.2 Gravity Load Resisting System	8
4.3 Lateral Load Resisting System	8
5. Assessment	9
6. Damage Assessment	10
6.1 Surrounding Buildings	10
6.2 Residual Displacements and General Observations	10
6.3 Ground Damage	10
7. Critical Structural Weakness	11
7.1 Short Columns	11
7.2 Lift Shaft	11
7.3 Roof	11
7.4 Staircases	11
7.5 Site Characteristics	11
7.6 Plan Irregularity	11
8. Geotechnical Consideration	12
8.1 Site Description	12
8.2 Published Information on Ground Conditions	12
8.3 Seismicity	14



8.4	Slope Failure and/or Rockfall Potential	14
8.5	Liquefaction Potential	14
8.6	Conclusions & Recommendations	15
9.	Survey	16
10.	Initial Capacity Assessment	17
10.1	% NBS Assessment	17
10.2	Seismic Parameters	17
10.3	Expected Structural Ductility Factor	17
10.4	Discussion of Results	17
10.5	Occupancy	18
11.	Initial Conclusions	19
12.	Recommendations	20
13.	Limitations	21
13.1	General	21
13.2	Geotechnical Limitations	21

Table Index

Table 1	%NBS compared to relative risk of failure	6
Table 2	ECan Borehole Summary	12
Table 3	Summary of Known Active Faults	14

Figure Index

Figure 1	NZSEE Risk Classifications Extracted from table 2.2 of the NZSEE 2006 AISPBE	5
Figure 2	Plan	7
Figure 3	Section along front elevation	7
Figure 4	Section along centreline of building	8
Figure 5	Post February 2011 Earthquake Aerial Photography	13

Appendices

- A Photographs
- B Existing Drawings



C CERA Building Evaluation Form



Qualitative Report Summary

Women's Toilet Avonhead Cemetery

PRK 0217 BLDG 004

Detailed Engineering Evaluation

Qualitative Report - SUMMARY

Version Final

140 Hawthornden Road

Background

This is a summary of the Qualitative report for the building structure, and is based in part on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 19 July 2011, visual inspections on 18 June 2012 and available construction drawings.

Description

The building is constructed entirely from un-plastered reinforced in-situ concrete and takes the shape of half a concave cone. A 150mm thick wall forms the vertical face at the rear of the half cone and the curved external surface is formed from a 100mm roof slab sloping from the apex to the ground. There are also 150mm walls internally from ground to the underside of the roof slab. Strip footings form the foundations.

Key Damage Observed

No damage to the structure was observed.

Critical Structural Weaknesses

No potential critical structural weaknesses have been identified in the structure.

Indicative Building Strength (from IEP and CSW assessment)

Based on the information available, and using the NZSEE Initial Evaluation Procedure, the original capacity of the building has been assessed to be in the order of 71% NBS and post-earthquake capacity also in the order of 71% NBS. Since no critical structural weaknesses were identified, the buildings post-earthquake capacity irrespective of critical structural weakness consideration, is also in the order of 71% NBS.

The building has been assessed to have a seismic capacity in the order of 71% NBS and is therefore considered neither potentially Earthquake Risk nor Earthquake Prone.



Recommendations

The Women's Toilet has been assessed as being not Earthquake Prone and consequently, can remain occupied.



1. Background

GHD has been engaged by the Christchurch City Council (CCC) to undertake a detailed engineering evaluation of the Women's Toilet in Avonhead Cemetery.

This report is a Qualitative Assessment of the building structure, and is based in part 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.



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 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



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 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.

2.2.1 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.



2.3 Christchurch City Council Policy

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

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.

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.

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 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 1 below.

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

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

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



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

Table 1 %NBS compared to relative risk of failure

4. Building Description

4.1 General

The building is located in Avonhead Cemetery at 140 Hawthornden Road. The building was constructed in 1979 and its sole use is a public toilet.

The building is constructed entirely from un-plastered reinforced in-situ concrete and takes the shape of half a concave cone. A 150mm thick wall forms the vertical face at the rear of the half cone and the curved external surface is formed from a 100mm roof slab sloping from the apex to the ground. There are also 150mm walls internally from ground to the underside of the roof slab. Strip footings form the foundations.




Figure 2 Plan




Figure 3 Section along front elevation




Figure 4 Section along centreline of building

The building's footprint is a semi-circle with an approximate radius of 4.8m and it has an overall height of 3.8m. The building is one of three buildings of similar construction and layout, the nearest being approximately 3m away. The flat site is approximately 150m south of an unnamed stream.

Full plans are included in Appendices B.

4.2 Gravity Load Resisting System

Gravity roof loads are supported by the insitu concrete roof slab spanning between walls and the foundations. The load bearing concrete walls transfer the gravity loads to the foundations which in turn transfer the forces to the substrata.

4.3 Lateral Load Resisting System

The conical shape of the building forms a natural geometrically braced structure which means lateral loads have no single path but rather are distributed to the foundations by most structural elements. The reinforced vertical concrete walls in the line of loading act as shear walls to transfer the lateral loads to the foundations. In addition, the curved reinforced concrete roof forms a shell, which acts as a sloping 'diaphragm', to transfer lateral loads to the foundations. The foundations in turn transfer the lateral loads to the substrata where they dissipate.



5. Assessment

An inspection of the building was undertaken on the 18 June 2012. Both the interior and exterior of the building were inspected.

The inspection consisted of scrutinising the building to determine the structural systems and likely behaviour of the building during an earthquake. The site was assessed for damage, including examination of the ground conditions, checking for damage in areas where damage would be expected for the type of structure and noting general damage observed throughout the building in both structural and non-structural elements.

The %NBS score determined for this building has been based on the IEP procedure described by the NZSEE and based on the information obtained from visual observation of the building and available drawings.



6. Damage Assessment

6.1 Surrounding Buildings

The nearby buildings, of similar construction, did not show any signs of structural damage.

6.2 Residual Displacements and General Observations

No residual displacements of the structure were noticed during our inspection of the building.

6.3 Ground Damage

There was no evidence of ground damage on the property or surrounding neighbours land.



7. Critical Structural Weakness

7.1 Short Columns

No critical short columns are present in the structure.

7.2 Lift Shaft

The building does not contain a lift shaft.

7.3 Roof

The roof is a reinforced concrete shell which slopes to ground level, providing sufficient roof stability and diaphragm action.

7.4 Staircases

The building does not contain a staircase.

7.5 Site Characteristics

Following a geotechnical appraisal it was found that the site has an insignificant potential for liquefaction.

7.6 Plan Irregularity

The building, while not having a regular shape, does have sufficiently balanced stiffness's and bracing, not to demonstrate a plan irregularity.



8. Geotechnical Consideration

8.1 Site Description

The site is situated in the suburb of Avonhead in western Christchurch, and is relatively flat at approximately 30m above mean sea level. It is approximately 150m south of an unnamed stream, 1100m north of the head of the Avon River, and 16km west of the coast (Pegasus Bay).

8.2 Published Information on Ground Conditions

8.2.1 Published Geology

The geological map of the area¹ indicates that the site is underlain by:

- Holocene alluvial soils of the Yaldhurst Member, sub-group of the Springston Formation, comprising alluvial sand and silt overbank deposits.

Figure 72 from Brown & Weeber (1992) indicates groundwater is likely to be between 5 and 10m below ground level (bgl).

8.2.2 Environment Canterbury Logs

Information from Environment Canterbury (ECan) indicates that four boreholes are located within 350m of the subject structures (see Table 2), of which three had lithographic logs.

These indicate the area comprises sand /silt / clay to ~3m, underlain by gravel-dominated subsoils.

Table 2 ECan Borehole Summary

Bore Name	Log Depth	Groundwater	Distance & Direction from Site
M35/10125	15m	8.7m	220m SE
M35/12250	2.8m	-	330m E
M35/3087	37.7m	10.6m	320m W

It should be noted that the boreholes were sunk for groundwater extraction and not for geotechnical purposes. Therefore, the amount of material recovered and available for interpretation and recording will have been variable at best and may not be representative. The logs have been written by the well driller and not a geotechnical professional or to a standard. In addition strength data is not recorded.

8.2.3 EQC Geotechnical Investigations

The Earthquake Commission has not undertaken geotechnical testing in the area of the subject site.

¹ Brown, L. J. and Weeber, J.H. 1992: *Geology of the Christchurch Urban Area*. Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences 1:25,000 Geological Map 1. Lower Hutt. Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Limited.

8.2.4 Land Zoning

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) has indicated the site is situated within the Green Zone, indicating that repair and rebuild may take place.

Land in the CERA green zone has been divided into three technical categories. These categories describe how the land is expected to perform in future earthquakes. The technical categories – TC1 (grey), TC2 (yellow) and TC3 (blue) describe how the land is expected to perform in future earthquakes.

The site is indicated as being within the TC1 (grey)² zone, indicating that future land damage from liquefaction is unlikely.

8.2.5 Post February Aerial Photography

Aerial photography taken following the 22 February 2011 earthquake shows no signs of liquefaction outside the building footprint or adjacent to the site, as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5 Post February 2011 Earthquake Aerial Photography³



8.2.6 Summary of Ground Conditions

From the information presented above, the ground conditions underlying the site are anticipated to comprise ~3m of sand /silt / clay, overlying gravel and sandy gravel (likely of the Riccarton Gravels).

Groundwater levels are anticipated to be 8 to 10m below the surface, as indicated by Brown & Weeber and the ECan borelogs. Hence, soils are not expected to be saturated above this level.

² CERA Landcheck website, <http://cera.govt.nz/my-property>

³ Aerial Photography Supplied by Koordinates sourced from <http://koordinates.com/layer/3185-christchurch-post-earthquake-aerial-photos-24-feb-2011/>



8.3 Seismicity

8.3.1 Nearby Faults

There are many faults in the Canterbury region, however only those considered most likely to have an adverse effect on the site are detailed below.

Table 3 Summary of Known Active Faults⁴⁵

Known Active Fault	Distance from Site	Direction from Site	Max Likely Magnitude	Avg Recurrence Interval
Alpine Fault	120 km	NW	~8.3	~300 years
Greendale (2010) Fault	19 km	SW	7.1	~15,000 years
Hope Fault	100 km	N	7.2~7.5	120~200 years
Kelly Fault	100 km	NW	7.2	~150 years
Porters Pass Fault	55 km	NW	7.0	~1100 years

Recent earthquakes since 22 February 2011 have identified the presence of a previously unmapped active fault system underneath the Canterbury Plains, including Christchurch City, and the Port Hills. Research and published information on this system is in development and not generally available. Average recurrence intervals are yet to be estimated.

8.3.2 Ground Shaking Hazard

This seismic activity has produced earthquakes of Magnitude-6.3 with peak ground accelerations (PGA) up to twice the acceleration due to gravity (2g) in some parts of the city. This has resulted in widespread liquefaction throughout Christchurch.

New Zealand Standard NZS 1170.5:2004 quantifies the Seismic Hazard factor for Christchurch as 0.30, being in a moderate to high earthquake zone. This value has been provisionally upgraded recently (from 0.22) to reflect the seismicity hazard observed in the earthquakes since 4 September 2010.

8.4 Slope Failure and/or Rockfall Potential

Given the site's location in Avonhead, a flat suburb in western Christchurch, global slope instability is considered negligible. However, any localised retaining structures or embankments should be further investigated to determine the site-specific slope instability potential.

8.5 Liquefaction Potential

The site is considered to have negligible liquefaction susceptibility, due to the following:

- No evidence of liquefaction in the post-earthquake aerial photography;

⁴ Stirling, M.W., McVerry, G.H. and Berryman K.R. (2002) A New Seismic Hazard Model for New Zealand, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 92 No. 5, pp 1878-1903, June 2002.

⁵ GNS Active Faults Database



- CERA's classification of TC1 (grey), indicating land damage from liquefaction is unlikely;
- Anticipated presence of predominantly gravels and sandy gravels beneath the site; and,
- Soils near the surface are not anticipated to be saturated.

8.6 Conclusions & Recommendations

This assessment is based on a review of the geology and existing ground investigation information, and observations from the Christchurch earthquakes since 4 September 2010.

The site appears to be situated on stratified alluvial deposits comprising predominantly gravel below 3m. As such, liquefaction at the site is considered unlikely.

A soil class of **D** (in accordance with NZS 1170.5:2004) should be adopted for the site.

Further investigation is not considered necessary for this site. However, all Department of Building and Housing (DBH) guidelines for repair and rebuild in TC1 areas should be followed.



9. Survey

No level or verticality surveys have been undertaken for this building at this stage as indicated by Christchurch City Council guidelines.



10. Initial Capacity Assessment

10.1 % NBS Assessment

The building has had its capacity assessed using the Initial Evaluation Procedure based on the information available. The building's capacity excluding critical structural weaknesses is in the order of 71% NBS, and the capacity irrespective of critical structural weaknesses as none were found, is also in the order of 71% NBS. These capacities are subject to confirmation by a more detailed quantitative analysis.

Following an IEP assessment, the building has been assessed as achieving 71% New Building Standard (NBS). Under the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) guidelines the building is considered neither Earthquake Risk nor Earthquake Prone as it achieves greater than 67% NBS. This score has not been adjusted for damage to the structure as none was observed.

10.2 Seismic Parameters

The seismic design parameters based on current design requirements from NZS 1170:2002 and the NZBC clause B1 for this building are:

- ▶ Site soil class: D, NZS 1170.5:2004, Clause 3.1.3, Soft Soil
- ▶ Site hazard factor, $Z = 0.3$, NZBC, Clause B1 Structure, Amendment 11 effective from 1 August 2011
- ▶ Return period factor $R_u = 1.0$ NZS 1170.5:2004, Table 3.5, Importance level 2 structure with a 50 year design life.

An increased Z factor of 0.3 for Christchurch has been used in line with requirements from the Department of Building and Housing resulting in a reduced % NBS score.

10.3 Expected Structural Ductility Factor

A structural ductility factor of 1.25 has been assumed based on the structural system observed and the date of construction. The concrete walls have a reasonable reinforcement amount and are expected to be nominally ductile.

10.4 Discussion of Results

The results obtained from the initial IEP assessment are consistent with those expected for a building of this age and construction type. The building was built in 1979 and was likely designed to the loading standard current at the time, NZS 4203:1976. The design loads used in accordance with this standard are likely to have been less than those required by the current loading standard. When combined with the increase in the hazard factor for Christchurch to 0.3, it would be expected that the building would not achieve 100% NBS. However, due to the lack of any Critical Structural Weaknesses, the building's well detailed reinforcement and its robust layout, it is reasonable to expect the building to be classified as neither Earthquake Prone nor Earthquake Risk.



10.5 Occupancy

The building has been assessed as being not potentially Earthquake Prone or Earthquake Risk. Consequently, the Toilet can remain in use.



11. Initial Conclusions

The building has been assessed to have a seismic capacity in the order of 71% NBS and is therefore not potentially Earthquake Prone nor Earthquake Risk.



12. Recommendations

The recent seismic activity in Christchurch has caused no damage to the building, hence the building has achieved above 67% NBS following an initial IEP assessment of the building, no further assessment is required by Christchurch City Council to comply with the building act.

The building is currently in use and the findings of this report mean that this is acceptable and usage may continue.



13. Limitations

13.1 General

This report has been prepared subject to the following limitations:

- ▶ No intrusive structural investigations have been undertaken.
- ▶ No intrusive geotechnical investigations have been undertaken.
- ▶ No level or verticality surveys have been undertaken.
- ▶ No material testing has been undertaken.
- ▶ No calculations, other than those included as part of the IEP in the CERA Building Evaluation Report, have been undertaken. No modelling of the building for structural analysis purposes has been performed.

It is noted that this report has been prepared at the request of Christchurch City Council and is intended to be used for their purposes only. GHD accepts no responsibility for any other party or person who relies on the information contained in this report to a specific limitations section.

13.2 Geotechnical Limitations

This report presents the results of a geotechnical appraisal prepared for the purpose of this commission, and for prepared solely for the use of Christchurch City Council and their advisors. The data and advice provided herein relate only to the project and structures described herein and must be reviewed by a competent geotechnical engineer before being used for any other purpose. GHD Limited (GHD) accepts no responsibility for other use of the data.

The advice tendered in this report is based on a visual geotechnical appraisal. No subsurface investigations have been conducted. An assessment of the topographical land features have been made based on this information. It is emphasised that Geotechnical conditions may vary substantially across the site from where observations have been made. Subsurface conditions, including groundwater levels can change in a limited distance or time. In evaluation of this report cognisance should be taken of the limitations of this type of investigation.

An understanding of the geotechnical site conditions depends on the integration of many pieces of information, some regional, some site specific, some structure specific and some experienced based. Hence this report should not be altered, amended or abbreviated, issued in part and issued incomplete in any way without prior checking and approval by GHD. GHD accepts no responsibility for any circumstances, which arise from the issue of the report, which have been modified in any way as outlined above.



Appendix A

Photographs




Photograph 1 North elevation.



Photograph 2 View of the toilet from the south.



Photograph 3 View of the toilet from the west.



Photograph 4 Reinforced concrete walls and roof slab soffit.




Photograph 5 View of window and roof slab soffit.




Appendix B


Existing Drawings




SOUTH ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION




GROUND FLOOR PLAN




EAST and WEST ELEVATIONS


WAIMAIRI COUNTY COUNCIL
APPROVED
SUBJECT TO BY-LAWS
BUILDING INSPECTOR
DATE



LOCATION PLAN



FOUNDATION PLAN



SET-OUT PLAN

Builder will be held responsible for any damage done to footpath.

NOTE: Roof Slab Reinforcing: D10 rods at 200 c/s in both directions.


APPROVED	SURVEYED	NAME	DATE	DATUM
<i>[Signature]</i>	NAME	P. WILLS	5.79	BENCH MK.
COUNTY ENGINEER	TRACED	P. WILLS	5.79	LEVEL BK No
DATE 16-7-79	CHECKED	L. WOODING - ANZIA	5.79	FIELD BK No
	DESIGNED	S. TAYLOR	5.79	
	STRUC. DES.			

PROPOSED RECORDS ROOM AND TOILET BUILDINGS
AVONHEAD PARK CEMETERY

WAIMAIRI COUNTY COUNCIL


SCALE
PLANS 1:100
ELEVATIONS 1:100

AMENDMENTS
SHEET SIZE A1
PLAN No.
2710
SHEET 1 OF 3 SHEETS



APPROVED COUNTY ENGINEER DATE 16-7-79			SURVEYED DRAWN P. WILLS 5.79 TRACED P. WILLS 5.79 CHECKED L. WOODING A.N.Z.A. 3.79 DESIGNED S. TAYLOR 5.79			DATUM BENCH MK. LEVEL BK No. FIELD BK No.			PROPOSED RECORDS ROOM AND TOILET BUILDINGS AVONHEAD PARK CEMETERY			WAIMAIRI COUNTY COUNCIL			SCALE AS SHOWN			AMENDMENTS SHEET SIZE A1 PLAN No. 2710 SHEET 2 OF 3 SHEETS		
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	-------------------------	--	--	-------------------	--	--	---	--	--

150 mm
100
80
60
40
20
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
110
120
130
140
150
160
170
180
190
200
210
220
230
240
250
260
270
280
290
300
310
320
330
340
350
360
370
380
390
400
410
420
430
440
450
460
470
480
490
500
510
520
530
540
550
560
570
580
590
600
610
620
630
640
650
660
670
680
690
700
710
720
730
740
750
760
770
780
790
800
810
820
830
840
850
860
870
880
890
900
910
920
930
940
950
960
970
980
990
1000
1010
1020
1030
1040
1050
1060
1070
1080
1090
1100
1110
1120
1130
1140
1150
1160
1170
1180
1190
1200
1210
1220
1230
1240
1250
1260
1270
1280
1290
1300
1310
1320
1330
1340
1350
1360
1370
1380
1390
1400
1410
1420
1430
1440
1450
1460
1470
1480
1490
1500
1510
1520
1530
1540
1550
1560
1570
1580
1590
1600
1610
1620
1630
1640
1650
1660
1670
1680
1690
1700
1710
1720
1730
1740
1750
1760
1770
1780
1790
1800
1810
1820
1830
1840
1850
1860
1870
1880
1890
1900
1910
1920
1930
1940
1950
1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010
2020
2030
2040
2050
2060
2070
2080
2090
2100
2110
2120
2130
2140
2150
2160
2170
2180
2190
2200
2210
2220
2230
2240
2250
2260
2270
2280
2290
2300
2310
2320
2330
2340
2350
2360
2370
2380
2390
2400
2410
2420
2430
2440
2450
2460
2470
2480
2490
2500
2510
2520
2530
2540
2550
2560
2570
2580
2590
2600
2610
2620
2630
2640
2650
2660
2670
2680
2690
2700
2710
2720
2730
2740
2750
2760
2770
2780
2790
2800
2810
2820
2830
2840
2850
2860
2870
2880
2890
2900
2910
2920
2930
2940
2950
2960
2970
2980
2990
3000
3010
3020
3030
3040
3050
3060
3070
3080
3090
3100
3110
3120
3130
3140
3150
3160
3170
3180
3190
3200
3210
3220
3230
3240
3250
3260
3270
3280
3290
3300
3310
3320
3330
3340
3350
3360
3370
3380
3390
3400
3410
3420
3430
3440
3450
3460
3470
3480
3490
3500
3510
3520
3530
3540
3550
3560
3570
3580
3590
3600
3610
3620
3630
3640
3650
3660
3670
3680
3690
3700
3710
3720
3730
3740
3750
3760
3770
3780
3790
3800
3810
3820
3830
3840
3850
3860
3870
3880
3890
3900
3910
3920
3930
3940
3950
3960
3970
3980
3990
4000
4010
4020
4030
4040
4050
4060
4070
4080
4090
4100
4110
4120
4130
4140
4150
4160
4170
4180
4190
4200
4210
4220
4230
4240
4250
4260
4270
4280
4290
4300
4310
4320
4330
4340
4350
4360
4370
4380
4390
4400
4410
4420
4430
4440
4450
4460
4470
4480
4490
4500
4510
4520
4530
4540
4550
4560
4570
4580
4590
4600
4610
4620
4630
4640
4650
4660
4670
4680
4690
4700
4710
4720
4730
4740
4750
4760
4770
4780
4790
4800
4810
4820
4830
4840
4850
4860
4870
4880
4890
4900
4910
4920
4930
4940
4950
4960
4970
4980
4990
5000
5010
5020
5030
5040
5050
5060
5070
5080
5090
5100
5110
5120
5130
5140
5150
5160
5170
5180
5190
5200
5210
5220
5230
5240
5250
5260
5270
5280
5290
5300
5310
5320
5330
5340
5350
5360
5370
5380
5390
5400
5410
5420
5430
5440
5450
5460
5470
5480
5490
5500
5510
5520
5530
5540
5550
5560
5570
5580
5590
5600
5610
5620
5630
5640
5650
5660
5670
5680
5690
5700
5710
5720
5730
5740
5750
5760
5770
5780
5790
5800
5810
5820
5830
5840
5850
5860
5870
5880
5890
5900
5910
5920
5930
5940
5950
5960
5970
5980
5990
6000
6010
6020
6030
6040
6050
6060
6070
6080
6090
6100
6110
6120
6130
6140
6150
6160
6170
6180
6190
6200
6210
6220
6230
6240
6250
6260
6270
6280
6290
6300
6310
6320
6330
6340
6350
6360
6370
6380
6390
6400
6410
6420
6430
6440
6450
6460
6470
6480
6490
6500
6510
6520
6530
6540
6550
6560
6570
6580
6590
6600
6610
6620
6630
6640
6650
6660
6670
6680
6690
6700
6710
6720
6730
6740
6750
6760
6770
6780
6790
6800
6810
6820
6830
6840
6850
6860
6870
6880
6890
6900
6910
6920
6930
6940
6950
6960
6970
6980
6990
7000
7010
7020
7030
7040
7050
7060
7070
7080
7090
7100
7110
7120
7130
7140
7150
7160
7170
7180
7190
7200
7210
7220
7230
7240
7250
7260
7270
7280
7290
7300
7310
7320
7330
7340
7350
7360
7370
7380
7390
7400
7410
7420
7430
7440
7450
7460
7470
7480
7490
7500
7510
7520
7530
7540
7550
7560
7570
7580
7590
7600
7610
7620
7630
7640
7650
7660
7670
7680
7690
7700
7710
7720
7730
7740
7750
7760
7770
7780
7790
7800
7810
7820
7830
7840
7850
7860
7870
7880
7890
7900
7910
7920
7930
7940
7950
7960
7970
7980
7990
8000
8010
8020
8030
8040
8050
8060
8070
8080
8090
8100
8110
8120
8130
8140
8150
8160
8170
8180
8190
8200
8210
8220
8230
8240
8250
8260
8270
8280
8290
8300
8310
8320
8330
8340
8350
8360
8370
8380
8390
8400
8410
8420
8430
8440
8450
8460
8470
8480
8490
8500
8510
8520
8530
8540
8550
8560
8570
8580
8590
8600
8610
8620
8630
8640
8650
8660
8670
8680
8690
8700
8710
8720
8730
8740
8750
8760
8770
8780
8790
8800
8810
8820
8830
8840
8850
8860
8870
8880
8890
8900
8910
8920
8930
8940
8950
8960
8970
8980
8990
9000
9010
9020
9030
9040
9050
9060
9070
9080
9090
9100
9110
9120
9130
9140
9150
9160
9170
9180
9190
9200
9210
9220
9230
9240
9250
9260
9270
9280
9290
9300
9310
9320
9330
9340
9350
9360
9370
9380
9390
9400
9410
9420
9430
9440
9450
9460
9470
9480
9490
9500
9510
9520
9530
9540
9550
9560
9570
9580
9590
9600
9610
9620
9630
9640
9650
9660
9670
9680
9690
9700
9710
9720
9730
9740
9750
9760
9770
9780
9790
9800
9810
9820
9830
9840
9850
9860
9870
9880
9890
9900
9910
9920
9930
9940
9950
9960
9970
9980
9990
10000



SECTION B - B

APPROVED	NAME	DATE
	P. WILLS	5.79
COUNT ENGINEER	P. WILLS	5.79
DATE 10.1.79	DESIGNED	L. WOODING ANZIA 3.79
	STRUC. DES.	S. TAYLOR 5.79

DATUM	LEVEL BK No	FIELD BK No
BENCH MK.		

PROPOSED RECORDS ROOM AND TOILET BUILDINGS
AVONHEAD PARK CEMETERY

WAIMAIRI
COUNTY
COUNCIL

SCALE	SECTIONS	1:20
	DETAILS	1:5

AMENDMENTS
SHEET SIZE A1
PLAN No.
2710
SHEET 3 OF 3 SHEETS



Appendix C

CERA Building Evaluation Form

Detailed Engineering Evaluation Summary Data

V1.11

Location

Building Name: Womens Toilet Avonhead Cemetery
 Building Address: 140 Hawthornden
 Legal Description: Lot 3 DP 26791

Degrees Min Sec

GPS south: 43 30 32.09
 GPS east: 172 32 50.50

Building Unique Identifier (CCC): PRK 0217 BLDG 004

Reviewer: Stephen Lee
 CPEng No: 1006840
 Company: GHD
 Company project number: 513090224
 Company phone number: 04 472 0799

Date of submission: 20/05/2013
 Inspection Date: 18-Jun-12
 Revision: Final
 Is there a full report with this summary? yes

Site

Site slope: flat
 Soil type: gravel
 Site Class (to NZS1170.5): D
 Proximity to waterway (m, if <100m):
 Proximity to clifftop (m, if < 100m):
 Proximity to cliff base (m,if <100m):

Max retaining height (m):
 Soil Profile (if available):

If Ground improvement on site, describe:

Approx site elevation (m): 30.00

Building

No. of storeys above ground: 1
 Ground floor split? no
 Storeys below ground: 0
 Foundation type: strip footings
 Building height (m): 3.70
 Floor footprint area (approx): 40
 Age of Building (years): 33

single storey = 1

Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): 30.00
 Ground floor elevation above ground (m): 0.00

if Foundation type is other, describe:
 height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m):

Date of design: 1976-1992

Strengthening present? no

Use (ground floor): other (specify)
 Use (upper floors):
 Use notes (if required): public toilet
 Importance level (to NZS1170.5): IL2

If so, when (year)?
 And what load level (%g)?
 Brief strengthening description:

Gravity Structure

Gravity System: load bearing walls
 Roof: concrete
 Floors: other (note)
 Beams: cast-insitu concrete
 Columns:
 Walls: load bearing concrete

slab thickness (mm) 100
 describe sytem concrete slab on grade
 overall depth x width (mm x mm) 200 x 100 approx
 #N/A

Lateral load resisting structure

Lateral system along: concrete shear wall
 Ductility assumed, μ : 1.25

Note: Define along and across in detailed report!

enter wall data in "IEP period calcs" worksheet for period calculation

Period along:	<input type="text" value="0.40"/>	##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	<input type="text"/>		estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):	<input type="text"/>		estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>
Lateral system across:	<input type="text" value="concrete shear wall"/>		enter wall data in "IEP period calcs"	<input type="text"/>
Ductility assumed, μ :	<input type="text" value="1.25"/>		worksheet for period calculation	<input type="text"/>
Period across:	<input type="text" value="0.40"/>	##### enter height above at H31	estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>
Total deflection (ULS) (mm):	<input type="text"/>		estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>
maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm):	<input type="text"/>		estimate or calculation?	<input type="text"/>

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"/>	<input type="text"/>
Wall cladding:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Roof Cladding:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Glazing:	<input type="text" value="aluminium frames"/>	<input type="text"/>
Ceilings:	<input type="text" value="none"/>	<input type="text"/>
Services(list):	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Available documentation

Architectural	<input type="text" value="none"/>	original designer name/date	<input type="text"/>
Structural	<input type="text" value="full"/>	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: (refer DEE Table 4-2)	Site performance:	<input type="text"/>	Describe damage:	<input type="text"/>
	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"/>	
Along	Damage ratio:	<input type="text" value="0%"/>	Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <input type="text"/>
	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 e'quakes:	<input type="text" value="71%"/>	71% %NBS from IEP below	If IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology:	<input type="text"/>
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	<input type="text" value="71%"/>			
Across	Assessed %NBS before e'quakes:	<input type="text" value="71%"/>	71% %NBS from IEP below		
	Assessed %NBS after e'quakes:	<input type="text" value="71%"/>			

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):	1976-1992	h_n from above:	m
Seismic Zone, if designed between 1965 and 1992:	<input type="text" value="B"/>	not required for this age of building	<input type="text"/>
		not required for this age of building	<input type="text"/>
	Period (from above):	along	across
		0.4	0.4
	(%NBS) _{nom} from Fig 3.3:	<input type="text" value="16.5%"/>	<input type="text" value="16.5%"/>
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			<input type="text" value="1.00"/>
Note 2: for RC buildings designed between 1976-1984, use 1.2			<input type="text" value="1.2"/>
Note 3: for buildngs designed prior to 1935 use 0.8, except in Wellington (1.0)			<input type="text" value="1.0"/>
	Final (%NBS) _{nom} :	along	across
		<input type="text" value="20%"/>	<input type="text" value="20%"/>
2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor	Near Fault scaling factor, from NZS1170.5, cl 3.1.6:		<input type="text" value="1.00"/>
	Near Fault scaling factor (1/N(T,D), Factor A :	along	across
		<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor	Hazard factor Z for site from AS1170.5, Table 3.3:		<input type="text" value="0.30"/>
	Z ₁₉₉₂ , from NZS4203:1992		<input type="text"/>
	Hazard scaling factor, Factor B :		<input type="text" value="3.33333333"/>
2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor	Building Importance level (from above):		<input type="text" value="2"/>
	Return Period Scaling factor from Table 3.1, Factor C :		<input type="text" value="1.00"/>

2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor

Assessed ductility (less than max in Table 3.2)	along	1.25	1.25
Ductility scaling factor: =1 from 1976 onwards; or = $k\mu$, if pre-1976, from Table 3.3:		1.00	1.00
Ductility Scaling Factor, Factor D:		1.00	1.00

2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor:

Sp:	0.925	0.925
Structural Performance Scaling Factor Factor E:	1.081081081	1.081081081

2.7 Baseline %NBS, $(NBS\%)_b = (\%NBS)_{nom} \times A \times B \times C \times D \times E$

%NBS _b :	71%	71%
---------------------	-----	-----

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

3.1. Plan Irregularity, factor A: insignificant 1

3.2. Vertical irregularity, Factor B: insignificant 1

3.3. Short columns, Factor C: insignificant 1

3.4. Pounding potential

Pounding effect D1, from Table to right 1.0

Height Difference effect D2, from Table to right 1.0

Therefore, Factor D: 1

3.5. Site Characteristics insignificant 1

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

Table for Selection of D2	Severe	Significant	Insignificant/none
Separation	0<sep<.005H	.005<sep<.01H	Sep>.01H
Height difference > 4 storeys	0.4	0.7	1
Height difference 2 to 4 storeys	0.7	0.9	1
Height difference < 2 storeys	1	1	1

3.6. Other factors, Factor F

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

Rationale for choice of F factor, if not 1

Along	1.0	Across	1.0

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)

1.00	1.00
------	------

4.3 PAR x (%NBS)_b:

PAR x Baseline %NBS:	71%	71%
----------------------	-----	-----

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

71%

Official Use only:

Accepted By: _____

Date: _____





GHD

GHD Building
226 Antigua Street, Christchurch 8013
T: 64 3 378 0900 F: 64 3 377 8575 E: chcmail@ghd.com

© GHD Limited 2013

This document is and shall remain the property of GHD Limited. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Document Status

Rev No.	Author	Reviewer		Approved for Issue		
		Name	Signature	Name	Signature	Date
Final	Paul Clarke	Rob Collins		Stephen Lee		20/05/13