

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2
Bradford Park Pavilion
196 Milton Street, Sydenham



QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FINAL

- Rev B
- 13 December 2012



Christchurch City Council
PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2
Bradford Park Pavilion
196 Milton Street, Sydenham

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Final

- Rev B
- 13 December 2012

Sinclair Knight Merz
142 Sherborne Street
Saint Albans
PO Box 21011, Edgware
Christchurch, New Zealand
Tel: +64 3 940 4900
Fax: +64 3 940 4901
Web: www.skmconsulting.com

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

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

Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Key Damage Observed	2
1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses	2
1.4. Indicative Building Strength	2
1.5. Recommendations	3
2. Introduction	4
3. Compliance	5
3.1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)	5
3.2. Building Act	6
3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy	7
3.4. Building Code	8
4. Earthquake Resistance Standards	9
5. Building Details	11
5.1. Building Description	11
5.2. Gravity Load Resisting System	11
5.3. Seismic Load Resisting System	11
5.4. Building Damage	11
6. Available Information and Assumptions	13
6.1. Available Information	13
6.2. Survey	13
6.3. Assumptions & Design Criteria	13
6.4. The Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE) process	14
7. Results and Discussions	17
7.1. Critical Structural Weaknesses	17
7.2. Analysis Results	17
7.3. Recommendations	17
8. Conclusion	19
9. Limitation Statement	20
10. Appendix 1 – CERA Standardised Report Form	21



Document history and status

Revision	Date issued	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Revision type
A	20/11/2012	Colin Paverd	Nick M. Calvert	20/11/2012	Draft for Client Approval
B	13/12/2012	Nick M. Calvert	Nick M. Calvert	13/12/2012	Final for Issue

Distribution of copies

Revision	Copy no	Quantity	Issued to
A	1	1	Christchurch City Council
B	1	1	Christchurch City Council

Printed:	13 December 2012
Last saved:	10 December 2012 04:29 PM
File name:	ZB01276.097_CCC_PRK_1133_BLDG_001_EQ2_Quantitative Assmt_B.docx
Author:	Willow Patterson-Kane
Project manager:	Nick Calvert
Name of organisation:	Christchurch City Council
Name of project:	Christchurch City Council Structures Panel
Name of document:	PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 Quantitative Assessment Report
Document version:	B
Project number:	ZB01276.097

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Background

A quantitative assessment was carried out on building PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 located in Bradford Park at 196 Milton Street, Sydenham. This building is a single storey pavilion that is currently utilised as changing rooms. It was built in two sections. The original structure appears to be constructed from partially reinforced masonry walls while the more recent extension has reinforced masonry walls. Both sections have a timber-framed roof. An aerial photograph illustrating the building's location is shown below in Figure 1. Detailed descriptions outlining the buildings age and construction type are given in Section 5 of this report.



■ Figure 1: Aerial Photograph of the Bradford Park pavilion at 196 Milton Street

This quantitative report for the building structure is based on the Detailed Engineering Evaluation Procedure document (draft) issued by the Structural Advisory Group on 11 July 2011, the visual inspection carried out on 23 May 2012 and limited intrusive investigations carried out on 23 August 2012 and 28 August 2012.



1.2. Key Damage Observed

Key damage observed includes:-

- Step cracking along mortar joints.
- Cracking at control joint.

1.3. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No potential critical structural weaknesses have been identified for this building.

1.4. Indicative Building Strength

As described in the Engineering Advisory Group's "Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings" (from July 2011) we have assessed the percentage of new building standard seismic resistance using the quantitative method. Our assessment included consideration of geotechnical conditions, existing earthquake damage to the building and structural engineering calculations to assess both strength and ductility/resilience.

The assessment was based on the following:

- On-site investigation to assess the extent of existing earthquake damage including limited intrusive investigation.
- Qualitative assessment of critical structural weaknesses (CSWs) based on review of available structural drawings and inspection where drawings were not available.
- A geotechnical desktop study.
- Assessment of the strength of the existing structures taking into account their current condition.

Any building that is found to have a seismic capacity less than 34% of the new building standard is required to be strengthened up to a capacity of at least 67% NBS.

Based on the information available, and using the Quantitative Assessment Procedure, the building's original capacity has been assessed to be in the order of 37% NBS. The damage observed during the site investigation was not significant, therefore the post earthquake capacity is also in the order of 37% NBS. Since the building's seismic capacity is less than 67%NBS the building is classed as a potential earthquake risk and does not require strengthening, although it is recommended. It is worth noting that this assessment was made with partial structural drawings and is accordingly limited.



1.5. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the assessment, the building does not require strengthening.

It is recommended that:

- a) The current placard status of the building of Green 1 remain as is.
- b) We consider that barriers around the building are not necessary.

2. Introduction

Sinclair Knight Merz was engaged by the Christchurch City Council to carry out a quantitative assessment of the seismic performance of PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 located at 196 Milton Street in Bradford Park.

The scope of this quantitative analysis includes the following:

- Analysis of the seismic load carrying capacity of the building compared with current seismic loading requirements or New Buildings Standard (NBS). It should be noted that this analysis considers the building in its damaged state where appropriate.
- Identify any critical structural weaknesses which may exist in the building and include these in the assessed %NBS of the structure.
- Preparation of a summary report outlining the areas of concern in the building as well as identifying strengthening concepts to 67%NBS for any areas which have insufficient capacity if the building is found to be an earthquake prone building.

The recommendations from the Engineering Advisory Group¹ were followed to assess the likely performance of the structures in a seismic event relative to the New Building Standard (NBS). 100% NBS is equivalent to the strength of a building that fully complies with current codes. This includes a recent increase of the Christchurch seismic hazard factor from 0.22 to 0.3².

At the time of this report, limited intrusive site investigation had been carried out. These intrusive investigations enabled us to determine the reinforcing present in the masonry walls. Only partial structural drawings were available, and as a result our evaluation of the building is accordingly limited. The building's description outlined in Section 5 is based on our visual inspections, the partial structural drawings and limited intrusive investigations.

¹ EAG 2011, *Guidance on Detailed Engineering Evaluation of Earthquake Affected Non-residential Buildings in Canterbury - Draft*, p 10

² <http://www.dbh.govt.nz/seismicity-info>

3. Compliance

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

3.1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)

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

Section 38 – Works

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

Section 51 – Requiring Structural Survey

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

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

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

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

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

3.2. Building Act

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

3.2.1. Section 112 – Alterations

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

3.2.2. Section 115 – Change of Use

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

3.2.3. Section 121 – Dangerous Buildings

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

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

3.2.4. Section 122 – Earthquake Prone Buildings

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

3.2.5. Section 124 – Powers of Territorial Authorities

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

3.2.6. Section 131 – Earthquake Prone Building Policy

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

3.3. Christchurch City Council Policy

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

The 2010 amendment includes the following:

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

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

We anticipate that any building with a capacity of less than 34% NBS (including consideration of critical structural weaknesses) will need to be strengthened to a target of 67% NBS of new building standard as recommended by the Policy.

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

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



3.4. Building Code

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

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

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

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



4. Earthquake Resistance Standards

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

5. Building Details

5.1. Building Description

Building PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 is a single storey building that is currently utilised as changing rooms. The building is divided into two changing rooms in the east and west of the building. The west changing room was an extension of the east changing room and was designed in 2003 and has reinforced masonry walls. The original east changing room appears to be constructed from partially masonry walls. The presence of reinforcing in the walls is indicated by dowel bars between the original building and extension on the corners, and with the concrete perimeter beam at the mid-height of the building that is likely to have horizontal reinforcing. Therefore it was concluded that the building was likely to be reinforced in at least every eighth cell. The roof has timber trusses at one metre centres, with plasterboard ceiling cladding and lightweight profiled steel roof cladding. The masonry walls are supported on strip footings. The ground floor is constructed from a concrete slab. It is assumed the original building was designed and constructed in the 1960's due to its architecture and nominal reinforcing.

Our evaluation was based on the visual inspection carried out on 23 May 2012 and limited intrusive investigations carried out on 23 August 2012 and 28 August 2012. Partial structural drawings were available for the recent extension but the date of construction of the original building was not able to be verified.

5.2. Gravity Load Resisting System

The gravity loads from the roof are taken by the timber trusses and then transferred into the masonry block walls and the concrete strip footings below.

5.3. Seismic Load Resisting System

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

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

5.4. Building Damage

SKM undertook an inspection on 23 May 2012. A summary of the typical damage during the time of inspection is outlined below:

- 1) Movement along control joint on north and south walls.
- 2) Cracking through the top masonry block at the control joint on the south wall.
- 3) Cracking through concrete footing directly under the control joint on the south wall.



- 4) Step cracking along mortar joints on internal south wall at the corner of the window opening.
- 5) Gap opening up between top of masonry wall and soffit lining on the south side.
- 6) Impact damage was noted in several locations throughout the building, including corners of the walls and windowsills. This is not believed to be earthquake-related damage.

6. Available Information and Assumptions

6.1. Available Information

Following our inspection carried out on 23 May 2012, SKM carried out a seismic review on building PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 located at Bradford Park. This review was undertaken using the available information which was as follows:

- SKM site measurements and inspection findings.
- Partial structural drawings were available for this building.
- Findings from limited intrusive investigations.

6.2. Survey

There was no visible settlement of the structure, nor were there any significant ground movement issues around the building. The building is zoned as 'urban non-residential' under the CERA Residential Technical Categories Map. Due to these factors we do not recommend that any survey be undertaken at this stage of the assessment.

6.3. Assumptions & Design Criteria

The assumptions and design criteria made in undertaking the assessment include:

- The building was built according to the drawings and according to good practice at the time. We have reviewed the building and from our visual inspection the structure appears to be built in accordance with the drawings.
- The soil on site is class D as described in AS/NZS1170.5:2004, Clause 3.1.3, Soft Soil. This is a conservative assumption based on our findings from the Desktop study. The ultimate bearing capacity on site is 300kPa, we believe that this assumption is reasonable. Liquefaction does not need to be accounted for in the foundation design as our Desktop study established that the liquefaction risk appears to be low at this site. The latter two assumptions assume that the ground conditions classify as "good ground".
- Standard design criteria for typical buildings as described in AS/NZS1170.0:2002:
 - 50 year design life, which is the default NZ Building Code design life.
 - Structure Importance Level 2. This level of importance is described as 'normal' with medium or considerable consequence for loss of human life, or considerable economic, social or environmental consequence of failure.
- The building has a short period less than 0.4 seconds.



- Site hazard factor, $Z = 0.3$, NZBC, Clause B1 Structure, Amendment 11 effective from 1 August 2011
- The following ductility criteria used in the building:
- Table 2: Assumed Building Ductility**

Ductility of Building in Current State	Ductility of Building in Strengthened State
1.25	1.25

The above ductility is based on code requirements at the time of design

- The following material properties were used in the analyses:
- Table 3: Material Properties**

Material	Nominal Strength	Structural Performance
Unfilled masonry blockwork	$f_{mt} = 0.137\text{MPa}$ & $f_c = 13.7\text{MPa}$	$S_p = 1.0$
Concrete	$f_c = 25\text{MPa}$	$S_p = 1.0$

The detailed engineering analysis is a post construction evaluation and therefore has the following limitations:

- It is not likely to pick up on any concealed construction errors (if they exist)
- Other possible issues that could affect the performance of the building such as corrosion and modifications to the structure will not be identified unless they are visible and have been specifically mentioned in this report.
- The detailed engineering evaluation deals only with the structural aspects of the structure. Other aspects such as building services are not covered.

6.4. The Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE) process

The DEE is a procedure written by the Department of Building and Housing's Engineering Advisory Group and grades buildings according to their likely performance in a seismic event. The procedure is not yet recognised by the NZ Building Code but is widely used and recognised by the Christchurch City Council as the preferred method for preliminary seismic investigations of buildings³.

³ <http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/EarthquakeProneDangerousAndInsanitaryBuildingsPolicy2010.pdf>

The procedure of the DEE is as follows:

- 1) Qualitative assessment procedure
 - a. Determine the building's status following any rapid assessment that have been done
 - b. Review any existing documentation that is available. This will give the engineer an understanding of how the building is expected to behave. If no documentation is available, site measurements may be required
 - c. Review the foundations and any geotechnical information available. This will include determining the zoning of the land and the likely soil behaviour, a site investigation may be required
 - d. Investigate possible Critical Structural Weaknesses (CSW) or collapse hazards
 - e. Assess the original and post earthquake strength of the building (this assessment is subsequently superseded by the quantitative assessment)
- 2) Quantitative procedure
 - a. Carry out a geotechnical investigation if required by the qualitative assessment
 - b. Analyse the building according to current building codes and standards. Analysis accounts for damage to the building.

The DEE assessment ranks buildings according to how well they are likely to perform relative to a new building designed to current earthquake standards, as shown in Table 4. The building rank is indicated by the percent of the required New Building Standard (%NBS) strength that the building is considered to have. Earthquake prone buildings are defined as having less than 34% NBS strength which correlates to an increased risk of approximately 20 times that of 100% NBS⁴. Buildings that are identified to be earthquake prone are required by law to be strengthened within 30 years of the owner being notified that the building is potentially earthquake prone⁵. This timeframe is likely to be adjusted by CERA, refer to Table 6 below. This states that buildings which are earthquake prone but undamaged shall be strengthened within two years. We understand that the building does not need to be evacuated since the building has limited damage which will impact on the seismic capacity of the building. Notwithstanding the above, the building occupier may wish to evacuate the building until it is strengthened or propped on the basis of the limiting building capacity summarised in Table 5, the building occupier should ensure that they are meeting their requirements under the health and safety in employment act.

⁴ NZSEE 2006, *Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes*, p 2-2

⁵ <http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/EarthquakeProneDangerousAndInsanitaryBuildingsPolicy2010.pdf>



■ **Table 4: DEE Risk Classifications**

Description	Grade	Risk	%NBS	Structural performance
Low risk building	A+	Low	> 100	Acceptable. Improvement may be desirable.
	A		100 to 80	
	B		80 to 67	
Moderate risk building	C	Moderate	67 to 33	Acceptable legally. Improvement recommended.
High risk building	D	High	33 to 20	Unacceptable. Improvement required.
	E		< 20	

The DEE method rates buildings based on the plans (if available) and other information known about the building and some more subjective parameters associated with how the building is detailed and so it is possible that %NBS derived from different engineers may differ.

This assessment describes only the likely seismic Ultimate Limit State (ULS) performance of the building. The ULS is the level of earthquake that can be resisted by the building without catastrophic failure. The DEE does also consider Serviceability Limit State (SLS) performance of the building and or the level of earthquake that would start to cause damage to the building but this result is secondary to the ULS performance.

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

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



7. Results and Discussions

7.1. Critical Structural Weaknesses

No critical structural weaknesses have been identified for this building.

7.2. Analysis Results

The equivalent static force method was used to analyse the seismic capacity of the building. The results of the analysis are reported in the following table as %NBS. The results below are calculated for the building in its damaged state. The building results have been broken down into their seismic resisting elements. The building has elements that are less than 67% NBS.

(%NBS = the reliable strength / new building standards)

■ Table 5: DEE Results

Seismic Resisting Element	Action	Seismic Rating %NBS
Masonry wall top ring beam	Bending	37
Masonry wall base connection to ground slab	Shear	70
Masonry wall connection (between existing & extension)	Shear	82
Masonry walls in out-of-plane action	Bending	93
Masonry walls in out-of-plane action	Shear	>100
Masonry walls in in-plane action	Shear	>100

7.3. Recommendations

The quantitative assessment carried out on building PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 indicates that the building has a seismic capacity less than 67% of NBS and is therefore classed as being in the category of 'Moderate Risk Buildings'. Strengthening of the building is not required, but it is recommended, to bring it up to a minimum of 67% of NBS.

As per Table 6 below, verbal CERA recommendations state that buildings which are an earthquake risk but undamaged, be strengthened. We understand that the building does not need to be evacuated since the building has limited damage which will impact on the seismic capacity of the building. Notwithstanding the above, the building occupier may wish to evacuate the building until it is strengthened or propped on the basis of the limiting building capacity summarised above in Table 5, the building occupier should ensure that they are meeting their requirements under the health and safety in employment act.



■ **Table 6: Verbal CERA recommendations for Building Strengthening**

CERA Updated Earthquake Prone Building Timelines

Level of Damage	High	Strengthen Immediately	Strengthen within 8 Years	Acceptable (Improvement may be desirable)
	Low	Strengthen Immediately	Strengthen within 4 Years	Acceptable (Improvement may be desirable)
	None	Strengthen within 2 Years	Strengthening Recommended	Acceptable (Improvement may be desirable)
		High Risk	Moderate Risk	Low Risk

0%	33	67%	100%
Strength			

Notes:

- 1) Assumed that damage refers to structural damage that would impact on structural capacity
- 2) The table was discussed in a CERA briefing session dated 26/10/11 and is yet to be formally printed

If it is determined that the building should be strengthened there are a number of issues which will need to be investigated and associated documents prepared in order to submit a building consent application. These issues will need to be considered during the initial phase of strengthening works. Listed below are the likely items the council may require to be explored:

- A geotechnical investigation will be required and associated factual and interpretive geotechnical reports prepared – the geotechnical reports will be required to enable completion of the strengthening design.
- A fire report will be required and all necessary upgrades to egress routes, emergency lighting and specified systems will need to be undertaken.
- An emergency lighting design will be required to meet the provisions noted in the fire report.
- A disabled access summary will be required including provision for disabled facilities.
- The site amenities (toilets and the like) will need to be reviewed to ensure that there are sufficient facilities for the expected number of people on site.
- Landscaping will need to be considered although we do not anticipate that any modifications will be required since you will not be adjusting the footprint area of buildings on site and will likely only be required for the new build option.

8. Conclusion

SKM carried out a quantitative assessment on building PRK_1133_BLDG_001 EQ2 located in Bradford Park at 196 Milton Street, Sydenham, Christchurch. This assessment concluded that the building is classified as a potential earthquake risk.

■ Table 7: Quantitative Assessment Summary

Grade	Risk	%NBS	Structural performance
C	Moderate	37	Acceptable legally. Improvement recommended.

Strengthening is not required for the building to bring the seismic capacity up to at a minimum of 67% of NBS, but it is recommended.

We make the following additional recommendations if the building is to be strengthened:

- A full geotechnical investigation will be required prior to lodging a consent for the repairs and any design changes recommended in the geotechnical investigation will need to be incorporated in the detailed strengthening design
- A detailed strengthening design should be undertaken.
- A full strengthening and repair specification should be prepared accounting for the damage contained in the damage assessment report and strengthening as confirmed by the detailed design.

It is recommended that:

- a) The current placard status of the building of Green 1 remain as is.
- b) We consider that barriers around the building are not necessary.



9. Limitation Statement

This report has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of, SKM's client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between SKM and the Client. It is not possible to make a proper assessment of this report without a clear understanding of the terms of engagement under which it has been prepared, including the scope of the instructions and directions given to, and the assumptions made by, SKM. The report may not address issues which would need to be considered for another party if that party's particular circumstances, requirements and experience were known and, further, may make assumptions about matters of which a third party is not aware. No responsibility or liability to any third party is accepted for any loss or damage whatsoever arising out of the use of or reliance on this report by any third party.

Without limiting any of the above, in the event of any liability, SKM's liability, whether under the law of contract, tort, statute, equity or otherwise, is limited in as set out in the terms of the engagement with the Client.

It is not within SKM's scope or responsibility to identify the presence of asbestos, nor the responsibility of SKM to identify possible sources of asbestos. Therefore for any property pre-dating 1989, the presence of asbestos materials should be considered when costing remedial measures or possible demolition.

Should there be any further significant earthquake event, of a magnitude 5 or greater, it will be necessary to conduct a follow-up investigation, as the observations, conclusions and recommendations of this report may no longer apply. Earthquake of a lower magnitude may also cause damage, and SKM should be advised immediately if further damage is visible or suspected.



10. Appendix 1 – CERA Standardised Report Form

Location		Building Name: <u>PRK_1133_BLDG_001_EQ2</u>	Unit No: Street	Reviewer: <u>NM Calvert</u>
Building Address: _____		196 Milton Street, Sydenham		CPEng No: <u>242062</u>
Legal Description: _____		Company: <u>SKM</u>		
GPS south: _____		Company project number: <u>ZB01276_097</u>		
GPS east: _____		Company phone number: <u>09 928 5500</u>		
Building Unique Identifier (CCC): _____		Date of submission: <u>20-Nov</u>		
		Inspection Date: <u>23/05/2012</u>		
		Revision: <u>A</u>		
		Is there a full report with this summary? <u>yes</u>		

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

Building		No. of storeys above ground: <u>1</u>	single storey = 1	Ground floor elevation (Absolute) (m): <u>5.00</u>
Ground floor split? <u>no</u>		Stores below ground: <u>0</u>		Ground floor elevation above ground (m): <u>5.00</u>
Foundation type: <u>mat slab</u>		Building height (m): <u>5.00</u>	if Foundation type is other, describe: _____	height from ground to level of uppermost seismic mass (for IEP only) (m): <u>5</u>
Floor footprint area (approx): <u>84</u>		Age of Building (years): <u>50</u>	Date of design: <u>1935-1965</u>	
Strengthening present? <u>no</u>		Use (ground floor): <u>public</u>	Use (upper floors): _____	Use notes (if required): _____
Importance level (to NZS1170.5): <u>IL2</u>		Brief strengthening description: _____		

Gravity Structure		Gravity System: <u>load bearing walls</u>	
Roof: <u>timber framed</u>		rafter type, purlin type and cladding: _____	Timber trusses (100x50) at 1 metre centres, plasterboard ceiling cladding and lightweight corrugated roof cladding
Floors: <u>concrete flat slab</u>		slab thickness (mm): _____	Unknown
Beams: <u>none</u>		overall depth x width (mm x mm): _____	None
Columns: <u>none</u>		typical dimensions (mm x mm): _____	None
Walls: <u>unreinforced concrete masonry</u>		thickness (mm): _____	200

Lateral load resisting structure		Lateral system along: <u>partially filled CMU</u>	Ductility assumed, μ : <u>1.25</u>	Period along: <u>0.40</u>	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <u>10</u>	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): _____	Note: Define along and across in detailed report!	note total length of wall at ground (m): <u>200mm</u>	wall thickness (m): _____	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>
Lateral system across: <u>partially filled CMU</u>		Ductility assumed, μ : <u>1.25</u>	Period across: <u>0.40</u>	Total deflection (ULS) (mm): <u>10</u>	maximum interstorey deflection (ULS) (mm): _____			note total length of wall at ground (m): <u>200mm</u>	wall thickness (m): _____	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>	estimate or calculation? <u>estimated</u>

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

Non-structural elements		Stairs: _____	Wall cladding: <u>exposed structure</u>	Roof Cladding: <u>Metal</u>	Glazing: <u>aluminium frames</u>	Ceilings: <u>plaster, fixed</u>	Services(list): <u>Water, sewerage</u>	describe: <u>Masonry walls</u>	describe: <u>Corrugated sheeting</u>
--------------------------------	--	---------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Available documentation		Architectural: <u>none</u>	Structural: <u>none</u>	Mechanical: <u>none</u>	Electrical: <u>none</u>	Geotech report: <u>partial</u>	original designer name/date: _____	original designer name/date: _____	original designer name/date: _____	original designer name/date: _____	original designer name/date: _____
--------------------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

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

Building:		Current Placard Status: <u>green</u>	
Along	Damage ratio: <u>0%</u>	Describe (summary): <u>Cracking along mortar joints</u>	Describe how damage ratio arrived at: <u>Current damage noted will not diminish the capacity of the building</u>
Across	Damage ratio: <u>0%</u>	Describe (summary): <u>Cracking along mortar joints</u>	
Diaphragms	Damage?: <u>no</u>	Describe: _____	
CSWs:	Damage?: <u>no</u>	Describe: _____	
Pounding:	Damage?: <u>no</u>	Describe: _____	
Non-structural:	Damage?: <u>yes</u>	Describe: <u>Opening at control joint. - Minor</u>	

Recommendations		Level of repair/strengthening required: <u>minor non-structural</u>	Building Consent required: <u>no</u>	Interim occupancy recommendations: <u>full occupancy</u>	Describe: _____	Describe: _____	Describe: <u>Not an immediate collapse hazard.</u>
Along	Assessed %NBS before: _____	Assessed %NBS after: _____	%NBS from IEP below	if IEP not used, please detail assessment methodology: _____	Quantitative Assessment carried out to find the building capacity		
Across	Assessed %NBS before: _____	Assessed %NBS after: _____	%NBS from IEP below				