

Kapiti Coast District Council - Initial Seismic Evaluation

# FYTFIELD PLACE – EOC, PARAPARAUMU

#### EQ No: 0883

5-C3144.00



## **INTRODUCTION:**

Opus International Consultants Ltd has undertaken an 'Initial Evaluation Procedure' (IEP) of Fytfield Place, Paraparaumu. The evaluation was carried out in accordance with NZ Society of Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) guidelines. The process includes internal and external non-invasive visual inspections, and an estimation of %NBS using the IEP process.

## **BUILDING DESCRIPTION:**

Building Name:	Kapiti Emergency Operations Centre	Building Use:	Emergency Operations Centre
Design/Constructed:	2007	Importance Level	4
General Shape:	Rectangular	No. of Storeys:	1
Longitudinal Lateral Load Resisting System:	Braced timber framed walls. Multi brace roof and Gib diaphragm bracing	Transverse Lateral Load Resisting System:	Braced timber framed walls. Multi brace roof and Gib diaphragm bracing
Foundation System:	Timber, driven timber anchor piles	Other Level Floor Systems:	None
Roof System:	Timber frames supporting lightweight cladding	Primary Cladding Type:	Hardboard cladding.
Other Comments:	None		

#### **INITIAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE:**

Fytfield Place, Kapiti Emergency Operations Centre, is assessed as **85% NBS** when considered as an IL4 building. The building is a low risk and does not require strengthening under the Building Act 2004.

0%	20%	33%		44%		67%	8	30%	100%
	D ligh Risk quake Prone	N	( Ioderate			B		A Low Risk	A+
				Longitudin	nal			- Trans	sverse
Baseline %	SNBS			56%				56	5%
Factors In	fluencing Baseline		Age o	of structure ar	nd desi	gn	Α	ge of structı	ıre and design
Critical St	ructural Weaknesse	es		None			None		
Modificati	on Factors			1.5			1.5		
Influence	on Modification Fac	ctor	Brace	d timber fran	ned wa	lls.	Bı	raced timber	framed walls.
%NBS				85% NBS	6			85%	NBS
Prepared l	oy:	Gi	regory Fitzg	gerald	Date	:		21.	June 2016
Reviewed	by:	Ca	arl Ashby		CPE	ng No:		:	178762
Released b	y:	Ca	arl Ashby		Repo	ort Issue	:		Issued

Telephone: +64 4 471 7000 Facsimile: +64 4 471 1397 Website: www.opus.co.nz

conjunction with the limitations set out	is been carried out solely as an initial seismic assessment of the build essment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Building in the accompanying report, and should not be relied on by any part based on them, have not been undertaken, and these may lead to d	s in Earthquakes, June 2006". This spre y for any other purpose. Detailed inspec	adsheet must be read in
treet Number & Name:	Fytfield Place	Job No.:	5C3144.00
KA:	Kapiti Emergency Operations Centre	By:	GF
ame of building:		Date:	8/06/2016
ity:	Paraparaumu	Revision No.:	0
able IEP-1 Initial Ev itep 1 - General Information			
.2 Sketches (plans etc, show			
.3 List relevant features (Note ame - Timber frames braced with Ply and g undations - Timber piles, driven piles bof Structure - Timber frame with multi brac ubsoil - Assumed subsoil D based on local onstruction - 2008	e and lightweight cladding	er text required use Page 1a)	
4 Note information sources	Tick as appropriate		

reet Number	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Fytfield Place	Job No	.: <u>5C3144.00</u>
KA:		Kapiti Emergency Operations Cent		GF
ame of buildi		Daranaraumu	Date: Revisio	8/06/2016 on No.: 0
ty:		Paraparaumu	Revisio	0 U
able IEP-2	Initial Evalua	ation Procedure Step 2		
•	mination of (%NB)	, -		
	nominal (%NBS) = (	,	Longitudinal	Transverse
a) Building S	trengthening Data			
Tick if bui	lding is known to have b	been strengthened in this direction		
If strength	nened, enter percentage	e of code the building has been strengthene	d to N/A	N/A
h) Year of De	ian/Strongthoning D	uilding Turns and Saismis Zons		
b) fear of Des	sign/Strengthening, B	uilding Type and Seismic Zone	Pre 1935 🔘	Pre 1935 🔿
			1935-1965	1935-1965
			1965-1976 🔿 1976-1984 🔿	1965-1976 O 1976-1984 O
			1984-1992	1984-1992 〇
			1992-2004 🔘	1992-2004 🔘
			2004-2011 💿	2004-2011 💿
			Post Aug 2011 🔘	Post Aug 2011 🔘
		Building Type	:	
		Seismic Zone:	· ·	
c) Soil Type	From NZS1170.5:200	4, Cl 3.1.3 :	D Soft Soil	D Soft Soil
	From NZS4203:1992,		Flexible	Flexible
	(for 1992 to 2004 and	only if known)		_
d) Estimate F Comment:			h <sub>n</sub> = 5	5 m
			A <sub>c</sub> = 1.00	1.00 m <sup>2</sup>
	esisting Concrete Fram		0	0
	esisting Steel Frames: Ily Braced Steel Frames	T = max{0.14 $h_n^{0.75}$ , 0.4} T = max{0.08 $h_n^{0.75}$ , 0.4}	0	0
	rame Structures:	$T = \max\{0.06h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$	ŏ	õ
	Shear Walls	$T = \max\{0.09h_n^{0.75}/A_c^{0.5}, 0.4\}$		0
	hear Walls: ed (input Period):	<i>T</i> <u>&lt;</u> 0.4sec	0	8
User Dellin	( )	nt in metres from the base of the structure to the	Ŭ	V V
	uppermost seismi		<b>T:</b> 0.40	0.40
e) Factor A:	Strengthening factor deter if not strengthened)	mined using result from (a) above (set to 1.0	Factor A: 1.00	1.00
f) Factor B:		Suidelines Figure 3A.1 using	Factor B: 1.00	1.00
g) Factor C:		ldings designed between 1976-84 Factor	Factor C: 1.00	1.00
h) Factor D:	For buildings designed pri	or to 1935 Factor D = 0.8 except for Wellington	Factor D: 1.00	1.00
	where Factor D may be ta	ken as 1, otherwise take as 1.0.		
(%NBS) <sub>nom</sub> =	= AxBxCxD		(% <b>NBS</b> ) <sub>nom</sub> 100%	100%

immusions set out in the accompanying report, and should not be relied on by any party for any other purpose. D judgements based on them, have not been undertaken, and these may lead to a different result or seismic grade.

itreet Number & Name: KA: lame of building: ity:	Fytfield Place Kapiti Emerge Paraparaumu	ncy Operation	s Centre	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	5C3144.00 GF 8/06/2016 0
able IEP-2 Initial Eva	aluation Procee	dure Step 2 d	ontinued		
.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor,					
If <i>T</i> < 1.5sec, Factor E = 1			Longitudi	nal	Transverse
a) Near Fault Factor, N(T,D)			N(T,D): 1		1
(from NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.6) <b>b) Factor E</b>		= 1/N(T,D)	Factor E: 1.00		1.00
.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Fac	tor F				
a) Hazard Factor, Z, for site					
Location	n: Paraparaumu	_	Refer right for user-defined lo	cations	
	Z = 0.4	(from NZS1170.5:2		-/L\\	
Z <sub>199</sub> ; Z <sub>2004</sub>		(NZS4203:1992 Zo (from NZS1170.5:2	ne Factor from accompanying Figure 3.8 004, Table 3.3)	,(0))	
b) Factor F					
For pre 1992 For 1992-2011	=	1/Z Z <sub>1992</sub> /Z			
For post 2011	=	$Z_{2004}/Z$			
			Factor F: 1.00		1.00
<ul> <li>a) Design Importance Level, I (Set to 1 if not known. For buildings de public building set to 1.25. For building public building set to 1.33 for Zone A of b) Design Risk Factor, R<sub>o</sub> (set to 1.0 if other than 1976-2004, or</li> </ul>	gs designed 1965-1976 and or 1.2 for Zone B. For 1976-	known to be designed			1
c) Return Period Factor, R (from NZS1170.0:2004 Building Impo	ortance Level)	Choose Import	ance Level 01 02 0	3 @ 4 0	1 02 03 💿
			R = 1.8		1.8
d) Factor G	=	IR <sub>o</sub> /R		_	
.5 Ductility Scaling Factor, Fa a) Available Displacement Duct		Structure	Factor G: 0.56		0.56
Comment: Lined timber framed walls bot	, ,	Siluciale	μ = <u>2.00</u>	<u></u>	2.00
b) Factor H	For pre 1976 (max	kimum of 2)	$k_{\mu} = 1.57$		κ <sub>μ</sub> 1.57
	For 1976 onwards		= 1 Factor H: 1.00	_	1
(where $k\mu$ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelast	tic Spectrum Scaling Factor	, from accompanying T			1.00
.6 Structural Performance Sca a) Structural Performance Factor	•	rl			
(from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed cons	struction in this directio	n	$S_n = 0.50$	_	0.50
		. 4/0	·		
b) Structural Performance Scal Note Factor B values for 1992 to 200	-	$= 1/S_p$ 0.67 to account for Sp	Factor I: 1.00		1.00
.7 Baseline %NBS for Buildin (equals (%NBS) <sub>nom</sub> x E x F x			56%		56%

eet Number & Name:	Fytfield Place		Jo	ob No.:	5C3144.00
A:	Kapiti Emergency Operatio	ns Centre	B	/:	GF
me of building:			······	ate:	8/06/2016
y:	Paraparaumu		Re	evision No.:	0
ble IEP-3 Initial Ev	valuation Procedure Step 3				
ep 3 - Assessment of Per fer Appendix B - Section B3.2)	rformance Achievement Ratio (I	PAR)			
Longitudinal Direction					
potential CSWs		Structural Performan			Fact
Plan Irregularity		© 0:#(		A Incimiticant	
Effect on Structural Performa	ance 🖸 Severe	C Significant		Insignificant	Factor A 1.0
Vertical Irregularity					
Effect on Structural Performa	ance OSevere	Significant		Insignificant	Factor B 1.0
Short Columns					
Effect on Structural Performa	ance OSevere	C Significant		Insignificant	Factor C 1.0
Pounding Potential (Estimate D1 and D2 and set	et D = the lower of the two, or 1.0 if no	potential for pounding,	or consequen	ices are consider	red to be minimal)
) Factor D1: - Pounding Effe	ct				1
Values given assume the	e building has a frame structure. For s	tiff buildings (eg shear v	valls), the effe	ct of pounding	
	e building has a frame structure. For s g the coefficient to the right of the val		ouildings.		]
	g the coefficient to the right of the val	lue applicable to frame b Factor D1 For Long Severe	<b>jitudings.</b> jitudinal Dire Significant	ction: 1.0	
may be reduced by takin	g the coefficient to the right of the val	Tactor D1 For Long Severe Daration 0 <sep<.005h (0<="" td=""><td>puildings. Jitudinal Dire</td><td>ction: 1.0</td><td></td></sep<.005h>	puildings. Jitudinal Dire	ction: 1.0	
may be reduced by takin	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey	Interaction applicable to frame between to frame between to the server of the serve	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H () 1</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H () 1	
may be reduced by takin	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Sep	Interaction applicable to frame between to frame between to the server of the serve	<b>jitudings.</b> <b>jitudinal Dire</b> Significant 205 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H	
Table for Selection	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Sep Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey	Interaction applicable to frame between to frame between to the server of the serve	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H () 1</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H () 1	
Table for Selection Alig	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Ser Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey	Factor D1 For Long         Severe         varation       0 <sep<.005h< td="">         Height       1         Height       0.4</sep<.005h<>	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 0.7</sep<.01h 	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Seps.01H © 1 0.8 Ction: 1.0	
Table for Selection	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Ser Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey	Image: Applicable to frame by the severe         Severe         Severe         Severe         Severe         Height         1         Height         0.4	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 07 jitudinal Dire Significant 005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>ction: 1.0 Insignificant Seps.01H © 1 0.8</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></sep<.01h 	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Seps.01H © 1 0.8	
Table for Selection Alig NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4	Image: Applicable to frame by the severe         Severe         Severe         Severe         Severe         Severe         Height         Severe	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 07 07 07 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 07</sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 0.8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1	
Table for Selection Alig	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 + Height Difference 2 to 4 +	Image: Control of the second secon	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 027 01 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 027 09</sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 1 ○ 1 ○ 1	
Table for Selection Alig NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4	Image: Control of the second secon	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 07 07 07 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 07</sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 0.8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1	
may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 + Height Difference 2 to 4 +	Image: Control of the second secon	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 027 01 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 05<sep<.01h 027 09</sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ○ 1 ○ 1 ○ 1 ○ 1	Factor D
may be reduced by takin         Table for Selection         Alig         NA         b) Factor D2: - Heigh         Table for Selection         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 + Height Difference 2 to 4 +	Interpretation of the server	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.1</sep<.01h 	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H € 1 € 0.8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H € 1 € 1 € 1	
may be reduced by takin         Table for Selection         Alig         NA         b) Factor D2: - Heigh         Table for Selection         NA         Site Characteristics - State	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Sep Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Differenc	Interpolation       Interpolation         Factor D1 For Long         Severe         Daration       0 <sep<.005h< td="">         Definition       1         Height       1         Height       0.4         Factor D2 For Long       Severe         0<sep<.005h< td="">       .0         Storeys       0.4         Storeys       0.7         Storeys       1         it affects the structural per store</sep<.005h<></sep<.005h<>	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.1</sep<.01h 	ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         Image: Sep>.01H       1         Image: One       0.8         ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         Image: Sep>.01H       1         Image: One       1         Ima	pective
may be reduced by takin         Table for Selection         Alig         NA         b) Factor D2: - Heigh         Table for Selection         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         NA         D) Factor D2: - Height         Table for Selection         NA	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Sep Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Differenc	Interpretation of the server	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.1</sep<.01h 	ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H € 1 € 0.8 Ction: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H € 1 € 1 € 1	pective
may be reduced by takin         Table for Selection         Alig         NA         b) Factor D2: - Heigh         Table for Selection         NA         Site Characteristics - State         Effect on Structural Perform         None         Other Factors - for alloward         Record rationale for characteristics	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Difference 2 to 4 Segre bility, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as pance Segre	Image: Applicable to frame be severe         Severe         paration       0 <sep<.005h< td="">         Preight       1         Preight       04         Factor D2 For Long       Severe         Severe       0<sep<.005h< td="">         Preight       04         Factor D2 For Long       Severe         Severe       0<sep<.005h< td="">         Storeys       04         Storeys       07         Storeys       1         it affects the structural pe       Significent         Storeys       1         it affects the structural pe       Significent         The building       For ≤ content</sep<.005h<></sep<.005h<></sep<.005h<>	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 007 07 01 07 04 07 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 007 09 01 01 007 09 01 007 09 01 007</sep<.01h 	ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         © 1       0.8         ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         Sep>.01H       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1         0 1       1	Factor E 1.0
may be reduced by takin         Table for Selection         Alig         NA         b) Factor D2: - Heigh         Table for Selection         NA         Site Characteristics - State         Effect on Structural Perform         None         Other Factors - for alloward         Record rationale for characteristics	g the coefficient to the right of the val n of Factor D1 Seg Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey nment of Floors not within 20% of Storey t Difference Effect n of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Height Difference 3 to 4 Height Differenc	Image: Applicable to frame be severe         Severe         paration       0 <sep<.005h< td="">         Preight       1         Preight       04         Factor D2 For Long       Severe         Severe       0<sep<.005h< td="">         Preight       04         Factor D2 For Long       Severe         Severe       0<sep<.005h< td="">         Storeys       04         Storeys       07         Storeys       1         it affects the structural pe       Significent         Storeys       1         it affects the structural pe       Significent         The building       For ≤ content</sep<.005h<></sep<.005h<></sep<.005h<>	jitudinal Dire Significant 005 <sep<.01h 01 007 07 01 07 04 07 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 05 09 01 01 007 09 01 01 007 09 01 007 09 01 007</sep<.01h 	ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         © 1       0.8         ction:       1.0         Insignificant       Sep>.01H         Sep>.01H       1         0 1       1         1       1	Factor E 1.0

<pre>/ •</pre>	Fytfield Place			J	ob No.:	5C3144.00
(A:	Kapiti Emergency	Operations Cer	ntre	B	y:	GF
me of building:	Dereneroumu			<mark></mark>	ate:	8/06/2016 0
ty:	Paraparaumu			ĸ	evision No.:	0
able IEP-3 Initial Ev	valuation Procedur	e Step 3				
ep 3 - Assessment of Per efer Appendix B - Section B3.2)		nt Ratio (PAR)				
Transverse Direction						
potential CSWs		Effect on Stru (Choose a value				Facto
Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Perform NA	nance O Severe	c	Significant		Insignificant	Factor A 1.0
Vertical Irregularity						
Effect on Structural Perform	nance OSevere	0	Significant		Insignificant	Factor B 1.0
Short Columns			0:		O Incimificant	
Effect on Structural Perform NA	nance 🖸 Severe	0	Significant		Insignificant	Factor C 1.0
	e building has a frame stru ng the coefficient to the rig no of Factor D1	ht of the value appl	icable to frame ctor D1 For To Severe	buildings. ransverse Dire Significant	ection: 1.0	
	Alignment of Floors within 2	Separation 0% of Storey Height	0 <sep<.005h< td=""><td>.005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></td></sep<.005h<>	.005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	Sep>.01H	
	qnment of Floors not within 2		0.4	0.07	0.8	
Alia		on otoroy molght				
Alig NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	nt Difference Effect					
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh		Fa		ransverse Dire		
NA		Fa	ctor D2 For Tr Severe 0 <sep<.005h< td=""><td>ransverse Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></td></sep<.005h<>	ransverse Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H	
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	on of Factor D2	Fa	Severe 0 <sep<.005h< td=""><td>Significant .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></td></sep<.005h<>	Significant .005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	Insignificant Sep>.01H	
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	on of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Diffe	erence > 4 Storeys rence 2 to 4 Storeys	Severe 0 <sep<.005h 0 04 0 07</sep<.005h 	Significant .005 <sep<.01h 0.7 0.9</sep<.01h 	Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 1	
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh	on of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Diffe	erence > 4 Storeys	Severe 0 <sep<.005h< td=""><td>Significant .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></td></sep<.005h<>	Significant .005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>Insignificant Sep&gt;.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	Insignificant Sep>.01H	
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh <i>Table for Selection</i>	on of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Diffe	erence > 4 Storeys rence 2 to 4 Storeys	Severe 0 <sep<.005h 0 04 0 07</sep<.005h 	Significant .005 <sep<.01h 0.7 0.9</sep<.01h 	Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 1	Factor D 1.0
b) Factor D2: - Heigh	on of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Diffe Height Dif	erence > 4 Storeys rence 2 to 4 Storeys fference < 2 Storeys	Severe 0 <sep<.005h 0 04 0 07 0 1</sep<.005h 	Significant .005 <sep<.01h 0 07 0 09 0 1</sep<.01h 	Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 1 1 1 1	
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh <i>Table for Selection</i> NA	on of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Diffe Height Dif ability, landslide threat, liquef	erence > 4 Storeys rence 2 to 4 Storeys fference < 2 Storeys	Severe 0 <sep<.005h 0 04 0 07 0 1</sep<.005h 	Significant .005 <sep<.01h 0 07 0 09 0 1</sep<.01h 	Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 1 1 1 1	pective
NA b) Factor D2: - Heigh <i>Table for Selection</i> NA Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform None Other Factors - for allowan Record rationale for c	n of Factor D2 Height Diffe Height Differ Height Differ He	erence > 4 Storeys rence 2 to 4 Storeys fference < 2 Storeys action etc as it affect.	Severe 0 <sep<.005h 0.4 0.7 1 s the structural p Significant</sep<.005h 	Significant .005 <sep<.01h 0.7 0.9 0 1 Deerformance from ≤ 3 storeys - May otherwise - May</sep<.01h 	Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	pective

me of building: Paraparaumu Pate: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2007 Paraparaumu Pate: 2007 p 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) ap 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate) Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS : <u>Grade: A+ A B C D E</u>	me of building: y: Paraparaumu Pate: B06/2016 Revision No.: 0 Date: B06/2016 Comparison No.: 0 Date: B06/2016 Date: B06/	me of building: Paraparaumu Pate: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2007 Paraparaumu Pate: 2007 p 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) ap 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate) Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS : <u>Grade: A+ A B C D E</u>	me of building: Paraparaumu Pate: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2007 Paraparaumu Pate: 2007 p 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) ap 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate) Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS : <u>Grade: A+ A B C D E</u>	me of building: Paraparaumu Pate: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2006 Revision No.: 0 Date: 2007 Paraparaumu Pate: 2007 p 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) ap 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate) Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS : <u>Grade: A+ A B C D E</u>	eet Number & Name:	Fytfield Place				Job N	o.:	5C3144.00
ty: Paraparaumu Revision No.: 0 able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), PAR x Baseline (%NBS), (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) Paraparaumu %NBS < 67 NO (Mark as appropriate) Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Earthquake Nakes: Earthquake Assessed State A A B C D E	ty: Paraparaumu Revision No.: 0 able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), PAR x Baseline (%NBS), (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) Paraparaumu %NBS < 67 NO (Mark as appropriate) Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Earthquake Nakes: Earthquake Assessed State A A B C D E	ty: Paraparaumu Revision No.: 0 able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), PAR x Baseline (%NBS), (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) Kep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate) Kep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Earthquake Mark as the second of the secon	ty: Paraparaumu Revision No.: 0 able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), PAR x Baseline (%NBS), (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) Per 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS : <u>Grade: A+ A B C D E</u>	ty: Paraparaumu Revision No.: 0 able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) PAR x Baseline (%NBS), PAR x Baseline (%NBS), (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate) Paraparaumu %NBS < 67 NO (Mark as appropriate) Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Earthquake Nakes: Earthquake Assessed State A A B C D E	KA:	Kapiti Emerg	ency Operat	ions Centre				
able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 56%   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.50   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 85%   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) 85%   5 Potentially Earthquake Prone? %/NBS ± 34   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) %/NBS ± 34   tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? %/NBS ± 67   (Mark as appropriate) %/NBS ± 67   tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %/NBS :	able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 56%   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.50   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 85%   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) 85%   5 Potentially Earthquake Prone? %/NBS ± 34   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) %/NBS ± 34   tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? %/NBS ± 67   (Mark as appropriate) %/NBS ± 67   tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %/NBS :	able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS),   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)   (from Table IEP - 1) 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 85% <th>able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS), Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS),   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS),   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)   ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?   (Mark as appropriate)   Seismic Grade   Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)   Relationship between Grade and %NBS:</th> <th>able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 56%   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.50   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 85%   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) 85%   5 Potentially Earthquake Prone? %/NBS ± 34   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) %/NBS ± 34   tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? %/NBS ± 67   (Mark as appropriate) %/NBS ± 67   tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %/NBS :</th> <th>-</th> <th>Paraparaum</th> <th>U</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>••••••</th> <th>on No.:</th> <th>••••••</th>	able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS), Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS),   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS),   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)   ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?   (Mark as appropriate)   Seismic Grade   Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)   Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7   tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal   1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 56%   2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.50   (from Table IEP - 2) 1.50 1.50   3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 85%   4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) 85%   5 Potentially Earthquake Prone? %/NBS ± 34   (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) %/NBS ± 34   tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? %/NBS ± 67   (Mark as appropriate) %/NBS ± 67   tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %/NBS :	-	Paraparaum	U			••••••	on No.:	••••••
ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS)       Longitudinal       Transverse         4       Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (trom Table IEP - 1)       56%       56%         2       Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         3       PAR x Baseline (%/NBS),       85%       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %/NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %/NBS:       E       D       E	ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS)       Longitudinal       Transverse         4       Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (trom Table IEP - 1)       56%       56%         2       Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         3       PAR x Baseline (%/NBS),       85%       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %/NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %/NBS:       E       D       E	ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS)       Longitudinal       Transverse         4       Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (trom Table IEP - 1)       56%       56%         2       Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         3       PAR x Baseline (%/NBS),       85%       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %/NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %/NBS:       E       D       E	ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS)       Longitudinal       Transverse         4       Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (trom Table IEP - 1)       56%       56%         2       Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         3       PAR x Baseline (%/NBS),       85%       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %/NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %/NBS:       E       D       E	ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS)       Longitudinal       Transverse         4       Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (trom Table IEP - 1)       56%       56%         2       Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         3       PAR x Baseline (%/NBS),       85%       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         4       Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %/NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %/NBS:       E       D       E	•			5 4 5 6 an	47			
Longitudinal       Transverse         Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS)b.       56%         (from Table IEP - 1)       56%         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)       1.50         (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS)b.       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)       85%         (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?       %NBS < 67         (Mark as appropriate)       Seismic Grade         A       Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :       E	Longitudinal       Transverse         Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS)b.       56%         (from Table IEP - 1)       56%         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)       1.50         (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS)b.       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)       85%         (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	Longitudinal       Transverse         Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS)b.       56%         (from Table IEP - 1)       56%         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)       1.50         (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS)b.       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)       85%         (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	Longitudinal       Transverse         Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS)b.       56%         (from Table IEP - 1)       56%         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)       1.50         (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS)b.       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)       85%         (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	Longitudinal       Transverse         Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS)b.       56%         (from Table IEP - 1)       56%         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR)       1.50         (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS)b.       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS)       85%         (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67			-	5 4, J, U allo				
(from Table IEP - 1)       1.50       1.50         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Seismic Grade       A         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :       E       E       E	(from Table IEP - 1)       1.50       1.50         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 1)       1.50       1.50         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 1)       1.50       1.50         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 1)       1.50       1.50         Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2)       1.50       1.50         PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	,p + Teroentage of New	Dunung otunuu			Long	itudinal		Transverse
(from Table IEP - 2)         3       PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 4       Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Example Table Image: A + A B C D E	(from Table IEP - 2)         3       PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 4       Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 2)         3       PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 4       Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 2)         3       PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 4       Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(from Table IEP - 2)         3       PAR x Baseline (%NBS) <sub>b</sub> 4       Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS ≤ 34         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67		3S (%NBS) <sub>b</sub>				56%		56%
Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 34       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       E         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :       E       E       E	Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 34	Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 34	Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 34	Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)       85%         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone? (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 34		ent Ratio (PAR)				1.50		1.50
(Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67       NO         ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?       %NBS < 67       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67       NO         ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP       Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Mark as appropriate)       Mark as appropriate)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :       To the two scores       To the two scores	(Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	(Use lower of two values from Step 4.3)         ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Prone?       %NBS ≤ 34       NO         (Mark as appropriate)       %NBS < 67	B PAR x Baseline (%NBS)	Ь			1	35%		85%
(Mark as appropriate)     ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?   (Mark as appropriate)     ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	(Mark as appropriate)     ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?   (Mark as appropriate)     ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	(Mark as appropriate)     ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?   (Mark as appropriate)     ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	(Mark as appropriate)     ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?   (Mark as appropriate)     ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	(Mark as appropriate)     ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk?   (Mark as appropriate)     ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)     Relationship between Grade and %NBS:			S)					85%
(Mark as appropriate)         tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP         Seismic Grade         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A         B       C         D	(Mark as appropriate)         tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP         Seismic Grade         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A         B       C         D	(Mark as appropriate)         tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP         Seismic Grade         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS:         Grade:       A+         A         B       C       D         E	(Mark as appropriate) ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score) Relationship between Grade and %NBS:   Grade: A +	(Mark as appropriate)         tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP         Seismic Grade         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A         B       C         D	tep 5 - Potentially Earthqu		riate)			%N	BS <u>&lt;</u> 34	NO
Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A B       C       D	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A B       C       D	Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Image: A to a score of the score	Seismic Grade       A         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)       Image: A to	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP score)         Relationship between Grade and %NBS :         Grade:       A+         A B       C       D	ep 6 - Potentially Earthqu		riate)			%N	BS < 67	NO
Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E						Seismi	c Grade	A
Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Additional Comments (iten	ns of note affecting I	IEP score)			Seismi	c Grade	A
Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Grade: A+ A B C D E	Additional Comments (iten	ns of note affecting I	IEP score)			Seismi	c Grade	A
					Additional Comments (iten	ns of note affecting I	IEP score)			Seismi	c Grade	A
					Relationship betwe	en Grade and	%NBS:					A
					Relationship betwee	en Grade and	%NBS:			D	E	
					Relationship betwee	en Grade and	%NBS:			D	E	

٩KA	ne of building:	Fytfield Place Kapiti Emergency Paraparaumu	Operations Centre	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	5C3144.00 GF 8/06/2016 0
		aluation Procedure			
step	-	a significant number o	Structural Weaknesses th of occupants	at could result in	
8.1	Number of storeys abov	ve ground level			1
3.2	Presence of heavy conc	rete floors and/or conc	rete roof? (Y/N)		N
	Occupancy not consid	dered to be significant	t - no further consideratior	n required	
	Risk not considered to	o be significant - no fu	urther consideration requi	ed	
		ent Confirmed by	a.	Signature	
	ILF ASSESSIN		Carl Ashby	Name	
			178762	CPEng. No	
WA	<b>RNING!!</b> This initial evaluation have a series of the ser	as been carried out solely as an in	itial seismic assessment of the building fo	llowing the procedureset out in the New 2	Zealand Society for Earthque

