

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO Forum

Date	17/01/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	<p>[REDACTED] – Christchurch City Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Christchurch City Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Christchurch City Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] Waimakariri District Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Waimakariri District Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Selwyn District Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] Selwyn District Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] Arrow/AMI</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Arrow/AMI</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Arrow/AMI</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Arrow/AMI</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Arrow/AMI</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Maxim/FMP</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Maxim/FMP</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Hawkins/IAG</p> <p>[REDACTED] MWH Mainzeal</p> <p>[REDACTED] – MWH Mainzeal</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Vero</p> <p>[REDACTED] – EQR</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Ireland Group</p>
Apologies	Nil.

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Main objective and direction of meeting</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] outlined what the main objectives and the direction of this meeting should be to ensure that these meetings are productive, of high value, globally informative, maintain expectations, consensus on new legislation/guidelines interpretation, common repair solutions, work through issues together, resolve differences between TAs for PMOs, understand the timeframes and deadlines.</p> <p>It's all about working together, understanding everyone's expectations and needs, making decisions and moving forward.</p> <p>It was also suggested that we invite other organisations to join the meeting. These people need to be in a position where they can make a decision on behalf of CERA, EQC, Insurance Council, Engineers, DBH.</p>
2.	<p>Agenda and regularity of the meeting</p> <p>It was decided that this meeting will be a monthly meeting to be held at Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street. Meetings will be held on the third Tuesday of every month from 3:00 - 4:30pm. An agenda item request will be sent out 10 days prior to the next meeting requesting additional agenda items,</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>with the final agenda being distributed one week prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>It was also decided that the Agenda will contain set items, prioritise items, guest speakers on a particular specific topics, actions for people to investigate and report back, ongoing update from CCC/WDC/SDW with their systems and processes.</p>
3.	<p>Key issues which have been identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · EQC – claims endorsement · Retaining walls around the hill suburbs · Land remediation · No direct line/contact with EQC · Need consistency between the three TAs – building, compliance, processes, documentation needed, exemptions, etc. · TC1,2,3 zone changes
4.	<p>CCC Workload</p> <p>█████ outlined how CCC are dealing with the extra workload:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Currently recruiting for extra staff. · New technology and systems have been put in place. · “One-Stop-Shop” Rebuild Team will be established. · Negotiating with other TAs throughout New Zealand to help deal with spikes. · Working with SDC and WDC. <p>CCC has a new system called Aconex to lodge consents with. CCC will be doing a training session with PMOs regarding the new system. PMOs are also encouraged to have Pre-Application meetings with Council staff to ensure all documentation is complete and is of acceptable quality. PMOs are also asked if they could speak to Designers re quality of documentation which will help to process consents quicker and on time.</p> <p>There will also be a Project Activity Log through Aconex which PMOs can access to find out “real time” progress of applications.</p> <p>It was advised that SDC are also using Aconex and their projects should be transferable with CCC's projects.</p>
5.	<p>General Discussion</p> <p>There was some discussion around TC 1, 2, 3 land zones, levelling of land and land remediation. These items will be discussed at future meetings when the correct people are in attendance and full information can be provided.</p>

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1	17/1/12	Identify 5 top priorities and forward these to [REDACTED] or discussion at the next meeting.	All PMOs	23/1/12	
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					



Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO & TA Forum

Date	21/2/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	<p>[REDACTED] (Christchurch City Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Waimakariri District Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Selwyn District Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (DBH)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (CERA)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Arrow/AMI)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Maxim/FMG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Hawkins/IAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (MWH/ Mainzeal)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Vero)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EQR)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Ireland Group)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Stream Group)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (BRANZ/DBH EAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EAG)</p>
Apologies	[REDACTED]

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Existing Use Rights</p> <p>[REDACTED] discussed on the statutory requirements to aid in the Existing Use Rights process under the Resource Management Act. The Council has a few court rights. It is important to have as much information on the building being lawfully established before it reaches the court. There is a new process that came up dealing with commercial buildings in the central city.</p> <p>He suggested to get involved in the early stage of scoping before costing which will make the process easier. There is no certificate issued but just a wording in the application. He has small team who can be help at the start of the process. He is happy to be the contact person. He will email [REDACTED] the guidance website and his direct dial contact number to be disseminated to all.</p> <p>There was a question raised on Variation 48 and others which were policy oriented. [REDACTED] said the policy issues will be discussed in another meeting.</p>
2.	<p>Action Items Top 5</p> <p>Item 1 – [REDACTED] to make a presentation on Flood Management Areas in the next meeting.</p> <p>Item 2 – [REDACTED] mentioned that the processing has been slow as there is lots of work to be done with Insurers.</p> <p>Item 3 - There has been meetings with the Council on this.</p> <p>Item 4 - [REDACTED] mentioned that EQC will finalise extent of liability and how they will deliver. There are 8,000 land damaged. Most were paid in cash. Land repair handled on a case by case basis. Vast majority is that the land works is not the determining factor apart from others. This is delivered</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>through the PMO.</p> <p>There is a new website on geo tech information available. This is written by TNT and uses CERAs database. This will go live soon. It includes a User Manual and it is easy to use.</p> <p>Item 6 – considered as top priority item.</p> <p>Item 5 – has been addressed in today’s meeting.</p> <p>Items 8- 13 - are building consent issues that will be addressed by [REDACTED] in future meeting.</p> <p>Item 14 – this has been addressed by [REDACTED] in today’s meeting.</p> <p>Item 15 -</p> <p>Item 16 -</p> <p>[REDACTED] told people to come back to him on top priority items.</p>
3.	<p>TC3 Guidelines</p> <p>[REDACTED] made a brief explanation on TC3 Guidelines. As part of TC3 training, he will put up an interim guidance on the later part of March which will include approval process.</p> <p>There was a question on the investigation requirements needed on TC3. As well as the inconsistency of assessments done by Engineers and Geo Tech. He mentioned that such concerns can handled in a training like the one he conducted last January where they discussed a case study with the PMOs. He is looking again at having a ½ day workshop which will be open to PMOs and to those who are interested for couple of sessions and to initiate a Train the Trainor concept. The workshop aims to familiarise participants to the 3 types of solutions.</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will present a workshop. [REDACTED] will provide the mailing list.</p>
4.	<p>PMO Monthly Projections</p> <p>[REDACTED] has asked the insurance companies on the data, quantities on rebuild repairs, methodologies and time frames. [REDACTED] will present in the next meeting.</p>
5.	<p>Agency Updates</p> <p>CERA</p> <p>[REDACTED] gave a copy of the 40 rebuild forums. The forums were established to handle issues and focus on resourcing the rebuild. At present, there is the Working Group. But eventually there will also be a Steering Group which will look at commercial strategic level, Rebuild Focus Group, Operations Group and Commercial Group.</p> <p>[REDACTED] asked to email him any feedback and he will let forward it to [REDACTED]</p> <p>DBH</p> <p>[REDACTED] mentioned that they currently involved with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAG - implementation of licensing of building practioners by 1 March. Conducting seminars.

Item	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- building investigation on CTV- reviewing on crime building- issues on guidance on forums
5.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 20 March, 3pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street.</p>

Retaining Walls -

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1	21/02/12	Discussion of Top Priority	AI PMOs		
2		Feedback on 40 Rebuild Forums to be emailed to [REDACTED]	AI PMOs		
3		Contact details of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and website on Existing New Rights.	[REDACTED]		
4		Mailing list for TC3 Workshop by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
5		Collect technical issues on TC3	[REDACTED]		
6					
7					

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO & TA Consenting Operations Working Group Meeting

Date	20/3/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	<p>[REDACTED] (Christchurch City Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Selwyn District Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] DBH)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (CERA)</p> <p>[REDACTED], (Arrow/AMI)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Hawkins/IAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED]s (MWH/ Mainzeal)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Vero)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EQR)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Ireland Group)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Stream Group)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (LUMLEY)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Mainland Claims – Lumley)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Hawkins)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (IAG)</p>
Apologies	[REDACTED]

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Previous minutes (12/109049)</p> <p>[REDACTED] reminded the group on Terms of Reference to ensure that this group focused on specific issues not already under consideration at other groups</p> <p>[REDACTED] recapitulated the topics discussed during previous minutes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] discussed guidelines on building consents [REDACTED] talked about revisions on TC3 and PMO projections [REDACTED] gave CERA updates [REDACTED] discussed DBH updates
2.	<p>Previous Action Items & Priority Items</p> <p>Refer to the table below for priority items.</p>
3.	<p>PMO Monthly Projections</p> <p>[REDACTED] gave an update on the Halswell project which consists of 21 properties. He reported positive outcomes of meetings held with community members and geotech engineers. He stressed the necessity of finalising the MOU and project plan as crucial factors in starting pilot works.</p>

Item	Discussion
4.	<p>New Action Items There were no items to add to the actions list</p>
5.	<p>Agency Updates</p> <p>- CERA</p> <p>██████████</p> <p><u>Summary of work currently undertaken by associate groups</u> ██████████ advised that EQC and PMOs are holding regular meetings to discuss geotechnical issues.</p> <p><u>Green Zone Geotechnical Database</u> ██████████ briefly explained the work currently progressing with the development of a geotechnical database to capture various tests and reports for properties in Canterbury. There is no time frame yet with regards to making the database live.</p> <p>- DBH</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>DBH is working with policy on temporary housing demand.</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████ mentioned that there had been good progress with the development of TC3 guidance and there would soon be information available to PMOs in the form of a TC3 guidance document. ██████████ will address the group at the next meeting regarding this guidance.</p> <p>██████████ discussed aspects of the revised guidance on repairing and rebuilding houses affected by the Canterbury earthquake sequence. ██████████ mentioned that there had been some inconsistencies regarding the application of the guidance.</p> <p>There was a question to clarify whether CCC needs more detailed geotechnical assessments in areas classified within TC2. ██████████ said that if typical TC2 testing reveals less than typical TC2 ground conditions a greater level of investigation would be required.</p> <p>██████████ mentioned that TC boundaries can change depending on the availability of geotechnical information and as a bigger picture develops from multiple tests.</p>
6.	<p>General Business</p> <p><u>Geotechnical reports</u> ██████████ advised that the Christchurch City Council had made a technical decision on the life of geotechnical reports after seeking professional geotechnical advice. The Council would not apply an expiry period on any geotechnical report or testing. Buildings should be designed to withstand any reasonably foreseeable changes in ground conditions that might be expected over the life of the building. In flat land residential areas changes to the ground characteristics would be minimal and not affect a typical housing structure with the exception</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>of larger seismic events that may cause more than minor settlement or lateral spread. If these events occur between the production of a report and the issue of a consent The Council may ask that the author of the report confirm its suitability.</p> <p>What is important is that the design submitted for consent complements the geotechnical report. Where the 2 are complimentary delays can occur in issuing consents.</p> <p>The situation is slightly different for commercial sites where activities on adjoining sites can affect the properties of the ground supporting larger structures. These larger structures are generally more sensitive to changes in ground characteristics.</p> <p><u>CCC EQ Prone Building Policy</u></p> <p>A comment was made on the need for guidance in the building consent process in strengthening of buildings. ██████ replied that guidance is published on the CCC website. ██████ advised that he would arrange for ██████, the CCC Engineering Services Manager, to attend in the future for question and answers.</p> <p><u>Consent and Code Compliance Certificate Time Frames</u></p> <p>There was a question on the consent time frames at CCC and it was suggested that it was currently taking six weeks to process some consents. ██████ replied that this was not typical and that most PMO consents are issued within 10 days. The use of Aconex greatly improves overall times to issue so applicants are encouraged to start using that process.</p> <p>There would have been some issues why some building consents take a longer time to process e.g. handing in a substandard application. He asked to be provided with details of the properties with pending building consents so he can investigate.</p> <p>With regards to Code Compliance process, ██████ said they have identified some areas for improvement and have made corrective measures including the appointment of 4 additional staff processing CCC's. Aconex helps to speed up the process in this area as well. He emphasised that the efficiency in processing applications depends on the quality of applications.</p>
7.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 17 April, 3pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street.</p>

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing) (See also item 9 below)	TA's CCC	██████████	<p>██████████ discussed Flood Management Areas and Variation 48</p> <p>There was a question about access of LIDAR information. ██████████ replied that the LIDAR data is owned by EQC and EQC is currently analysing the data; once EQC is satisfied with data quality EQC will release the LIDAR data which will eventually be made public.</p> <p>██████████ advised that it is important to remember that the boundary of flood management plains is not the same as the flood risk boundary. There were significant changes since after the February earthquakes.</p> <p>A question was also raised regarding the extent of potential ground remediation. ██████████ replied that program for fixing land drainage for example could be tricky as the affected area can be extensive.</p>
2	21/02/12	Quantity of claim endorsements - EQC	Insurers -EQC		Item to be removed - Matter for regulatory working group
3	21/02/12	Temp accommodation (contractor & homeowners needing to move for repairs or rebuilds)	Insurers		Item to be removed - Matter for other groups (rebuild resourcing)
4	21/02/12	Land - Repair / Remediation - EQC	Insurers -EQC	██████████	<p>Responded - ██████████ mentioned that EQC will finalise extent of liability and how they will deliver. There are 8,000 land damaged properties. Most were in the Red Zone. Land repair handled on a case by case basis. Vast majority is that the land works is not the determining factor apart from others. This is delivered through the PMO.</p> <p>Item to be removed - Matter for Regulatory Working Group</p>
5	21/02/12	What is the current stance regarding existing user rights?	TA's -	Predominantly CCC Issue - ██████████	Resolved - CCC response, Planning Team Leader ██████████ discussed existing use rights in

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
			CCC	██████████	depth at the meeting. ██████████ is available to handle queries and there is information available on the Christchurch City Council website.
6	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's		<p>Mostly relates to apportionment of works</p> <p>A question was raised whether the Council has an asset registry to facilitate identification of property ownership in relation to application of building consents.</p> <p>██████████ ██████████ responded that any information Christchurch City Council has on private retaining walls would be held on each property file rather than on an overall register. This will only exist where council has had consent applications for the works.</p>
7	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's		██████████ ██████████ gave an update on the Halswell project which consists of 21 properties. He reported positive outcomes of meetings held with community members and geotech engineers. He stressed the necessity of finalising the MOU and project plan as crucial factors in starting pilot works.
8	21/02/12	CCC's 'plan' for consenting process, resources, timelines etc. (and the potential use of external peer reviews to expedite the process)	CCC		Resolved - ██████████ discussed CCC position here. Regular updates will be given over time
9	21/02/12	<p>Flood management Areas</p> <p>Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)</p> <p>(To be combined with item number 1 as a related issue)</p>	TA's - CCC	██████████	██████████ ██████████ discussed Variation 48. ██████████ explained that Variation 48 is CCC's response to calibrate the effects of extreme rainfall and sea level rise which are associated with climate change. Variation 48 identifies areas of the city subject to greater risks of flooding as Flood Management Areas. Variation 48 was completed in January 2011, however, it is being updated to include the effects of the 22 February earthquake to the ground level.

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
					Buildings within the Flood Management Areas will require resource consent.
10	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] will coordinate a collaborative response from the 3 councils to clarify what works need building consent. A draft of the guidance when building work to repair earthquake damaged residential buildings requires a building consent was provided. [REDACTED] said that CCC will finalise the document and will make it available on the CCC website.
11	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] explained CCC take on this, TA's agreed to get together to produce guidance aligned between TA's
12	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (I'm thinking insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] explained CCC take on this, TA's agreed to get together to produce guidance aligned between TA's
13	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	[REDACTED]	The 1st Schedule of the Building Act explains what is exempt as of right plus clause k allows for discretionary exemptions by TA's. The DBH provides comprehensive guidance – Guidance document available on the departments website. Councils are producing guidance also. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued) Advice is that if you arent sure then check with the TA.
14	21/02/12	TC3 foundation options - guidelines	DBH	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] advised that the Engineering Advisory Group is still working to produce the TC3 guidance and it should be available about mid-April.
15	21/02/12	Hill Suburb retaining walls	Insurers / PMOs		Refer item 6
16	21/02/12	Consistency between the 3 TA's	TA's		Item to be removed – This is ongoing – The 3 TA's will be continuously working together and this group meeting will tease out any consistency issues and stimulate colaberation between TA's.

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1	21/02/12	Discussion of Top Priority	All PMOs		Resolved - Top priority list established and will be ongoing
2	21/02/12	Contact details of [REDACTED] and website on Existing Use Rights.	[REDACTED]		Resolved – [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Website info at - http://www.ccc.govt.nz/homeliving/buildingplanning/resourceconsents/resourcemanagementpamphlets.aspx Look for PDF to right of page in blue box
3	21/02/12	Mailing list for TC3 Workshop by [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED] has advised [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to copy the mailing list to [REDACTED]
4	21/02/12	Collect technical issues on TC3	[REDACTED]		Ongoing [REDACTED] reminded PMO's to advise technical issues.
5					
6					

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO & TA Consenting Operations Working Group Meeting

Date	17/04/2012	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	<p>[REDACTED] (Christchurch City Council)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (DBH)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EQR)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Vero)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (MWH Mainzeal)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Hawkins/IAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Arrow International)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Southern Response)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Arrow International)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (IGL/Lumley)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (Beca)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (EAG)</p> <p>[REDACTED] (CERA)</p>
1. Apologies	[REDACTED]

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
2.	<p>PREVIOUS MINUTES (12/166928)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earlier Minutes Requested [REDACTED] (DBH) Resources offered in the interim until official minute taker is found. [REDACTED] to follow up)
3.	<p>AGENCY UPDATES:</p> <p>[REDACTED] (CERA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insurers & EQC making progress towards a resolution. Wont be a significant holdup. Synergine On behalf of Lumleys undertaking issues to be resolved. Resolution on repair methodologies will be months away. Joint Geotech testing appointed Synergine to develop a more robust proposal, First stage a week away EQC testing first pilot block. Testing on roads, not on private land Regulatory testing working through flood levels DBH doing work on clarifying sections/guidelines on TC3 Briefing from EQC to insurers on bare land obligations Interacts with foundation design / Rebuild resources forum – Material supply Temporary accommodation – no conclusion Green zone database – technical house, launch date the 27th April, same as TC3 guidelines Awaiting confirmation from EQC for a database of land damage (what they can be released) Orbit from Tonkin an Taylor CERA database is separate from orbit. More user friendly. – presentation next meeting, other members welcomed. Contact for database – CERA AGS format for data. Over time the same format can go into other software systems.

Item	Discussion
	<p>EQC and council needs funding to convert system to a more compatible format. Will be required to be AGS data specification in 3 months</p> <p>██████████ (DBH):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Identifying CTV similar buildings and informing owners, also apart of the Royal commission enquiry · DBH & CERA are working through accommodation issues, Permanent, temporary work and residents issues. Preferably they would like to let the market provide. For displaced residents - a new temporary village will be available during repairs. Encourage PMO's to advise this is available. Accomadation will be a big issue. <p>██████████ (DBH / EAG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Training in guidance on EQ repairs. TC1's, TC2's. Register for training (through PMO, CCC). Engineer advisors will be presenting. · ██████████ working on case studies similar to tests run in 2010,2011 presented to the training readers/PMOs. Case studies available electronically for hubs and BCA's. · ██████████ is available for consultation on applications Contact: ██████████ · Draft guidance on TC3 Peer reviewed this morning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lighter is better ○ More clarity in areas ○ More cautionary areas identified ○ There is concern that it may suit insurance but wont work in all places. ○ Conservative pile capacity. ○ Challenges are wrapping up. · Briefing senior consenting staff last six weeks. Careful and deliberate consent review required for TC3 foundations. For BCA's, what the change in process will be for TC3's. Sole reliance on producer statements may not be appropriate. TC3 application highlighted areas where a more structured application process may be required. · Integrating for geotech and structural reviews. Higher geotech monitoring required. <p>QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:</p> <p>Q : When reading documents in repairs, if there is a slight reduction of damage it leads to easy repair. Is there a lessening of criteria to repair damage?</p> <p>A: A fair summary to be clear part of the breakthrough. Start looking at damage then repair ground. If the damage is minor but may be influenced by the 22nd February. There may be conscious relaxation that is justified by repairs meeting the building code.</p> <p>Q: Areas where insurers may be reluctant to buy into it?</p> <p>A: Not yet. Opportunity has not been provided for insurers to respond or not being prepared to fund the work. Every case will be different. It may be uneconomical to repair with collective cost. Land remediation issues with EQC can potentially be affected by the wording on policy's between insurers,</p> <p>C: Fletchers is looking at information on 800 properties in the TC3 zone. They have found 124 they are repairing / repaired in North New Brighton, where the damage falls into the minor category. Inspections were completed, not one was dealt with incorrectly.</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>C: There are many properties in the TC3 zone that are immediately repairable. More information should be provided, sooner rather than later.</p> <p>Q: There is a TC3 requirement to do geotech testing, but is there a need for allowing shallow geotech tests, will these be sufficient?</p> <p>A: A New building has to comply with the Building code regardless. If tests can prove it complies it may not be required. However if extensively damaged, this is a good indication more intrusive testing is required. The fundamentals are : what are you trying to prove? The Building Code needs to be satisfied.</p> <p>Q: For new building consent applications where no geotech has been provided will it be turned down by the CCC?</p> <p>A: What will need to be provided when applying in practice is written information to back the design / a written methodology. There may be lots of reasons for non typical application. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is available to discuss what will be required by the CCC with the PMO's where there is uncertainty.</p> <p>C: Bring examples, photos, to work through what council needs. [REDACTED] is putting together a power - point for action items. Advise [REDACTED] via email if there is anything to add. More information brought to the forum the better. Leave badges at the door, come as allies to get the rebuild to happen. The more efficient the process the better.</p> <p>C: While working on the TC3 guidelines a lot of geotech results were having to be parked. Once the document is released solutions will be worked through for rebuilds and repairs</p> <p>C: CCC Is receptive to guideline options for geotech & structural rather than CCC being road-blocked. Could potentially use [REDACTED] s Engineering group to review. If the engineers sign the design CCC will approve. Engineer's will put a fingerprint on the design .</p> <p>Debate in geotech, what geotech is telling you for structural elements. Consistency is a challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Endorsed peer review · Economically sensible
4.	<p>PREVIOUS ITEMS & PRIORITY ITEMS Refer to priority items table below</p>
5.	<p>PMO MONTHLY PROJECTIONS</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DBH / EAG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Working on case studies for TC3 low mobility. Case data in domain. Will enquire if Lumley happy to have PMO's included. · Test case would be great further down the track. · Heads up to TA's, if there are any changes let CCC know (To go to [REDACTED] with as much up front info as possible) <p>Fletcher Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Moving to Building consents. The priority is over 50k. This target to be completed by 2013. It is hard to see properties at 50K, 60K, 80K not needing consent. 30,40k has not required consent. Less then 10% needs a building consent. · Current rate of completions is up to 80 houses a day. 14000 have been completed. · Are setting up a tech hub. The chief engineer is gathering expertise from architects, geotech engineers & structural engineers. They will work through the TC3 guidelines. · There will be a suite of solutions for repairs not just for foundations, wall claddings e.t.c. · The updated guidance document could provide a huge resource.

Item	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Could lead to schedule 1K solutions and a more streamlined process. · Happy to discuss this. <p>Lumley's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Forecasting a spike in 3-4 months time subject to settlement EQC funds, 240 with 80% that will need a building consent. · Unsure of what district's these will be in. Mainly Christchurch.
6.	<p>GENERAL BUSINESS / NEW ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>██████████ (Arrow International):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Key points on contaminated sites. Geotech's have been alerted to issues. Spoken with ECAN and are investigating maps for contaminated sites. CCC provide CERA information on this. · ECAN update: They have (CCC, CERA & ECAN) identified contaminant solutions. That information will be available in 3 weeks then progress to TC3, TC2, & TC1 areas. CCC has information available now for 500 properties. · Political sensitivity issue to be resolved. · A map to identify properties would be useful · ██████████ will look into with GIS. Currently there is varying degrees of information. Could potentially have been redevelopment on title and site may be contaminated, but CCC are not aware. · Red zone is key with health and safety issues. · If map is not available, they will look into other options, <p>Q: Are these sites contaminated due to liquefaction?</p> <p>A: No. mainly Industrial sites that have previously been landfill areas, petrol stations e.tc.</p> <p>Leaky Buildings</p> <p>One property halfway through repairs it was uncovered that it was a leaky building. Could be a legal nightmare. This has been identified as high risk</p> <p>Q: Question to PMO's, what is the policy on leaky buildings?</p> <p>Fletchers – Not delved into legal situations. Provided policy is up to the homeowners to take action. It is not appropriate for Fletchers to provide advice. EQC cash out.</p> <p>Consenting and exemption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Waimak & Selwyn district representatives are not here. For exemptions, Selwyn and Waimak have process to see the site and make a call. · CCC not currently to engage in site visits. There are no resources to do so for the large number there could be. Building professionals can make a call and provided CCC with photos. For common situations could engage in activity common to multiple sites but not every site. This would delay consents. CCC will provide advice to enable Building professionals to make a call. <p>BA Schedule 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Material presented to CCC to help make a decision. · Option to place information on the property file was desired. ██████████ mentioned that CCC had considered and would develop a means to facilitate that need. · Fletcher's have elected for a more formal process of documenting their exemption decisions and tabled their process documents. · CCC would offer to accept notices of exempt work via Aconex and training is available on Wednesday's from 1- 3pm at 53 Hereford street. PMO's are encouraged to advise their designers etc that this is available. Contact pmoinbox@ccc.govt.nz

Item	Discussion
7	<p>ROUND TABLE:</p> <p>■■■■ (EAG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This meeting is a place to access advise from CCC and to bring case studies. Take advantage of the opportunity's in this meeting. The DBH is also here to support. · PMO's are getting the easier jobs done. It may be a few weeks before issues arise. <p>■■■■ (IGL/Lumley):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Would like to see repair solutions (from PMO's) In TC3 guidelines there is an emphasis on not shifting building of property, but can potentially work under building. Keen to hear of methods/experience for remediation work. · Methods will come to light. TC3 proposed in guidelines lean towards taking the buildings off site. <p>■■■■ (Arrow International):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Stabilising building document has been given to the department of labour. They have given a verbal ok. Sign off will be in 6 weeks. Working not stabilised issues. Working ring foundation issues under TC3. · Possible to lift off concrete slab. Can be more straightforward. <p>■■■■ (IGL/Lumley):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · House to be lifted is 1.5 ft deep then could be 8 ft deep. Would like to look at different ways on managing this. <p>■■■■ (Arrow International):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · When lifting off the slab and holding building – the timber floor can be built then carted away. This Can be recycled. Should not be demoing where it can be reused.
8.	<p>NEXT MEETING: 15th June 3:00 until 4:30 CCC Hereford St</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Presenting TC3 & example documentation. · ■■■■ will attend next month on EQ prone building policy. · ■■■■ Exemption presentation · ■■■■ Canterbury Geotechnical Database presentation. <p>■■■■ to follow up with other TA's for attendance at the next meeting</p>

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing) Flood management Areas Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)	TA's CCC CERA	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Partly Resolved - ██████████ presentation on Flood Management Areas. Additional information to be shared as developments occur. Discussions are being held at the regulatory working group meetings. ██████████ can keep this group up to date on those discussions.
2	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's		Mostly relates to apportionment of works Ongoing ██████████ to provide info from CCC.
3	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's	Arrow - ██████████	Ongoing - PMO's to continue discussions. 17/4: ██████████ advises MOU has been sent to insurers for signing. . The project steering group agreeing to progress geotech investigation and how to split costs. This has been slow.
4	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
5	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	██████████████████ ██████████	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
6	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (Insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	██████████████████ ██████████	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
7	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	██████████████████ ██████████	Councils are producing guidance. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued) Advice is that if you arent sure then check with the TA.
8	21/02/12	TC3 foundation options - guidelines	DBH	██████████████████ ██████████	TC3 guidance under development. ██████████ will present on this at the next meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO and TA Forum

Date	15/5/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	<p>[REDACTED] - Christchurch City Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] - MWH Mainzeal</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Vero</p> <p>[REDACTED] - EAG</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Beca</p> <p>[REDACTED] - IAG</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Hawkins/IAG</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Arrow</p> <p>[REDACTED] - EQR</p> <p>[REDACTED] - DBH</p> <p>[REDACTED] - HNZC</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Stream</p> <p>[REDACTED] - EAG/DBH</p> <p>[REDACTED] - CERA</p>
Apologies	<p>[REDACTED] - IAG</p> <p>[REDACTED] - Stream</p>

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Agency Updates</p> <p>CERA: [REDACTED] discussed the Regulatory Working Groups current activity and later gave a demonstration of the Canterbury Geotechnical Database. Time was limited so he will show again in the next meeting.</p> <p>DBH: [REDACTED] discussed the work currently being done by the DBH. Introduction of the TC3 guidance document was a key piece of work the DBH were focused on.</p>
2.	<p>Previous Actions & Priority Items</p> <p>Updated.</p>
3.	<p>PMO Monthly Projections</p> <p>Council has noticed activity has increased in the last two weeks including the volume of consents through Aconex. Working with other Councils to remotely process for the City Council (Hastings, Wellington). Council has been actively promoting with applicants the use of the Aconex system. 'Go Ahead' newsletter is another promotion tool the Council uses, if you wish to be added to the distribution list please email [REDACTED]. The Council has recently starting promoting the need for building consents in the community through the 'Go Ahead' campaign.</p> <p>Most residential consents are being processed within 10 working days (though Aconex system).</p> <p>It was queried about the timeframe of processing Code Compliance Certificates. It was stated that the PMO Service agreement is 10 working days. It was noted that the inspections and Code Compliance Certificates system is being moved into the Aconex system to have a clearer view of what is going on with the consent. Inspectors are now being pro-active and obtaining design</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>statements during the inspection process, if there are any issues with the documents it can be addressed at that time instead of at the end of inspection process.</p> <p>PMOs allow owners to move back into their properties at 'practical completion' - emails will be sent to relevant parties. Owners can move into properties without the code compliance certificate being issued at that time. Commercial works would need CCC before occupation.</p> <p>Some earthquake repair work has been carried out on work that hasn't received code compliance; this is classed as an 'open building consent'. PMOs need to be aware of this situation. Provide any feedback to [REDACTED] on this situation.</p> <p>It was noted that a lot of projects are being stalled at EQC.</p> <p>[REDACTED] noted that they are concentrating on >\$50k jobs.</p>
4.	<p>General Business</p> <p>Exempt building works guidelines: It was noted that TA guidance documents need to be consistent. All TAs need to be present at this forum. PMOs have requested that a coordinated approach be taken to the guidelines and that they are able to provide comments on the guidelines. Draft guidelines to be circulated for feedback to be received within 2 weeks. These guidelines are for residential work.</p> <p>Advice for exempt building works is that if you are not sure if the works are exempt please check with the relevant TA.</p> <p>Guidance for exempting commercial repairs:</p> <p>Consent requirements for re-leveling works: [REDACTED] to follow up on if you require consent for releveling works (guidance document B391, item 2, bullet point 3). Make sure the outcome is consistent with all TAs.</p> <p>To what extent must work comply with the building code when undertaking repairs, discussing the notion of building back the way something existing previously: When building work is undertaken it is completed so it is not worse than what it was before.</p> <p>Earthquake damaged buildings guidelines: The Council is prepared to exempt some minor works ie crack repairs of non-critical elements less than 5mm (some conditions apply, see guidelines). If the exemption is not listed under DBH's guidelines, exemption will need to be applied for.</p>
5.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 19 June, 3pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street</p>

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing) Flood management Areas Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)	TA's CCC CERA	[REDACTED]	Partly Resolved - [REDACTED] presentation on Flood Management Areas. Additional information to be shared as developments occur. Discussions are being held at the regulatory working group meetings. [REDACTED] can keep this group up to date on those discussions.
2	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's		Ongoing. [REDACTED] to circulate the latest SCIRT spreadsheet, currently 456 retaining walls.
3	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's	[REDACTED]	Ongoing - PMO's to continue discussions. MOU still being circulated for signing by insurers.
4	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
5	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
6	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (Insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's
7	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Councils are producing guidance. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued).
8	21/02/12	TC3 foundation options - guidelines	DBH	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	TC3 guidance was issued at the end of April. Waiting to hear any inputs or thoughts on the guidance. Will be meeting with PMO engineers to discuss the guidelines. Planning an update of the November guidance document. TC1 and TC2 familiarisation workshops held last week, was set up as a train the trainer sessions for PMOs etc. Working closely with relevellers.
9	15/5/12	'Open Building Consents' - earthquake repair work being carried out on work that hasn't received code compliance.		All	All to provide any feedback to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO and TA Forum

Date	19/6/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christchurch City Council - Christchurch City Council - CERA - DBH - EAG/DBH - Arrow International - Beca - EQR - Hawkins/IAG - IAG - Maxim Projects - MWH Mainzeal - Selwyn District Council - Stream - Vero - Waimakariri District Council
Apologies	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christchurch City Council - Christchurch City Council - Arrow International - MWH Mainzeal - Housing New Zealand - IAG

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Agency Updates</p> <p>1.1 DBH</p> <p>[REDACTED] discussed the work currently being done by the DBH including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Work continuing on TC3 foundations. · Working with CERA on various issues to promote understanding of technical solutions for repairing/reconstruction of buildings, temporary accommodation for workers. · Working with CCC on technical guidance around TC3 in relation to the Councils' interpretations, streamlining consents process. · DBH has released guidance on building evaluations. <p>[REDACTED] requested feedback on any specific areas that attendees think DBH should issue guidance on.</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] discussed the work EAG is doing including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Developing standard engineering sign-off wordings – draft wordings to be reported back at the next meeting. · Working with PMO geotech engineers on topics of clarification around alternative foundation solutions and issues around regulatory linkage with that. · Working on introducing an architectural group to help brief architects/designers in addressing questions and working with them to clarify details in foundation questions. [REDACTED] requested PMOs who have specific architects/designers on their team that EAG can engage with to email any names to [REDACTED]

Item	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Pushing CERA for access into residential red zone for testing on re-levelling as some urgent research to undertake in this regard. · Working on getting an update of the November guidance by early next month. <p>1.2 CERA [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · EQC land repair – fundamental decisions in relation to obligations/exposures has begun with the process likely to take until September. · The Regulatory Working Group is working on a number of issues around release of the flood data. The CERA comms team is looking at how best to roll this out to all parties and more information should be available in the next few weeks. · Information around minimum floor levels to insurers in relation to longevity. · Guidance from DBH around application of s.72 to 74 in relation to where hazard notices may apply relating to flood risk – part of the issue is that s.74 notices may apply and may make properties uninsurable. · Existing use rights and the various scenarios around commencement/duration of existing use rights. · Issue of land and land raising i.e. there are approx. 3000 houses that need resource consents to fill their land and there are associated costs/land settlement issues around this. · Apportionment issue between EQC and insurers is progressing - Lumleys and EQC are piloting a process in the next few weeks. It is hoped the pilot will identify any systemic issues and set up a transparent process to resolve claims. · Canterbury geotechnical database – looking at having the aerial photos from pre and post events including Lidar pre and post-events for 6-7 events. This should be available shortly and further information around mapping/live data from Lidar will be forthcoming. [REDACTED] requested feedback be provided to him on the usefulness of the database and any other issues. <p>It was agreed that a further demonstration of the Canterbury Geotechnical Database was not required.</p>
2.	<p>Previous Actions & Priority Items</p> <p>Updated below.</p>
3.	<p>PMO Monthly Projections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Work programming developments - [REDACTED] sent through list of projections that was circulated to everyone - any questions to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] · It was noted that projected work volumes are looking similar to 2009 figures i.e. approximately 750-800 per month for new properties – predicted to continue at this level for the next 3 years. It was noted that there could be some artificial peaks in this figure due to bulk consents which don't flow through. · It was noted that labour demand modelling is nearly ready and it is estimated that the predicted figure of 24,000 tradesmen may be correct. Commercial projections will be available once CCDU release information on anchor projects. · EQR noted that they are involved with EQC and T&T in relation to the drilling programme. Drilling is going well but there are concerns around the number of consents that could suddenly emerge at one time and how this can be managed. It was recommended that these issues be brought to the Council's Review Panel to get pre-approved particularly if they will be used consistently. <p>a. It was noted that the Council has noticed increased activity over the last two weeks including the volume of consents through Aconex. The Council is working with other Councils (Hastings, Wellington) to remotely process consents on behalf of the Council.</p>

Item	Discussion
4.	<p>Discussion on TA Protocols for Sub-standard Building Consent Applications (CCC/DBH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Discussion was held on the issue of sub-standard building consents. The DBH noted that it is not the Council's responsibility to fix sub-standard applications and it is encouraging the Council to make a complaint if they are consistently getting sub-standard applications from the same applicants. · The Council will be taking a more pro-active approach to address this issue and applications will be vetted before acceptance – any applications identified as sub-standard before acceptance will be knocked back. The Council is also looking at an RFI refusal letter for consents i.e. if you don't respond to an RFI within xx amount of days then it will be refused. It will be possible to reactivate the application but it will go back on a priority list and a fee incurred. More information will be circulated when available. · It was queried that this could be an issue for more complex repairs. It was noted that the Council recognizes this but there will be greater timeframes in conjunction with acceptance vetting for complex applications. · The Council is also encouraging applicants to make use of the pre-application advice service through Aconex. The onus is on PMOs to put pressure on designers to ensure quality applications and to keep up-to-date with constant changes particularly around fire regulations.
5.	<p>Building Consent Exemptions (CCC/DBH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · More information is needed from PMOs on this type of work. A common situation is repair and replacement i.e. what is the interpretation of complete and substantial, so trying to work out what these terms mean and give guidance around that. · Working on finding out what the common repairs are going to be around the Schedule A exemption including looking for a standard solution/specific guidance. · There are different ways of looking at substantial i.e. piles or performance of building – how do you explain that. Preference is to work with PMOs to clarify what these are – it was requested that PMOs provide any live examples to [REDACTED] so that terms can be worked on. After further discussion it was agreed that examples should be provided in a workshop environment. [REDACTED] to organize a meeting and request PMOs to bring 4-5 examples.
6.	<p>General Business</p> <p>6.1 Re-levelling [REDACTED] noted that in an earlier meeting there was discussion around a house in Kaiapoi that went out of level after being re-levelled – he would like to clarify that this was not correct.</p> <p>6.2 Common Construction Types Working with engineers on alternative solutions – once they get a consentable type they can share around and want everyone to do the same to get traction on solutions they can use. It was suggested that these are sent through to CCC to get them pre-approved.</p> <p>6.3 Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment It was noted that effective 1 July the government plans established establish the new Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment - this will bring together the existing functions of the Ministry of Science and Innovation, Ministry of Economic Development, Department of Labour and Department of Building and Housing.</p> <p>6.4 Flood Related Issues Any flood related issues be sent to [REDACTED]</p>
7.	<p>Next Meeting Tuesday 17 July, 3.00pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street.</p>

Item	Discussion
	<p>Discussion was held around whether a longer meeting is required. It was agreed to keep the meeting length the same for now.</p> <p>A list of meetings for the remainder of the year to be circulated with the minutes.</p>

Action List (Updates in bold)

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing) Flood management Areas Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)	TA's CCC CERA	[REDACTED]	Partly Resolved - [REDACTED] presentation on Flood Management Areas. Additional information to be shared as developments occur. Discussions are being held at the regulatory working group meetings. [REDACTED] can keep this group up to date on those discussions.
2	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's		Ongoing. [REDACTED] to circulate the latest SCIRT spreadsheet, currently 456 retaining walls. An updated schedule was sent out – please confirm if you still want to receive these?
3	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's	Arrow - [REDACTED]	Ongoing - PMO's to continue discussions. MOU still being circulated for signing by insurers. All PMOs have signed who need to sign so significant step forward. The issue of geotechnical cost share has been accepted between all parties so it is getting pretty close to commissioning these works with one small detail still to be resolved in relation to claims to settle. CERA will forward the report to [REDACTED]
4	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Started to make progress but working on coordinated guidance.
5	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Ongoing
6	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (Insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Ongoing
7	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	[REDACTED]	Councils are producing guidance. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued). Ongoing
8	21/02/12	TC3 foundation options - guidelines	DBH	[REDACTED]	TC3 guidance was issued at the end of April. Waiting to hear any inputs or thoughts on the guidance. Will be meeting with PMO engineers to discuss the guidelines.

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
					<p>Planning an update of the November guidance document. TC1 and TC2 famialiarisation workshops held last week, was set up as a train the trainer sessions for PMOs etc. Working closely with relevellers.</p> <p>Updated info covered in meeting minutes above.</p>

Meeting Minutes

Combined PMO and TA Forum

Date	17/7/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED]

Attendees	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christchurch City Council - Christchurch City Council - EAG/DBH - Arrow International - Beca - Fletcher EQR - Hawkins/IAG - IAG - Maxim Projects - Maxim Projects - MAS - MWH Mainzeal - Vero
Apologies	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christchurch City Council - Christchurch City Council - CERA - DBH - Arrow International - Beca - MWH Mainzeal - Housing New Zealand - IAG - Selwyn District Council - Stream - Waimakariri District Council
In Attendance:	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uretek Ground Engineering - RElevel

1. Discussion

Item	Discussion
1.	Apologies as above.
2.	Minutes of previous meeting confirmed.
3.	<p>Agency Updates</p> <p>1.1 DBH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apologies from [REDACTED] <p>EAG [REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TC3 foundation guidance – met with Council last week and looking at setting up a working group to include two to three PMO engineers to progress this work. - CCC taking the lead with Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to set up a TC3 review group including Senior BCOs and CERA engineering. The main aim is to agree on principles and solutions to assist with some of the more complex consent applications in residential TC3. The review group is also looking at the possibility of PMO input on a rotational basis. The group are looking for more examples of TC3 work and requested any examples be sent to [REDACTED] - Working with Councils to arrange dates for familiarisation workshops around TC1 and TC2.

Item	Discussion
	<p>1.2 CERA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies from [REDACTED] <p>1.3 Christchurch City Council ([REDACTED])</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent numbers steadily increasing and getting leg work under control. Training being conducted this week for some of the Building Inspectors on processing Certificates of Acceptance (COA) due to a significant increase in COA numbers. Looking at assigning one officer to a project so there is one point of contact and end-to-end processing. Still finding a lack of understanding around Temporary Accommodation and Change of Use situations - a reminder that there are still requirements under the Building Act that need to be complied with. RFI Acceptance and Refusal Process – the Council will be initiating a process to encourage designers to be more pro-active in providing correct information with the initial application and also responding to RFIs in a timely manner. This process will include vetting applications before acceptance and sending out notification letters with specific timeframes to provide information. There will be a marketing campaign ahead of the process and further information will be circulated when available. It was suggested that if PMOs wish to monitor this process that they set up a generic user in Aconex (which anyone can access) and request any correspondence is copied to that inbox. Alternatively when making an application the PMO may request the Council to copy them in on any correspondence.
4.	<p>Previous Actions & Priority Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated below.
5.	<p>PMO Monthly Projections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progressing as planned.
6.	<p>Building Consent Exemptions (CCC/DBH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting held between CCC/DBH and some of the PMOs to discuss scenarios/examples – most common scenarios are residential work and commercial work deemed complex with too many variations. The meeting provided a good understanding of some of the issues but more examples are needed before further guidance can be issued. The Council is putting together a robust case around why the Council does not need to be involved with some issues and looking for support from DBH. Next step for [REDACTED] and he put something to man team and what else we can let go and publish some guidance. Still in discussion on what is exempt and possible review mechanism Aconex – [REDACTED] will try to have a draft for review at the next meeting.
7.	<p>General Business</p> <p>7.1 Flood Management It was queried whether a new flood management plan will be released and also contamination maps. [REDACTED] to check.</p> <p>7.2 Retaining Walls Issues with retaining walls on EQC work – [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to talk to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to ascertain if SCIRT impacting the list that the Council already issued.</p> <p>7.3 Contact List / Database It was suggested that a contact list or database be created to assist with issues around attached buildings that have different insurance companies. It was agreed that PMO contact details be sent to [REDACTED] for compilation and then circulated to PMOs.</p>
8.	<p>Presentation by Uretex Ground Engineering and RElevel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] of Uretex and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of RElevel gave an overview of their respective companies and some of the projects/work they are doing in relation to re-levelling.

Item	Discussion
9.	Next Meeting Tuesday 21 August 2012 at 3:00pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street.

Action List (Updates in bold)

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	<p>Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing)</p> <p>Flood management Areas Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)</p>	TA's CCC CERA	[REDACTED]	<p>Partly Resolved - [REDACTED] [REDACTED] presentation on Flood Management Areas.</p> <p>Additional information to be shared as developments occur.</p> <p>Discussions are being held at the regulatory working group meetings. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] can keep this group up to date on those discussions.</p> <p>Update required on flood management plan and contamination sites.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>
2	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] to circulate the latest SCIRT spreadsheet, currently 456 retaining walls. An updated schedule was sent out – please confirm if you still want to receive these?</p> <p>[REDACTED] to follow-up with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in relation to SCIRT impacting the list that the Council already issued</p>
3	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's	Arrow [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>Ongoing - PMO's to continue discussions.</p> <p>MOU still being circulated for signing by insurers.</p> <p>All PMOs have signed who need to sign so significant step forward. The issue of geotechnical cost share has been accepted between all parties so it is getting pretty close to commissioning these works with one small detail still to be resolved in relation to claims to settle. CERA will forward the report to [REDACTED]</p> <p>Doc circulated by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] CERA – any feedback to [REDACTED] Just waiting for geotech with [REDACTED] to get underway. From consenting we have had discussion with PMOs on requirements but want to give early advice. Next step is to get geotech advice.</p>

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
4	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Started to make progress but working on coordinated guidance. [REDACTED] preparing draft for circulation.
5	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Ongoing
6	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (Insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	[REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Ongoing
7	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	[REDACTED]	Councils are producing guidance. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued). Ongoing
8	21/02/12	TC3 foundation options - guidelines	DBH	[REDACTED]	TC3 guidance was issued at the end of April. Waiting to hear any inputs or thoughts on the guidance. Will be meeting with PMO engineers to discuss the guidelines. Planning an update of the November guidance document. TC1 and TC2 familiarisation workshops held last week, was set up as a train the trainer sessions for PMOs etc. Working closely with releellers. A working group has been set-up and includes some of the PMO engineers which met with the Council the week of 9 July 2012. There will be further familiarisation workshops around TC1 and TC2 - Councils to propose dates.
9	17/7/12	Contacts database to be created and circulated to PMOs.	CCC	[REDACTED]	Draft prepared and circulated with these minutes.

	Issue / Topic	Action	Action By	Date
		<p>matter experts as part of the sub-groups whom are empowered to represent the interest of their organisations as well as champion the issue in their organisation.</p> <p>Action: PMOs are requested to email names of their representatives for sub-groups to [REDACTED] by COB Thursday 20 September.</p> <p>Action: Once member's names received, [REDACTED] to follow-up with PMOs and send out a list of sub-group members early next week.</p>	<p>PMOs</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>20/9</p> <p>24/9</p>
4.	Sub-Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion was held on scope and deliverables, membership and timetable of the sub-groups. It was agreed that a reporting template should be created for use by all sub-groups. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to draft a template and circulate to sub-groups once members known.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is expected that once membership is confirmed, sub-groups will meet next week and then determine frequency of future meetings. Sub-groups will then report back to the next monthly steering group meeting with scope and deliverables. 	[REDACTED]	24/9
5.	Proposal for collaboration on surveying for floor level benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] discussed a proposal for PMOs to work collaboratively in relation to surveying for floor level benchmarks in order to share information/costs. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to circulate a one page proposal to PMOs for feedback.</p>	[REDACTED]	24/9
6.	Outstanding deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of outstanding deliverables from previous meetings (Attachment 3) and the majority of these will be amalgamated into the appropriate sub-groups. The main purpose of the steering group is to look at these and ensure they are kept to by sub-groups. 	[REDACTED]	
7.	Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuesday, 16 October 2012 at 3:00pm, Function Room, 1st floor, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street. 	All	
8.	Any Other Business	<p>8.1 Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] queried if information in relation to unknown fill or contaminated sites is available. [REDACTED] advised he is working with ECan and hoping to get this information onto the Canterbury Geotech Database as a reference to identify sites for screening level. [REDACTED] suggested this item be discussed further at the next meeting. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to include this item on the next agenda.</p>	[REDACTED]	18/10
		<p>8.2 TC3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] commented that he has been involved in community meetings in relation to TC3 land primarily to alleviate misconceptions and issues/concerns in relation to TC3 for home owners MBIE has produced several explanatory fact sheets aimed at home owners but these may also be useful to PMOs. Copies available to take away today or can be downloaded from the MBIE website (www.mbie.govt.nz). 	Note	

Action Items

Item	Topic	Action Item	Meeting Date Added	Assigned To	Date Due	Status
1.	Steering Group membership	PMOs requested to email names of their representatives for sub-groups to [REDACTED] by COB Thursday 20 September.	18/9/12	PMOs	20/9/12	Open
2.	Steering Group membership	[REDACTED] to follow-up with PMOs once names received and send out the sub-group membership list early next week.	18/9/12	[REDACTED]	24/9/12	Open
3.	Sub-Groups	[REDACTED] to draft a reporting template and circulate to sub-groups.	18/9/12	[REDACTED]	24/9/12	Open
4.	Proposal for collaboration on Surveying for floor level benchmarks	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] to circulate a one page proposal to PMOs for feedback.	18/9/12	[REDACTED]	24/9/12	Open

PMO Technical Leaders Seminars: Canterbury Residential Reconstruction

27 and 28 September 2012-09-17

Seminars on the technical guidance for Canterbury's residential reconstruction are being held on 27 and 28 September by the Building and Housing Group of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.

The seminars aim to support good decision-making in Green Zone reconstruction projects, resulting in efficient, Code-compliant repairs and rebuilds.

The seminars are for Project Management Offices' technical leaders (that is, the PMO staff who are in a position to lead and guide other PMO staff in making decisions on reconstruction projects).

These two sessions are the first in series of seminars for PMO technical leaders on residential reconstruction and associated technical guidance. The seminars on 27 and 28 September, presented by [REDACTED] (Engineering Advisory Group Chair) and [REDACTED] (Building and Housing Group), will include the following topics:

- Regulatory requirements (inc sections 17 and 112 of The Building Act)
- Restricted Building Work
- Overview of imminent update to November 2011 Guidance document (including treatment of cracks in slabs and foundation walls, and partial rebuilds of chimneys)
- Repairing concrete foundation beams, and relevelling generally
- Plasterboard assessment and repairs
- Shallow geotechnical investigations (TCs 1 and 2)
- 'Readily repairable'.

We invite you to nominate technical leaders from your Project Management Office to attend the seminars on 27/28 September. Please email staff nominations (names, email addresses, and the date of the seminar being attended) to [REDACTED] by 5pm Friday 21 September. There are 50 places available in each seminar.

Both seminars (on 27 and 28 September) will run for two hours from 9am to 11am, following tea/coffee and savouries at 8.30am. The presenters will be available for an hour after the seminars to answer questions.

OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS TO BE AMALGAMATED INTO SUB-GROUPS WHERE APPROPRIATE

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
1	21/02/12	Geotechnical - Lidar / TT info release / Flood zoning (info sharing) Flood management Areas Variation 48 level requirements in Christchurch. (potentially in connection with Impact of EQC land repairs)	TA's CCC CERA	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Level information is available through insurers and public release expected to be in early to mid-September. ██████████ ██████████ – contaminated land. SCIRT has everything CCC has got. Can use ██████████ as a resource but Call Centre able to field calls – done on an address basis so can quickly advise. ██████████ can burn maps on to a disc on request (email ██████████ ██████████ GIS to talk to each other – could possibly export layers and get them on to the geotech dabase – ██████████ ██████████ to advise. ECAN have LLUR database essential Hail register but it is not complete. Most of it there and legal going through LIDAR to see what can be released. Data is 154GB and may be a small charge for the hard drive. Ownership issues still to be worked out so may be a few weeks yet.
2	21/02/12	Retaining walls - EQC	Insurers / PMO's	██████████ ██████████	██████████ received an updated list from SCIRT - 632 retaining walls in Port Hills and noted that there are a lot with undecided ownership. The list is marked confidential so unable to be distributed, however SCIRT has indicated they will release to PMOs. ██████████ ██████████ to follow-up with SCIRT – ██████████ to email ██████████ contact details. ██████████ meeting with SCIRT this week. To be referred to retaining walls sub-group
3	21/02/12	Pilot projects - Combined insurers /PMOs/CERA/EQC etc	PMO's	Arrow - ██████████ ██████████	Ongoing - PMO's to continue discussions. MOU still being circulated for signing by insurers. All PMOs have signed who need to sign so significant step forward. The issue of geotechnical cost share has been accepted between all parties so it is getting pretty close to commissioning these works with one small detail still to be resolved in relation to claims to settle. CERA will forward the report to ██████████

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
					<p>Doc circulated by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] CERA – any feedback to [REDACTED] Just waiting for geotech with [REDACTED] to get underway. From consenting we have had discussion with PMOs on requirements but want to give early advice. Next step is to get geotech advice.</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] passed around a Halswell site plan and noted that he has been working with numerous PMOs. CPT testing has been completed on site and a borehole rig has arrived on site and set up. 7 boreholes will be completed although there is a possibility they may have to go back and do more to get a good understanding. Should be completed within 2-3 weeks followed by laboratory testing and then reporting. Targeting 1 October for a report to participating PMOs.</p> <p>Borehole testing complete and deliverables target is 12 October for geotech reports. [REDACTED] to find out date for release and advise.</p>
4	21/02/12	Consent triggers (what constitutes a significant repair)	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Started to make progress but working on coordinated guidance.</p> <p>[REDACTED] preparing draft for circulation – still to be completed as issues arise. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] assisting. Request for definition of underpinning and re-levelling noted.</p> <p>[REDACTED] – looking at 1A and a tidy up B391. Some interpretation from building and housing required on what is substantial. To be referred to Foundation repair/rebuild thresholds and re-levelling Sub-Group</p>
5	21/02/12	Consent requirements/intended scope of review for house lifting methodologies.	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] r	<p>TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's</p> <p>[REDACTED] noted that there has been some talk in relation to running a trial but still need more examples – [REDACTED] noted he had sent some through to [REDACTED] It is unlikely that there will be “blanket” exemptions and these will need to be decided on a case by case basis. To be referred to Exemptions Sub-Group</p>

Item	Date Raised	Top Priorities for resolution	Owner group	Individuals	Status
6	21/02/12	Requirement for repairs to be completed to current code, rather than replaced as was or bought up to a % of code (Insulation, bracing, foundation repairs etc.)	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	TA's are to produce guidance aligned between TA's Agreed this item no longer required but may be revisited at a later date if required.
7	21/02/12	Building consent exemptions	TA's	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Councils are producing guidance. (Item to remain on this list until guidance issued). To be referred to Exemptions Sub-Group

Meeting Minutes

Canterbury Consent Operations Working Group - Steering Group

Date	16/10/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED] CERA			Minutes	[REDACTED], CCC

Attendees	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CERA - Christchurch City Council - Christchurch City Council - Selwyn District Council - Waimakariri District Council - Building & Housing Group, MBIE - MBIE EAG - Arrow International - Beca - Fletchers EQR - Hawkins/IAG - Lumley - MWH-Mainzeal - Stream - Vero
------------------	--	--

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
1.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Attendees introduced themselves.
2.	<p>Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Minutes of previous meeting on 18 September 2012 confirmed.
3.	<p>Review of restructure – is it working?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · It was queried whether some sub-groups were needed due to duplication of work currently being done by MBIE, EAG and/or CCC for some of the sub-groups i.e. TC3 Foundations, Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights. · It was suggested that some sub-groups could be combined i.e. TC3 Foundation /TC3 Superstructure and Flood Risk / Land Remediation.
4.	<p>Review of Sub-groups Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Agreed that all sub-groups should consider including training, guidance documents and practical examples as deliverables. <p>4.1 Retaining Walls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Agreed that the issue/problem definition should be re-defined i.e. the key issue is identification of ownership (mixed or no ownership or mixed or no funding) followed by funding and design. · Noted that suspensory loading on retaining walls and what design standard to build to should also be considered in the future. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>4.2 Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Agreed that the issue/problem definition should be re-defined and that there should be measurable/clearer deliverables. · It was agreed deliverables could be a booklet of case studies, further clarification on outstanding grey areas, technical guidance where applicable and practical examples. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
4.3	<p>TC3 Foundation Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EAG having fortnightly meetings with PMOs so appropriateness of having this sub-group was considered. Noted that PMOs meet without engineers to have some alignment of thinking from a programme point of view rather than a technical point of view. Sub-Group to give further consideration to this issue and provide feedback at the next meeting. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to include on next month's agenda for further discussion.</p>
4.4	<p>TC3 Superstructure Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of issue/problem and deliverables agreed.
4.5	<p>Foundations Repair/Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed Issue/Problem definition should be re-defined i.e. <i>"To verify that options are viable and are an acceptable solution for insurers/ reinsurers"</i> and to be clearer/more measurable. It was suggested that deliverables could include training and also to identify what should be provided with a building consent. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
4.6	<p>Land Remediation and Dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that EQC still to confirm their basis for making payments. Agreed discussion needed with the group co-ordinator to ascertain if this sub-group should continue without EQC confirmation. Noted that this issue also refers to Port Hills land issues in addition to TC3. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to discuss with [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
4.7	<p>Exemptions and Waivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Held over for the next meeting.
5.	<p>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate meeting to be arranged. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to arrange a separate meeting.</p>
6.	<p>Collaborative survey for benchmarks (Arrow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Held over for the next meeting. <p>Action: [REDACTED] to include on agenda for next meeting.</p>
7.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was queried whether anyone had access into the universities in relation to engineering expertise. It was noted that most universities are not strong in relation to experience with residential work but have the knowledge and skills.
8.	<p>Action List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated below.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm.

Action List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/9/12	<u>Collaborative survey for benchmarks</u> - ██████ discussed a proposal for PMOs to work collaboratively in relation to surveying for floor level benchmarks in order to share information/costs. ██████ to circulate a one page proposal to PMOs for feedback.	██████	24/9/12	16/10/12 - Due to unavailability of some attendees, the meeting to discuss this issue now scheduled for Thursday, 18/10/12.
2.	16/10/12	<u>Retaining Walls</u> - Agreed that the issue/problem definition should be re-defined i.e. the key issue is identification of ownership (mixed or no ownership or mixed or no funding), followed by funding and design. ██████ to discuss with ██████ ██████	████████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
3.	16/10/12	<u>Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights</u> - Agreed that the issue/problem definition should be re-defined and that that there is no measurable deliverable.	████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
4.	16/10/12	<u>TC3 Foundations</u> – this item to be discussed at the next meeting.	████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
5.	16/10/12	<u>Repair and Re-levelling</u> Agreed Issue/Problem definition should be re-defined i.e. <i>“To verify that options are viable and are an acceptable solution for insurers/ reinsurers”</i> and to be clearer/more measurable. It was suggested that deliverables could include training and also to identify what should be provided with a building consent.	████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
6.	16/10/12	<u>4.6 Land Remediation and Dwellings</u> -Agreed discussion needed with the group co-ordinator to ascertain if this sub-group should continue without EQC confirmation of basis of payments. ██████ to discuss with ██████	████████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
7.	16/10/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> – separate meeting to be arranged.	████████████████████	20/11/12	NEW
8.	16/10/12	<u>Exemptions & Collaborative Survey for Benchmarks (Arrow)</u> – both items held over for next meeting.	████████████████	20/11/12	NEW

Actions Complete

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/9/12	PMOs requested to email names of their representatives for sub-groups to [REDACTED] by COB Thursday 20 September.	PMOs	20/9/12	16/10/12 Complete – names received.
2.	18/9/12	[REDACTED] to follow-up with PMOs once names received and send out the sub-group membership list early next week.	[REDACTED]	24/9/12	16/10/12 Complete – circulated 5/10/12
3.	18/9/12	[REDACTED] to draft a reporting template and circulate to sub-groups.	[REDACTED]	24/9/12	16/10/12 Complete – circulated 11/10/12

Meeting Minutes

Canterbury Consent Operations Working Group - Steering Group

Date	20/11/12	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED] CERA			Minutes	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] CCC

Attendees	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CERA - Christchurch City Council - Selwyn District Council - Waimakariri District Council - Building & Housing Group, MBIE - MBIE EAG - Arrow International - Beca - Hawkins/IAG - Lumleys - MWH-Mainzeal - Stream - Vero
Apologies	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christchurch City Council - Fletchers EQR

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
1.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Attendees introduced themselves.
2.	<p>Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Minutes of previous meeting on 16 October 2012 confirmed.
3.	<p>Review of Sub-groups Progress</p> <p>a. Schedule 1 Exemptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sub-group is making good progress. · Noted that the Schedule should be amber rather than green (running approx. 1-2 weeks behind) and that a dependency in relation to TC3 is to be added. <p>b. Foundations Repair/Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling</p> <p>Two decisions required by the Steering Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Arrow International and Housing NZ are operating a parallel activity – can we clarify the involvement of this steering group/can our discussions or recommendations be shared with that joint venture.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · It was agreed that information could be shared and that any PMOs wishing to view results from the Arrow/Housing NZ pilot programme should contact [REDACTED] · It was also noted that Stream has put in consent for a mechanical foundation system to level concrete slabs and is keen to share information with PMOs as the job progresses. Contact [REDACTED] for more information or if you wish to view progress – work due to start next week. 2. <i>Clarify the intent of the education brief – Our understanding is for it to provide stakeholders (homeowners etc) with "piece of mind" that the method being employed is appropriate and tested. The scope of this education material may require coordination with DHB and specific operators, as well as the results of the trial re-levelling options.</i>

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that the focus for this sub-group should be on collecting case studies and to hold off on the education brief until results of the above pilot programme are known. <p>Action: ██████████</p>
	<p>c. Land Remediation and Dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This item on hold. <p>d. Retaining Walls A decision required by the Steering Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consider the option of a Walls Repair Coordination Service and a possible umbrella organisation. The group believes that CERA may be the appropriate umbrella organisation.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The viability of a coordination service under CERA was discussed but not considered viable. It was agreed that a central database be considered to identify ownership and that the sub-group produce a scope (including a firm definition of what it will look like and what data is required) for review by the steering group. <p>Action: ██████████ ██████████</p> <p>e. Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Two decisions required by the Steering Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(26/10/12) For the steering group to review the draft Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guidance document as well as the subgroups suggestions of things needed to be added. Then to tell the subgroup if they are on the right track or re-direct the subgroup.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that the sub-group to continue on and that the group produce flow charts and a foundation repair decision tree (if building consent needed) for eventual release to builders. Also noted that the foundation repair decision tree is dependent on the exemption decision tree. ██████████ to speak to ██████████ re percentages in relation to when a building consent is required. <p>Action: ████████████████████ / ██████████ ██████████</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(16/11/12) The subgroup is to discuss the Draft Determination 2505</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the draft determination attachment was not submitted with the report and also that the information from the applicant was incomplete; therefore, the determination is subject to change. <p>f. TC3 Foundation Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the performance expectations had been sent to EAG for discussion and EAG has reviewed them. ██████████ queried if this is a true sub-group or becoming something else with EAG/CCC/CERA holding similar fortnightly meetings in relation to the same issue, and where the steering group sees this sub-group going. It was agreed that this sub-group should focus on new solutions only but noted that there will be some cross-over in relation to costing elements. <p>Action: ██████████</p> <p>g. TC3 Superstructure Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the sub-group is making good progress and coming up with good details.

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
4.	<p>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion was held in relation to PMO accessibility to information held by government agencies particularly CCC. PMO preference is to have one central database that they can access. It was agreed that [REDACTED] would discuss this issue further with CCC staff and provide written instructions to PMOs on how they can access this information. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
5.	<p>Collaborative survey for benchmarks (Arrow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] commented that all sites in FMA or close to boundaries of FMA require a registered floor level survey to be carried out / signed-off for consent. Arrow has been conducting their own surveys but is interested in collaborating with other PMOs to reduce costs and to establish benchmarks. It was agreed that [REDACTED] would circulate further information to PMOs for feedback including potential cost savings. <p>Action: [REDACTED]</p>
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
7.	<p>Action List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated below.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm.

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/9/12	<p><u>Collaborative survey for benchmarks</u> - [REDACTED] discussed a proposal for PMOs to work collaboratively in relation to surveying for floor level benchmarks in order to share information/costs. [REDACTED] to circulate a one page proposal to PMOs for feedback.</p>	[REDACTED]	18/12/12	Discussed above in item 5.
2.	20/11/12	<p><u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - Discussion was held in relation to PMO accessibility to information held by CCC and ECan - PMO preference is to have one central database that they can access. It was agreed that [REDACTED] would discuss this issue further with CCC staff and provide written instructions to PMOs on how they can access this information.</p>	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	18/12/12	NEW

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>d. Retaining Walls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Steering Group agreed that a clearer case for database needs to be established. More work required on problem definition, what this may look like and how it would be run. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from Vero confirmed that they had not committed to this initiative at this stage. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to write up what is required from the sub-group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.</p> <p>e. Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Steering Group agreed that document development will have no status, but simply an output from the PMO Sub-Group. The Steering Group discussed benefit of some training in how to access, interpret and apply flood management info, floor level requirements, existing use rights, height in relation to boundary/daylight access plane and other applicable planning issues. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) offered to support CCC in developing and hosting such training sessions. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs, Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc. Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide. <p>f. TC3 Foundation Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Steering Group agreed that this Sub-Group should merge/consolidate with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group given the work that's been undertaken to date by EAG and others, and continues on several fronts, on TC3 foundation design. Noted that the current status info is missing from 14/12/12 report. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] - sub-group members to confirm that this is appropriate?</p> <p>g. TC3 Superstructure Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Steering Group is a little underwhelmed by sub-group progress and the sub-group needs to determine if greater effort required to achieve outcomes sought for group. The Steering Group believes initial objective and deliverables of this sub-group are still valid i.e.: '<i>produce pre-agreed details and principles of design for key superstructure elements</i>', but much stronger engagement and effort from the sub-group is required to progress this. The Steering Group questioned whether a new sub-group co-ordinator was needed given [REDACTED] [REDACTED] other busy commitments. This sub-group is for the PMOs to extract what they need, and hence needs to be driven by the PMOs if they see the need. The sub-group needs to finalise product and to do this needs a stronger commitment. <p>Action: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PMO representatives on this sub-group to each considers their commitment to the process and afford the necessary time and effort to progress things.

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>2. Sub-Group to consider if a new Chair is required who is able to dedicate more time to this sub-group. The Steering Group questioned whether Ian Wells might be an appropriate person given all his work to date on construction detailing.</p> <p>3. PMO representatives on this sub-group to consider if merging this sub-group with the TC3 Foundation Design sub-group would be an appropriate option.</p>
4.	<p>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites: Information for PMOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ██████████ (CCC) outlined the information that CCC hold. They are prepared to offer a service, using Aconex as a drop box for an 'enhanced property file' report. CCC is able to provide info via Aconex or on disc. • Some discussion held between PMO representatives about exactly what info they need (e.g. public drain locations, contaminated sites etc) and what mechanism it's best sourced through, e.g.: enhanced property file search, Project Information Memorandum, Land Information Memorandum, or some other PMO specific info request via Aconex. <p>Action: PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here and what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.</p>
5.	<p>Collaborative Survey for Benchmarks (Arrow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the number of surveys already established which appear adequate and no strong drive from PMOs to pursue this initiative, it was determined that no further discussion required.
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>6.1 <u>Change of Steering Group Chairperson</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ██████████ noted that he is stepping down as Chair of the Consent Operations Working Group as he has taken on a new role within the Central City Development Unit (CCDU) from January 2013. The Steering Group happily accepted the nomination of ██████████ (Earthquake Recovery Operations Manager at MBIE, formerly the Dept of Building & Housing) to take over chairmanship.
7.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday, 19 February 2013, CCC Function Room, 53 Hereford Street

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm.

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Supply Steering Group Chair with draft copy of exemption guidance material developed to date for distribution to Steering Group members.	Schedule 1 Exemptions	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
2.	18/12/12	Sub-group to hold in abeyance until consenting pilots results returned.	Foundations Repair/ Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling	[REDACTED]	On review	NEW
3.	18/12/12	Write up required from Sub-Group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.	Land Remediation and Dwellings	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
4.	18/12/12	Prepare better case for retaining walls database - write up required from sub-group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.	Retaining Walls	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
5.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
6.	18/12/12	Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
7.	18/12/12	Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	1 March 2013	NEW
8.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group	TC3 Foundation Design	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW
9.	18/12/12	PMO representatives on this Sub-Group to each consider their commitment to the process and afford the necessary time and effort to progress things.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	R [REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
10.	18/12/12	Sub-Group to consider if a new chair is required who is able to dedicate more time to this Sub-Group. Steering Group questioned whether Ian Wells might be an appropriate person given all his work to date on construction detailing.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	█ █	19 Feb 2013	NEW
11.	18/12/12	PMO representatives on this Sub-Group to consider if merging this Sub-Group with the TC3 Foundation Design Sub-Group would be an appropriate option.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	█ █	19 Feb 2013	NEW
12.	18/12/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here including what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.	N/A	All PMOs	19 Feb 2013	NEW

Meeting Minutes

Canterbury Consent Operations Working Group - Steering Group

Date	18/2/13	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED]			Minutes	[REDACTED] CCC

Attendees	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - MBIE EQ Response Programme - CERA - Christchurch City Council - Waimakariri District Council - Fletchers EQR - Arrow International - Beca - MWH-Mainzeal - Stream - Vero - Lumleys
Apologies	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAG - Hawkins - Selwyn District Council - Fletcher EQR

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
1.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendees introduced themselves.
2.	<p>Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of previous meeting on 19 December 2012 confirmed.
3.	<p>Review of Sub-groups Progress</p> <p>a. Schedule 1 Exemptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Running behind schedule. • Guidance has been developed for Schedule 1(a) and circulated to sub-group members and three Councils. Examples have been provided to Fletcher EQR and currently awaiting feedback from Fletcher EQR with a view to developing further guidance. • Ian Wells at Fletcher EQR has produced a document containing criteria around Schedule 1(a) which picks up on documents already published by CCC, MBIE etc. This booklet provides awareness of different views/opinions around Schedule 1 but what it hasn't done, is include the material the sub-committee has been doing. Clarification is sought if that info is public and can be included. • Schedule 1(k) draft guidance was provided to the three Councils and agreed in principle. This has now been confirmed and agreed by Waimakariri [REDACTED] and Selwyn District Council [REDACTED] but still awaiting agreement from CCC [REDACTED] • It was queried how much work outside of Fletcher EQR is likely to be exempt. Consensus was that some work i.e. garages likely to be impacted. It was generally agreed that PMOs are working in a risk averse environment which is impacting on the sector because of homeowners' requiring a level of comfort due to a lack of trust within the industry. • It was queried if homeowners have enough knowledge to decide if they need consent. It was noted that some insurers are requesting that the owner pay all associated consenting fees if the work is considered non-consented but the owner insists that consent be obtained.

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>b. Foundations Repair/Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This item on hold. <p>c. Land Remediation and Dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This item on hold. <p>d. Retaining Walls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMOs would like to know status of claims and whether EQC has paid out or not. · Will be going back to EQR around ownership, some insurers cover walls but some don't. The Council has a list of retaining walls but it still comes down to what is covered by the policy as it affects the build. · Still hoping that EQC will give PMOs access to their database. · It was queried if the lack of access may be due to an issue with sensitivity. General agreement was that it was not. <p>e. Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · It was discussed that if the sub-group members are unable to commit to regular meetings due to workloads then it was preferable that a replacement be found so that the sub-group can move forward. · Two action items still outstanding. · Draft guidance has been developed but Councils / MBIE prefer that PMOs own it as it is not an official document. ██████ commented that he would distribute the MBIE flow chart. · It was queried whether it is possible to define the work required? It was decided that guidance would not be appropriate for everyone. The draft guidance material has been pulled from various sources but is now contained in one document and has been circulated to sub-group members. It still comes down to property specific information. · Advice by CCC is that flooding decisions depend on the type of PMO project i.e. what type of building, size of building, is the building being lifted, etc · Some issues with hazard notice as there is a big difference between major and minor repairs when you read sections 71 to 72 of the Building Act. It was noted that even if it is a brand new house and there is a hazard on the land they will get a section 73 notice but there are some parameters around this. · A lot of properties in flood management area are now red zoned. · If it's a re-level, it is not subject to a hazard notice. · Where replacing the floor up to 50% or over that or a new house, this is a trigger to finding out what the floor levels are. It was queried if there is a way to work this out? PMOs may send requests to ██████ with calculations and he will send to CCC flood modellers. · It was agreed that although all information is contained in the guidance documentation, face-to-face explanations are required preferably in a workshop type environment using examples. Malcolm would like to move ahead with this training. · ██████ ██████ Lumleys noted that he would like to join this sub-group. <p>Action: ██████ to invite ██████ to future sub-group meetings. ██████ to circulate MBIE flow chart.</p> <p>f. TC3 Foundation Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No report to hand out due to systems being down. · Noted that new foundation option with re-level slab well on the way and first slab carried out last Friday. · It was discussed that there is some cross-over work that could be done with other sub-groups i.e. TC3 Superstructure and Foundation Repair and Re-levelling although some specific work still required on TC3 Foundations. · ██████ noted that Arrow is involved in the HNZ repair programme and at the stage where tested 15 properties and come up with repair options for all of these and hope to get proven in the next few weeks. ██████ will share the results with the steering group. <p>g. TC3 Superstructure Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ██████ ██████ noted that he has taken over chairing this sub-group in place of ██████ ██████

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Initially involved with TC3 Foundations and how they related to TC3 Superstructure and came up with a few ideas and some issues i.e. what sort of details do they need to generate. These can be broken down into new and existing foundations i.e. new foundation (fire wall part boundary) and existing. Quite a few details developed for existing foundations but there is a problem when dealing with base of cladding. · Also looking at how to develop a fire proof wall on a boundary and also possibility of internal fire walls i.e. in apartments. · Starting to think about foundation situations i.e. garages, porches and verandas which could raise some issues. · A lot of information available already on chimney rebuilds for new foundations but now starting to relate these to situations where existing foundation damage is not particularly bad. · It was queried if it is worth approaching architects and designers to see if they had similar situations/experiences and it was agreed this would be useful. <p>Action: ■ to engage with design sector to see what their experiences /needs are.</p>
4.	<p>MBIE EAG Advisory Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ■ ■ was unable to attend the meeting but provided the written update below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting MBIE with the release of the updated Guidance document (250 attended the 11 February launch). - Held Engineering training seminars on 12 & 13 February (160 in attendance). - Supporting MBIE Sector Education in planning further training for PMOs and designers. - Working with MBIE and BCAs to develop information sheet and worked examples covering RBW Certificates of Design Work, Producer Statements and engineering sign-off. - Assisting CCC with their Engineering Services Review. - Liaising with EQC and ECan on forthcoming technical reports and work in relation to land and ground water. - Looking to provide advice on geotechnical issues associated with light commercial and industrial buildings.
5.	<p>MBIE Canterbury Residential Rebuild Sector Education Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ■ noted MBIE's focus on sector education which was recently involved in providing training around repairs to BCAs/PMOs. · Sector Education proposes to hold training workshops (2-3 hours every 6-8 weeks) for BCAs and PMOs. They are looking for ideas / hot topics in relation to what could be presented and trained i.e. repair issues, rebuild issues. · It was suggested that designers / architects would benefit from training in order to ensure they understand guidance particularly in relation to foundation solutions. It was noted that advice should be simplified. It was agreed that the guidance document is not necessarily applicable to all insurers but noted that for consents to be processed quicker then the guidance should be used/adapted.
6.	<p>PMO's Engineers and Insurance Companies Requiring Council Sign-off of non-consented work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · It was noted that CCC is getting numerous requests from PMOs requesting written confirmation of non-consented work which is causing a strain on resources. CCC is always available to assist in providing building advice but cannot provide a specific service to determine if works require consent or are exempt. Guidance is available to PMOs to make these decisions but it appears that insurance companies are requesting written confirmation. · It was queried whether the Council has the capacity to provide a Building Consent Officer to accompany PMOs on sited visits (approx. 2-3 generic sites) in order to provide advice with the expectation that this time be charged for. ■ noted the current shortage of staff within the building consents department but would put the request to the Unit Manager. ■ ■ noted that MBIE can also assist with specific training for project managers. · ■ also commented that there are some issues in relation to registered capital surveyors certificates as only a licensed registered surveyor can make an adjustment to LIMs. ■ met with a representative of the building surveyor's institute recently who had a lot of questions. ■ queried if it was worth forming a sub-group to work out requirements (building locations certificates). The Building Surveyor's Institute would be interested in forming part of the sub-group.

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
	Action: [REDACTED] to discuss possibility of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to non-consented works.
7.	Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">No items.
8.	Next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">3pm, Tuesday, 19 March 2013, CCC Function Room, 53 Hereford Street

The meeting concluded at 4.45pm.

DRAFT

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Supply Steering Group Chair with draft copy of exemption guidance material developed to date for distribution to Steering Group members.	Schedule 1 Exemptions	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Distributed at today's meeting.
2.	18/12/12	Sub-group to hold in abeyance until consenting pilots results returned.	Foundations Repair/ Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling	[REDACTED]	On review	Sub-group on hold
3.	18/12/12	Write up required from Sub-Group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.	Land Remediation and Dwellings	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 ??
4.	18/12/12	Prepare better case for retaining walls database - write up required from sub-group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.	Retaining Walls	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 ??
5.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Still to do
6.	18/12/12	Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/12 Still to do.
7.	18/12/12	Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	1 March 2013	19/2/12 Still to do.
8.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group	TC3 Foundation Design	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Sub-groups still to discuss.
9.	18/12/12	PMO representatives on this Sub-Group to each consider their commitment to the process and afford the necessary time and effort to progress things.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	NEW

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
10.	18/12/12	PMO representatives on this Sub-Group to consider if merging this Sub-Group with the TC3 Foundation Design Sub-Group would be an appropriate option.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	█ █	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Sub-groups still to discuss.
11.	18/12/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here including what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.	N/A	All PMOs	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Some PMOs have been in touch with CCC.
12.	19/2/13	Engagement with design sector to see what their experiences/needs are.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	█ █		NEW
13.	19/2/13	Invite █ █ to future sub-group meetings.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	█ █	19/3/13	NEW
14.	19/2/13	MBIE Flow chart to be circulated to PMOs	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	█ █	19/3/13	NEW
15.	19/2/13	Discuss availability of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to non-consented works.	N/A	█ █	19/3/12	NEW

Actions Closed This Meeting

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Sub-Group to consider if a new chair is required who is able to dedicate more time to this Sub-Group. Steering Group questioned whether Ian Wells might be an appropriate person given all his work to date on construction detailing.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	█ █	19 Feb 2013	19/2/13 Complete

Meeting Minutes

Consent Operations Working Group - Steering Group Meeting

Date	19/3/13	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	██████████		MBIE	Minutes	██████████ CCC

Attendees	████████████████████ ██████████████████ ██████████████ ████████████████████ ██████████████ ████████████████████ ██████████████ ██████████████ ██████████████ ██████████████ ██████████████	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - CERA - Christchurch City Council - Waimakariri District Council - Fletchers EQR - Arrow International - Beca - MWH Recovery - Stream - Vero
Apologies	██████████████ ██████████████ ██████████ ██████████████ ██████████ ██████████████	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAG - MBIE - Selwyn District Council - Fletcher EQR - Fletcher EQR - Lumleys

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
1.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendees introduced themselves.
2.	<p>Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of previous meeting on 19 February 2013 confirmed.
3.	<p>Sub-groups progress presentations/reports</p> <p>1. Exempt building work Sub-Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ██████████ (MBIE) met with the sub-group last week to discuss progress made to date. Fletcher EQR has been applying the draft guidance provided to them. There is also a determination applied for by Fletcher EQR which will comment on whether the work should be exempt or not. This Determination will also establish if the proposed foundation repair strategy complies with the building code. Specific situation involves repairing/replacing the foundations on one side of a house and re-levelling of piles on a TC2 classified property. • Fletcher EQR has used the Schedule 1 guidance. Note there is no dispute with either the consenting authority or the home owner; they are just testing the case. It will provide published clarification around this matter. • ██████████ (Fletcher EQR) presented a copy of Fletcher EQRs technical manual on exempt building work, a guide for EQR staff and contractors, available in each Hub. • ██████████ mentioned that CCC has reported getting an increasing number of enquiries from PMOs and home owners seeking advice about whether certain building work was exempt or not. ██████████ (MBIE) wondered if CCC had a list of these enquiries showing where they came from and if they were predominantly Fletcher EQR or another PMO. ██████████ (CCC) wasn't sure, but will check and let the group know. • ██████████ (Fletcher EQR) asked that CCC refer these enquiries back to Fletcher EQR where they relate to their work, so they can check on them to determine if consents were needed or not. ██████████ said they could contact him when this occurs. • ██████████ (MBIE) to arrange a meeting with ██████████ (CCC) to discuss Schedule 1 K

Issue / Topic / Discussion

guidance / policy – which is still to be developed - and obtain examples of the documentation.

- Another aspect of blanket exemptions was discussed at the last meeting and there may be some agreement between the 3 Canterbury building consent authorities, to potentially exempt insulation installation from needing a building consent. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) will be following up on this matter shortly. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC) to forward an email he has regarding this matter, of an exemption already given, to Peter.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Fletcher EQR) noted that insulation being installed by Fletcher EQR is just to replace existing insulation damaged during the earthquake. Any extra insulation is done by an external and independent contractor, engaged by the home owner, but in coordination with the Fletcher EQR repairs and in line with EECA guidelines. Fletcher EQR require the installation of insulation be done under the EECA programme by a trained and qualified professional. The main driver for this is health and safety especially given the presence of old electrical wiring in many houses, and of course energy efficiency when installed correctly.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) mentioned that Building Bill No. 4 had had its second reading in parliament and is likely to be passed this calendar year. It contains some new exemptions for building work not requiring a building consent.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) asked if there were any implications or new exemptions relevant to the Canterbury rebuild. Peter explained much of it was a restructuring job, removing of some duplication caused by successive amendments over the years and some new exemptions based on the competence of who is carrying out the building work, e.g. professional engineers, registered drain layers and plumbers etc. The term 'damaged' has also been removed from the section *Demolition of a damaged building* so that you can now demolish a greater scale of work without the building(s) being damaged. Finally there are some minor clarifications and changes.
- [REDACTED] has asked that he be contacted if CCC receives what looks like a disagreement around exemptions involving Fletcher EQR projects, so that he can pass the details onto their technical hub. He is worried that Fletcher EQR may have been missed in the process and so are unaware of these issues.

2. Retaining walls Sub-Group

- The Sub-Group reported that the deliverable continues to evolve in terms of what the end product needs to look like. At the Feb 20 meeting it was resolved that information could be shared without the need to pool data if insurers, PMO's and the city council were willing to co-operate. It was considered possible and appropriate to share wall ownership information on a case by case basis without breaching commercial sensitivity thresholds and this could be done simply by means of a broadcast email to all the PMO's asking for the insurers of a particular property to identify their ownership/claim status over a particular retaining wall. It was proposed that the PMO representatives should confirm acceptability of this by the respective insurers and evidence from the March 13 meeting indicated that progress was being made through efforts from within the group to communicate and co-operate (refer attached minutes).
- It was suggested that a letter could be sent to the CEO of each insurance company outlining the challenges and problems retaining walls are posing for PMOs and asking for their help in agreeing that customers can come to them and ask if they insure retaining walls or not? It would be beneficial to have a point of contact for each insurer so that customers know who to contact if they need to find out who their neighbour's retaining wall (that might cross into their property or affect their properties repair work) is insured through. One source in each insurance organisation was needed.
- Request was made for either CERA and or MBIE to engage and communicate with insurers seeking their support and understanding that there is a need to work together across insurers and share information about ownership, claim coverage and status in relation to retaining walls if the rebuild was to maintain some momentum as retaining walls are proving to be a challenging issue at present.

Outstanding Actions

- **Prepare better case for retaining walls database - write up required from sub-group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.**

Issue / Topic / Discussion

New Actions

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) to talk to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Arrow) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (EQR) to fully understand the issues and progress the request for an insurer communication from either CERA and or MBIE.
- PMOs to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOs in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.
- MBIE [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to discuss with CERA the possibility of jointly communicating with insurers to raise the profile of and help them understand the complexity of issues surrounding retaining wall repairs/rebuilds, particularly those crossing boundaries and ownership, and seek insurers support for the appropriate sharing of information amongst PMOs to help expedite repair projects.

3. Flood risk, floor levels and existing use rights

- At a meeting on 1 March the Sub-Group concluded that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] would run a series of workshops on the guidance, they still need to decide on the number of workshops, content etc. [REDACTED] noted that 3 hours for the training would be to long and that 2 sessions of 1.5 hours each would be better in a larger group, with a discussion at the end. The training will be targeted at PMO site and project managers, taking a train the trainers approach. Refer PMO training overview table attached.
- The draft guidance document developed by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC) for the sector on Flood Risk, Floor levels & Existing Use Rights is currently being edited by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Arrow) so that it's ready for distribution at the proposed workshops. Andrew would like it to be an interactive electronic document with links to other flow charts, documents and guidance.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Fletcher EQR) suggested [REDACTED] [REDACTED] would be the best Fletcher EQR contact. Grant is already a member of the group, so [REDACTED] is going to talk to him to encourage his involvement and participation in this proposed sector training.

Outstanding Actions

- Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.
- Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.

New Action

- Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC) to arrange a meeting between himself, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to discuss this training and decide on format and dates.

4. TC3 foundations

- Progress has been made with the HNZN trials. Contractors have been selected and pricing is being finalised for approval. Interesting information is expected to be generated from these trials.
- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had a meeting to discuss the merging of the TC3 foundations and TC3 Superstructure sub groups. After comparing notes they discovered both groups were heading in the same direction in terms of the groups, research, focuses and desired solutions, particularly because the structure sits on top of foundations. There are also a number of members currently sitting on both sub-groups. [REDACTED] has noted that more input is needed from the Superstructure sub-group members and it would be beneficial to get more engineers/architects involved in this. Getting feedback from them is proving difficult.
- Steering group made the decision to merge TC3 Foundation Sub-Group and TC3 Superstructure Sub-Group. Moving forward they will be called TC3 Sub-Group and need to work closely with MBIE's engineering advisory group.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Arrow) discussed Firths progress in designing another foundation solution which

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>will be heading off to the EAG for review shortly. Allied Concrete are close to having their re-levellable slab designed, signed off and out to market</p> <p>Outstanding Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group <p>New Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ██████████ to arrange the first meeting of the merged groups <p>5. TC3 superstructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group has been looking at Type A building piles and foundations and various foundation types in the guidance. They raise interesting architectural challenges as to how we view a building in terms of roofs, walls and foundations and in terms of aesthetics and what people expect to see in relation to the foundations. They are trying to come up with solutions that would help resolve the issues regarding what people expect to see on a house. They may use a baton type sub-floor system similar to pre-fabricated buildings. Ian plans to send sketch details out to various consultants and designers to ask for their feedback and comments with a view to formulating a plan to propose to Council. • The group has produced a schedule listing the topics/areas they are focussing on at the moment and the progress they've made to date. Refer attached sheet provided by Ian. • MBIE ██████████ asked if a local Building Consent Authority member was involved with the group regarding code of compliance issues, to help when it comes to consenting requirements. ██████████ (CCC) is on the list but didn't attend the last meeting. MBIE ██████████ stressed the importance of insuring building code compliance technical expertise was around the table and involved in this work. <p>Outstanding Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with design sector to see what their experiences/ needs are.
4.	<p>Update from the Engineering Advisory Group (EAG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A third Engineering Training Seminar was held 12 March with MBIE Sector Education (a total of 210 engineers across all seminars), plus a session with EQR engineers. • Assisting MBIE Sector Education in planning further technical training for PMOs and designers, with the next workshop planned for Monday 8 April. • Finalising the guidance and worked examples for engineers covering RBW Certificates of Design Work, Producer Statements and engineering sign-off, following consultation with MBIE and BCAs. • Working with IPENZ, ACENZ to finalise an information sheet to be provided by engineers to home-owners to clarify expectations and responsibilities. ██████████ noted that the information is for consumers to try and help recalibrate their expectations of what should be required from the design sector. There are no guarantees things won't fail in the future. • They have undertaken an independent costing exercise for TC3 foundation options for Type 1 and Type 2b Surface Structures. This will be shared with PMOs to compare their experiences. • Participated in the monthly CCC TC3 Foundation Consent Review Group meeting. • Liaising with EQC and ECan on forthcoming technical reports and work in relation to land and ground water. • Commencing a process for updating guidance on geotechnical and structural issues associated with light commercial and industrial buildings.
5.	<p>MBIE Canterbury Residential Rebuild Sector Education Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two builder booklets have been developed (for above-floor, and below-floor) that provide an easy reference to the updated guidance document. The purpose of these booklets is to help builders and others quickly understand the key aspects of the regulatory framework and essentials on repairing and rebuilding houses in Canterbury. Publication is expected in early April, followed by distribution via multiple channels. • A new workshop is planned for 8 April 2013 – looking at new build case study scenario/s put together by the training team, while the team sources real case studies from PMOs for subsequent clinics and/or seminars. • The direction subsequent training sessions take will depend on input from PMOs in terms of repair

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>case studies for clinics/workshops. The team are looking for people to volunteer repair case studies. If you or anyone in your organisation has a potential case study please contact [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Acting Team Leader, Sector Education on [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBIE publications distributed - <i>Rebuild with confidence</i>, <i>Lighter cladding and you</i> and <i>Repairing, Rebuilding and re-levelling foundations damaged by the Canterbury earthquakes</i>. The lighter claddings and you and Rebuild with confidence have been published to help, amongst other things, to encourage people to think about what opportunities exist and what type of houses are really right for them now, i.e. should they design and build to suit their current lifestyle rather than build back just what they had. • [REDACTED] (MBIE) noted that there was some concern shown by PMOs over group home builders understanding of the technical guidance. [REDACTED] mentioned that MBIE and BCAs haven't yet seen a big change in the group home building companies house designs, still a little business as usual approach with same old standard designs at times, rather than more resilient simpler layout designs and lighter weight claddings. Discussions explored the drivers for this [REDACTED] (MWH) commented that this might be more customer driver rather than group home builders afraid to try something new. • [REDACTED] (Arrow) mentioned that Southern Response are looking into building a TC3 show home to show different options and finishes and the possibilities of new 'Cantabrian' home building design. Arrow International is working with Southern Response on this. • CERA are holding a rebuild expo on the 27th and 28th April, which MBIE and others are supporting/partnering with. It will provide an opportunity to disseminate products, information and services to consumers along with several seminars series on topical subjects. Various government agencies will be at this event. Further information on this event is available on line at: http://canterburyresidentialrebuild.govt.nz/events if anyone's interested in their organisation having a presence at the expo, please let [REDACTED] know and we can pass your interest onto the relevant people within CERA. [REDACTED] mentioned that the expo will also involve talks/seminars and if anyone has any thoughts on topics that would be useful to have covered off please contact him – all ideas are welcome. • CERA are hosting another series of breakfast seminars for professional groups (20th, 21st, 26th & 28th March) with lawyers, bankers, realtors and valuers to discuss EQC land damage settlements and other issues. • At the last meeting MBIE had an action point to arrange a meeting with the Canterbury branch of the Institute of Surveyors to discuss their issues with surveying challenges in CHCH post quakes. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] met with the surveyors on [REDACTED] behalf and has subsequently invited them to send through a summary of these issues, including information on how they think the issues will affect the rebuild. We anticipate that this information will be sent through shortly and once we have received this we will engage with CCC and others where appropriate to work through the issues. • At the last meeting we discuss the possibility of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to non-consented work. Discussions have taken place within CCC regarding this and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will follow this up. It will remain an outstanding action point.
7.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3pm, Tuesday, 16 April 2013, CCC Function Room, 53 Hereford Street

The meeting concluded at 4.15pm.

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Sub-group to hold in abeyance until consenting pilots results returned.	Foundations Repair/ Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling	██████████	On review	Sub-group on hold
2.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████	19 Feb 2013	OUTSTANDING 19/2/13
3.	18/12/12	Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████	19 Feb 2013	OUTSTANDING 19/2/13
6.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group	TC3 Foundation Design	██████████	19 Feb 2013	OUTSTANDING 19/3/13
4.	18/12/12	Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance. ██████████ to arrange a meeting between himself, ██████████ to discuss this training and decide on format and dates	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████ ██████████	1 March 2013	OUTSTANDING 19/2/13
5.	18/12/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here including what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.	N/A	All PMOs	19 Feb 2013	PARTLY COMPLETED Some PMOs have been in touch with CCC.
6.	19/2/13	Engagement with design sector to see what their experiences/ needs are.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	██████████	19/3/13	NEW
7.	19/2/13	Discuss availability of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to exempt building works.	N/A	██████████	19/3/13	NEW
8.	19/02/13	PMOs and BCAs to provide training topics for MBIE's Sector Education & Training team to consider delivering local training on. Cases encountered, 'head scratchers' etc.	N/A	All	16/4/13	NEW

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
9.	19/03/13	██████ to talk to ██████ and ██████ to agree on what the letter to the CEO of each insurance company needs to include and then socialise the draft with CERA, before forwarding it onto the insurers.	Retaining Walls	██████████	16/4/13	NEW
10.	19/03/13	PMOs to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOs in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.	Retaining Walls	██████████	16/4/13	NEW
11.	19/03/13	MBIE ██████ ██████ to discuss with CERA the possibility of jointly communicating with insurers to raise the profile of and help them understand the complexity of issues surrounding retaining wall repairs/rebuilds, particularly those crossing boundaries and ownership, and seek insurers support for the appropriate sharing of information amongst PMOs to help expedite repair projects.	Retaining Walls	██████████	16/4/13	NEW
12.	19/03/13	██ ██████ and ██████ ██████ to arrange the first meeting of the merged groups	TC3 Foundations and Superstructure Design Sub-Group	██████████ ██████	16/4/13	NEW

Actions Closed This Meeting

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
13.	19/2/13	Invite [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to future sub-group meetings.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19/3/13	Completed
2.	18/12/12	Supply Steering Group Chair with draft copy of exemption guidance material developed to date for distribution to Steering Group members.	Schedule 1 Exemptions	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	COMPLETED Distributed post 18/12/12.
14.	19/2/13	MBIE Flow chart to be circulated to PMOs	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19/3/13	Completed
7.	18/12/12	PMO representatives on this Sub-Group to consider if merging this Sub-Group with the TC3 Foundation Design Sub-Group would be an appropriate option.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	Completed
15.	18/12/12	Prepare better case for retaining walls database - write up required from sub-group that could be presented to Insurers clearly stating the problem definition, its size and possible cost and time implications in the rebuild. The proposed solution, its costs and benefits and implications for PMOs and Insurers. The who, what, where and how business case appears to still be required for the need for a database of retaining wall owners, in order to get Insurer commitment and buy in.	Retaining Walls	[REDACTED]	19 Feb 2013	CANCELED Appears unnecessary if PMOs and Insurers can respond to individual enquiries when needed.

Issue / Topic / Discussion

document is being developed listing exactly what insulation is exempt and how to install it. This is an important and positive step in achieving a level of consistency between the three Canterbury Building Consent Authorities and the group is hoping there will be more going forward.

- The group is working to implement Schedule 1k and so far Waimakariri, Selwyn and Christchurch District Councils are happy with the policy that's been drafted. Once the policy is adopted it will wrap up this particular stream of work for the group and they can look at something else. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) asked that on assumption this happens, what it will look like as an out product. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] replied by saying at this point the suggestion is to still fill out building consent application forms for exemption applications, rather than create new forms, but a policy will end up being developed around what requirements are needed and the documentation requirements should be a lot simpler.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) briefed the group on Bill No. 4 and tabled a copy. Whilst it doesn't introduce any new exemptions of any relevance to Canterbury's rebuild, the restructuring and reduction of duplication in schedule 1 will help make the legislation and subsequent guidance easier to understand and apply.

2. Retaining walls

- The initial purpose of the group was to identify and alert interested parties in relation to retaining walls. They now have a good understanding of the issues and have identified that there are problems and issues to address, in particular co-operation and co-ordination between key players. The group is looking at how to share information efficiently and safely, so as to help speed up the rebuilds that involve or are affected by the existence of damaged retaining walls. Issues include the need to avoid any breach of commercial sensitivity where relevant and perhaps deal with the queries on a case by case basis with PMOs and their insurers, possibly through in a broadcast email system to relevant parties, all with the goal of helping facilitate the process of rebuilding a shared wall or fixing properties where shared ownership of retaining walls impact of the repair or rebuild work.
- Some insurers (IAG was given as an example) are happy with this but some aren't (Southern Response was given as an example).
- Originally Christchurch City Council said they would allow access to the SCIRT database, so that people can better coordinate their repair programme of works, but there now seems to be some resistance to this within CCC. The EQC web portal is also closed at the moment, so a lot of the data can't be accessed which is also causing problems and delays. Up until this point the sub-group was making some head way, but issues with the EQC portal and information sharing are causing frustrations. Key roadblocks like the EQC portal, Insurer approval and access to the SCIRT database need to be rectified before the group can move forward and better rebuild momentum can be achieved on affected sites.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) apologised for not progressing his action point from last month to work with the group to draft communication to Insurers. [REDACTED] has secured some extra resource to help with this task and will be in contact with the group within the next few days to progress this matter.

Outstanding Actions

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) to talk to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Arrow) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (EQR) to fully understand the issues and progress the request for an insurer communication from either CERA and or MBIE.
- PMOs to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOs in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.
- MBIE [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to discuss with CERA the possibility of jointly communicating with insurers to raise the profile of and help them understand the complexity of issues surrounding retaining wall repairs/rebuilds, particularly those crossing boundaries and ownership, and seek insurers support for the appropriate sharing of information amongst PMOs to help expedite repair projects.

Issue / Topic / Discussion

3. Flood risk, floor levels and existing use rights

- After the last Steering Group meeting a sub-group meeting was held 25 March, hosted by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MWH Recovery) and attended [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC), [REDACTED] Buckley (Arrow International) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Stream Group). The action points that came out of the meeting were for Andrew to update the flood risk guidance document and Russell to draft a PowerPoint presentation for the upcoming workshops. The workshops will be presented to PMO technical groups first, then the Designers Association, Master Builders, Certified Builders and Institute of Architects. Group Home Builders will fit into the Master Builders and Certified Builders workshops. The hope is that they will then train their own people and will be given a copy of the presentation to use.
- A follow up meeting took place on 10 April and the PowerPoint presentation was given to all sub-group members for feedback.
- Another meeting is scheduled for 17 April and [REDACTED] has emailed out the flood risk guidance documents to group members for feedback.
- One uncompleted action point from the last meeting was to develop and host training workshop for PMOS and set up a meeting to be with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to discuss this. The meeting will be scheduled to take place after the meeting on 17 April. [REDACTED] will send out a meeting invite.
- Changes to draft guidance document – [REDACTED] [REDACTED] described that it is best used electronically. It hasn't been finalised but on page 33 there is a decision tree on exemptions and building consents. They are hoping to put a series of links on these diagrams which will take you to other relevant guidance and information. There will also be a third flow diagram added regarding flood management from a resource point of view. Existing use rights is a very complex subject and it's quite critical for building in the FMA. Any future papers developed by CCC will also have links added to the diagrams. A link will be provided to the participants of the workshops and will be kept up to date and relevant.
- PowerPoint presentation for training workshops – this subject is a starting point for the meeting on 17 April for people to provide feedback on what else needs to be added. The group will then work on how best to train the PMOs and then take it into the building sectors. The group thinks its going to be a very useful guide that will hopefully take some pressure of CCC. Hopefully there will be a point of contact that the people going to the training can liaise with that will also take pressure off CCC.
- [REDACTED] thinks that they possibly need a bit of guidance on how to use the flooding website and existing use rights. Some of the slides are a little busy so may need to be re-formatted. These matters will be discussed at the 17 April meeting, which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is attending. Being delivered to technical PMOS first (technical groups within the PMOS), then hopefully they can filter this down the line.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) noted that the key points to be covered off at the training are the inter-dependencies and competing requirements.

Outstanding Actions

- **Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.**
- **Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.**

4. TC3 Foundations & Superstructure

- A combined meeting of the TC3 Superstructure and TC3 Foundations sub-groups was held last week and all members unanimously agreed it should continue to move forward as a combined group.
- **TC3 Foundations**
 - Most of the new foundations being built are either type 1 or type 2 a or b. Further solutions are being investigated using screw piles and 300mm slab. [REDACTED] Buckley (Arrow) noted that Firth are looking at re-levelable TC3 slab designs that can accommodate 2 storey house options and the results aren't to far away. Allied are also looking at re-levelable slab options and Arrow International have suggested they contact

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>EAG to get them involved early in their design and testing work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arrow International is undertaking a job at the moment on a site with severe lateral spreading and is planning to use screw piles. They are receiving a huge amount of geotechnical and structural engineering input around this job. This will hopefully produce some useful findings as to whether or not using screw piles in areas of severe lateral spreading will be a viable solution. - HNZC are progressing 6 projects to repair TC3 foundations using solutions technically outside of MBIE guidelines, all be it hybrid designs, all engineering questions/issues will be passed back through EAG. HNZC are keen to trial new options. 1 house is consented and 5 will be going through the exempt building work schedule 1K scheme at CCC shortly. Another 8 houses are planned after these 6 (14 in total for HNZC). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC3 Superstructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A number of design ideas have been forwarded to architects and designers of the group for comments on the surplus structure foundations and seeking there feedback. Gathering feedback has proved some what difficult however they did receive one idea, which was a modification of type one, possibly type 2, foundations. The suggestion shifted the bracing to the inside of the piles, not the outside and the outside was clad in a panel system which is more akin to the standard foundation system we're used to. A sketch has been developed and ██████████ ██████████ (BRANZ) has a copy for review. Refer attached drawings. - The group are also looking at garage foundations. Concrete floors against timber floor dwellings and the different levels and interaction between the two elements. Refer attached drawings. - Ian Wells distributed some sketch drawings to the steering group to illustrate the type of work the Sub-Group have been working on, these included fire wall details and cladding junctions etc. • Apologies from the group for not getting copies of the minutes from their meeting sent through in time. These will follow shortly. • ██████████ ██████████ sent some TC3 Superstructure design solutions out to some of the designers Fletcher EQR have on their books seeking their feedback. Very limited feedback as at steering group meeting, one response from an Architecture firm. <p>Outstanding Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group
4.	<p>Multiproof presentation by ██████████ ██████████ from MBIE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer attached presentation slides and Multiproof pamphlet information.
5.	<p>MBIE Canterbury Residential Rebuild Sector Education Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team has been running a sector education programme aimed at increasing understanding and application of the technical guidance for the rebuild. Workshops and seminars have been held with building officials, PMOS, architectural designers and engineers. • The shape of PMO training going forward depends on the team receiving new case studies. They are very keen to obtain some new repair focussed case studies that are tricky, but where the person sending the idea to them feels confident with the solutions and think it would be useful for the wider PMO groups to learn about it. Please contact ██████████ ██████████ (Senior Advisory Sector Education) on (04) 817 4432 or ██████████ ██████████ • In terms of the case study training, ██████████ envisages MBIE working together with the person who has provided the case study to come up with a concept that can be put into a workbook and be used to work through the decision making process. To date they have created scenarios as they haven't received any real examples which they can get photos and data from. ██████████ ██████████ (Arrow) suggested HNZC could help with that and suggested Kirsty contact ██████████ ██████████ (Arrow). • The Sector Education Group has been receiving valuable input from EAG members. • There will be 2 builder booklets produced shortly, one for above floor and one on foundations. They will have references to the guidance and key messages throughout. These have been thoroughly reviewed by numerous people in MBIE, EAG etc. They are going to be distributed through various channels to PMOS and group home builders. Previous publications reached

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>97% of market and they think these will do the same. If anyone would like to be added to the distribution list please let Kirsty know (contact details above) ASAP as the books will begin to be distributed in the next week or so.</p>
5.	<p>Update from the Engineering Advisory Group (EAG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidance on <i>Repairing and Rebuilding houses affected by the Canterbury Earthquakes</i> has been released and various training workshops have been delivered on it to different professional groups. EAG continues to monitor and answer any queries received. They are currently preparing an update to the guidance containing FAQs on areas that required further explanation and information. This will be uploaded onto the website within the next few weeks. There will also potentially be a space where some of the Christchurch City Council issues and areas they are struggling with can be promoted as well. This will be ongoing and updated as and when needed. • Other guidance material continues to be updated and there are some updated fact and guidance sheets on line at: http://www.dbh.govt.nz/canterbury-rebuild-info-sheets as examples of ongoing updates. • EAG are working with Highway Stabilisers to get some demonstration projects underway for ground improvement options. Halswell School and a house in Fendalton have been trialled and results are being evaluated. The group are helping to promote the ground improvement options. • High court decision on the Laughlan case has raised 2 or 3 issues that mean the <i>Repairing and Rebuilding houses affected by the Canterbury Earthquakes</i> guidance may need to be better clarified in places as its would appear it has been misunderstood in the Laughlan case. • EAG are working with HNZC on their house repair programme looking at areas where they are working outside of guidance on hybrid and alternative TC3 solutions. • A costing exercise on TC3 foundations is being run in response to the CERA industry workshops. EAG are keen to work with PMOs on the results of these - particularly concerning the type 2b options being used - to compare the prices EAG are getting from their independent costings. • Ongoing Christchurch City Council and TC3 review meetings. • Guidance on producer statement certificates is being finalised but is being held up as further clarification is needed. • Information sheets for homeowners on appropriate expectations to have on engineers in the context of earthquake damaged repairs and rebuilds is being developed with input from IPENZ and others. • EAG are starting to develop a scope of issues relating to light industrial and commercial buildings, which will be important for the rebuild as the central city rebuild area gets underway. • EAG are also supporting some University of Canterbury research to help answer questions on design methodologies regarding liquefaction in areas where it didn't occur during the earthquake and also ground shaking and water table measurement issues. • EAG are helping CCC with the internal Engineering Services Review. • Finally, EAG are looking at multi unit buildings – trying to get clarity around issues there.
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC) noted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] asked about fire regulations in TC3. [REDACTED] wants to put a show home on TC3 land. • [REDACTED] (MBIE) raised the issue of management of flow rates around consenting applications sent to Councils. This is in relation to the PMO metrics forward forecasting of building consent applications to Councils, and a recent media story around significant consent volume increases. There has been a 100% jump in the number of applications received by Christchurch City Council over last 4 weeks. The PMO metrics weren't forecasting this and so it has been difficult for the Council to be prepared for the influx. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] asked if it was possible for the PMOs to better inform the Councils of the number of applications expected in the future, so they can be prepared. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Fletcher EQR) said it can be difficult as they can only provide a rough estimate due to so many external factors that are out of their control. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] noted that Arrow International are currently trying to set up a system with their Group Home Builders so that the application is sent back to Arrow to on-send to the Council and manage the consenting lodgement process themselves to get better control and management of this stage of the process, as opposed to the building companies sending them

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>direct to council. This way Arrow would be able to better monitor and manage the consent volume.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>██████████ (CCC) noted that due to the increase in applications received CCC are currently engaging with Councils around the country to ask for help with processing these applications, however they need to have a better indication of the number expected each month so that they can ensure adequate resources are in place externally as well as internally to help. Some sort of arrangement needs to be put in place regarding the flow rate to get better certainty before they engage extra resources. External suppliers require assurance of work volumes so they can manage their workloads also.</p>
7.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>3pm, Tuesday, 21 May 2013, CCC Function Room, 53 Hereford Street</p>

The meeting concluded at 4.45pm.

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Sub-group to hold in abeyance until consenting pilots results returned.	Foundations Repair/ Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling	██████████	On review	Sub-group on hold
2.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████	19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/13
3.	18/12/12	Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████	19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/12
4.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group	TC3 Foundation Design	██████████	19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING
5.	18/12/12	Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	██████████	1/3/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/12
6.	18/12/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here including what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.	N/A	All PMOs	19/3/13	PARTLY COMPLETED Some PMOs have been in touch with CCC.
7.	19/2/13	Discuss availability of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to exempt building works.	N/A	██████████	19/3/12	OUTSTANDING
8.	19/02/13	PMOs and BCAs to provide training topics for MBIE's Sector Education & Training team to consider delivering local training on. Cases encountered, 'head scratchers' etc.	All	All	19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING
9.	19/03/13	██████████ to talk to ██████████ and ██████████ to agree on what the letter to the CEO of each insurance company needs to include and then socialise draft with CERA, before forwarding it onto the insurers.	Retaining Walls	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	16/4/13	OUTSTANDING
10.	19/03/13	PMOS to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of	Retaining Walls	██████████	16/4/13	OUTSTANDING

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
		them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOS in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.				
11.	19/03/13	MBIE ██████████ ██████████ to discuss with CERA the possibility of jointly communicating with insurers to raise the profile of and help them understand the complexity of issues surrounding retaining wall repairs/rebuilds, particularly those crossing boundaries and ownership, and seek insurers support for the appropriate sharing of information amongst PMOs to help expedite the repair projects.	Retaining Walls	████████ ██████████	16/4/13	OUTSTANDING

Actions Closed This Meeting

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
12.	19/3/13	████████████████████ arrange the first meeting of the merged groups.	TC3 Foundations & Superstructure Design Sub-Groups	████████████████████	16/4/13	COMPLETED
13.	19/03/13	████████ ██████████ (Arrow International) to update the flood risk guidance document and ██████████ ██████████ (MWH Recovery) to draft a PowerPoint presentation for the upcoming workshops. This will be forwarded onto sub-group members for their review and feedback at the next meeting schedule to take place 17 April.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group	████████ ██████████	21/5/13	COMPLETED 16/04/2013
14.	19/2/13	Engagement with design sector to see what their experiences/ needs are.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group	████ ██████	19/3/13	COMPLETED 16/04/13

Meeting Minutes

Consent Operations Working Group - Steering Group Meeting

Date	21/5/13	Time	3.00pm	Venue	Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
Chair	[REDACTED], MBIE			Minutes	[REDACTED], MBIE

Attendees	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - Christchurch City Council - Fletcher EQR - Fletcher EQR - Arrow International - Beca - MWH Recovery - Stream - Vero - Lumley - Waimakariri District Council - CERA - Arrow International - Hawkins - EAG
Apologies	[REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IAG - Fletcher EQR - Hawkins - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) - Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE)

Issue / Topic / Discussion	
1.	Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendees introduced themselves.
2.	Confirmation of Previous Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of previous meeting on 16 April 2013 confirmed.
3.	Sub-groups progress presentations/reports <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exempt building work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub- Sub-group has been working to try and test some of the results of the decision tree process (refer attached example – repairing of chimneys). This is a good example of following the process through to exemption or consent and the group will continue to work on this decision tree process. • Still waiting for the Building Bill No. 4 amendment to be passed. Once this has been passed PMOs, builders etc will feel more confident on what the definitions are around complete/substantial repairs/rebuild. Some comfort would be provided as it will mean they are all following the same guidelines. Section 112 in Schedule 1, under new clause 42a of the amendment, is also quite important, as the current section only refers to building consent authorities and it would mean that exempt work could be treated the same way. This will provide PMOs with clarity around what if any upgrade to the building is required when repairs are being undertaken. 2. Retaining walls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has been working with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (who has been engaged by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to help cover off the group's action points about engaging with insurers and or CERA

Issue / Topic / Discussion

about allowing better information sharing in order to support speedier rebuilds. [REDACTED] is helping to find an avenue that will allow information sharing between insurers, PMOs etc. [REDACTED] noted that as time goes by people will get to know who the parties with the retaining walls that have issues are, but it's about speeding this process up. One of complexities of this issue is the privacy act regarding information sharing and status of insurance claims on retaining walls.

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] mentioned that he would be engaging with CERA's insurance team about this issue and also noted that The Privacy Commissioner is becoming more flexible with information sharing, in the context of Canterbury earthquake recovery initiatives. They accepted the current approach isn't always working and they are looking at how the sector can be more flexible without compromising privacy.

Outstanding Actions

- **PMOs to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOs in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.**

3. Flood risk, floor levels and existing use rights

- Following on from the meeting held on 10 April, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has completed a draft Powerpoint presentation for the planned training workshops on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has completed a draft guidance document on flood risks & floor levels. A meeting was held on 17 April to discuss progress of both and any changes that should be made. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on 7 May to update the Powerpoint presentation to incorporate these changes and they have agreed another meeting will be held 28 May to finalise this piece of work. Slides containing Section 71&73 and MBIE flow chart still need to be inserted.
- Tidal effect work which also needs to be better covered off and the A discussion was also held over who this information should be presented to, e.g. design people and people applying for PIMS, so that they understand the trigger points and can design around them.
- Timing of the delivery of the seminars will be discussed at the meeting on the 28th.

Outstanding Actions

- **Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.**
- **Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.**
- **Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance. [REDACTED] (CCC) to arrange a meeting between himself, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to discuss this training and decide on format and dates.**

4. TC3 Foundations & Superstructure

- The TC3 foundations and superstructure sub-groups have joined forces and have held a couple of meetings since the last steering group meeting.
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] previously presented some sketches on superstructure architectural subfloor details and the group considered further work needed to be done to these and put some ideas forward. These were submitted to everyone for comment and input and a discussion needs to be held with EAG and anyone else who has ideas around the 3 superstructure options (1, 2 and 3 - refer attachment). The purpose of this is so the group can work through some of the details and come up with guidance/rules that they feel will give the designers direction and uniformity. Once these are settled upon they will be put in a user friendly format.
- 2a / 2b foundation options and having a 2a / 2b foundation with attached garage were also

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<p>discussed in the second sub-group meeting held this month. The group is keen to gather information from people on current jobs they may be working on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group would like to hold more discussions around 3a / 3b foundations. Some work is taking place with engineers in this space; it's a work in progress. • An update was given on HNZC's foundation trial programme, which physically got underway a few weeks ago. There are a couple of properties having work done to them over the next few weeks and 13 properties will have repairs, partial replacements and re-levelling work carried out on them. • A decision was made at the last sub-group meeting that they will have monthly meetings going forward, as opposed to fortnightly meetings. [REDACTED] will send minutes of last meeting around to the group within the next few days. The next meeting is scheduled for 12 June. • A discussion was held over regular and irregular shape house designs. The definition is for the major projection to be applied to the 2 long sides. Firth has created their own definition of regular shape and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Arrow) thinks that anything out of their definition is a specific engineering design. They tend to be more prescriptive and would like the home builders to be following this definition. There are still questions to be answered by EAG. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (EAG) noted that the whole reason for having a 'shape' is that we are dealing with potential for lateral spread and that the design needs to be able to withstand the stretch if it occurs. You can design them to be less regular and they may at some point carry out specific design trials that would go to a larger ratio. There is a difference between one size fits all and specific engineering design.
4.	<p>Importance levels & out buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Building Code defines importance levels for buildings. A detached outbuilding such as a garage is not intended for residential occupation and is an IL1. The MBIE guidance suggests that the foundations of these buildings do not need to meet the performance levels of house slabs and apart from in TC3; a NZS 3604 tied slab will meet this requirement. This is because there is a lower economic risk and lower risk to life safety in these uninhabitable buildings. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] noted that EAG is currently discussing the requirements for garage floors and defining when a garage can be considered as being detached. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] noted EAG were interested in the insurer's views on this matter with respect to any implications for future insurance cover. • PMOs noted that even if the garage is detached, if the building consent application includes the installation of showers and toilet, Christchurch City Council's BCA was considering the building could be used for sleeping purposes and requires IL2 requirements to be met. A particular case recently came to light and was discussed at the meeting, where the garage had a shower and toilet in it; it was specified as a home gym on the consent documentation. CCC considered that because it could be used as a sleep out or minor dwelling if a kitchen is put in, higher foundation requirements were applied to it. CCC concerns relate to the possible future use of the building as a habitable dwelling facility. The group discuss the legality of this approach and the majority view was that the described use on the consent documentation should be relied upon. The Building Act had provisions and mechanism in it to cater to a change in use, including needing to notify Council of a change of use. The approach was viewed as potentially penalising current home owners for a possible future use of the building. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] noted that a number of engineers are getting RFIs questioning the IL classification for these situations. • [REDACTED] [REDACTED] noted that if CCC is going to impose these rules then MBIE needs to look at this as soon as possible and provide the Council with some advice on this. The potential to apply for a determination on the issue was raised. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to look into how many queries they have received. <p>New action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (MBIE) to talk to MBIE's Determinations & Assurance team on this matter and report back along with some guidance and advice for CCC and COWG on this.
5.	<p>Update from the Engineering Advisory Group (EAG)</p>

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q&As on the residential guidance now up on MBIE website, with updates anticipated on a one to two monthly basis • A Training Seminar was held 30 April for BCOs assisting CCC from other centres, as part of their induction • Assisting MBIE Sector Education in planning further technical training for PMOs and designers. The next workshop is intended to cover repairs, but despite previous requests, no case studies have been provided by the PMOs. • Independent costing exercise undertaken for Type 1 and Type 2b Surface Structures options for TC3 foundation. This will be shared with PMOs to compare their experiences. • Finalising the guidance and worked examples for engineers covering RBW Certificates of Design Work, Producer Statements and engineering sign-off, following consultation with MBIE and BCAs. • Finalising an information sheet with IPENZ and ACENZ to be provided by engineers to homeowners to clarify expectations and responsibilities. • Participated in the monthly CCC TC3 Foundation Consent Review Group meeting, and continue to lead the monthly meetings with MBIE, EAG members and MBIE. • Continuing to assisting CCC with their Engineering Services Review, emphasising the need for an in-house geotechnical engineer. The concept of an industry-resourced engineering panel for early stage (pre-App) reviews of significant commercial projects also developed. • Liaising with EQC on work in relation to land and ground water. Monitoring the recent cement stabilisation trials for the ground improvement option at a school and residential property. • Progressing the development of updated guidance on geotechnical and structural issues associated with light commercial and industrial buildings. • Commencing involvement in a workstream on multi-unit issues, initially in support of EQC's multi-unit work programme <p>New Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMOs to provide example case studies of repair projects to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBIE has recently published some updated guidance documents – The Guide for Canterbury Builders Below-Floor Work and The Guide for Canterbury Builders Above-Floor Work. Please let MBIE know if you would like some hard copies to distribute to your teams. • MBIE's Sector Education and Training group has commissioned Research NZ to undertake some survey work of builders and PMOs, to help inform future work programmes and web based training/workshops and the level of need for this training for builders in Canterbury. [REDACTED] (MBIE) will be approaching a number of COWG members seeking their support to talk to Research NZ, to help inform them about what areas of training are felt necessary for builders in Canterbury. Alternatively if you would like to volunteer to be a part of this please contact [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) • At the last CERA led workshop for the design and property sector it became apparent that there was a lack of awareness of the Consent Operations Working Group's existence and what it does/the issues it covers off, etc. To help address this [REDACTED] [REDACTED] thought that sending a semi-regular newsletter to inform industry stakeholders on what issues the group is focussing on would be beneficial, along with a charter document to explain the sector working group and its activities. Please refer attached copy of draft newsletter and charter document - if you have any thoughts/feedback on this then please send them to [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CCC) reported that he has had a lot of meetings lately with designers and CCC has assisted some of them in completing a compliance/design features summary to accompany their consent applications. Some designers are very good at this but others are not. The compliance summary is extremely beneficial in helping Building Consent Officers to easily check that all information needed to process the consent is present. Applications that are clear and easy to follow go through the Council system far more quickly. [REDACTED] has asked that PMOs talk to their designers to ensure they are using compliance indexes in their applications going forward. A template is available on the Structural Engineering website or MBIE's website refer: http://www.dbh.govt.nz/UserFiles/File/Publications/Building/Building-Act/design-summary-checksheet-template.doc

	Issue / Topic / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCC reported that building consent applications have gone up by approximately 50% in recent weeks and are still climbing. Projections for 2013/14 and 2014/15 are that they will continue to increase by approximately 50% per annum. The issue of consent banking was raised by ██████ (CCC). It was noted that a large proportion of recently consented new builds are still a long way from commencement. ██████ asked if the PMOs are prioritising their consent applications correctly and appealed to PMOs prioritise and stagger the applications in order of when they actually need them to help CCC manage their increasing workload. <p>New action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> █████ ██████ to send a copy of the recommended outline of a Design Features Report to ██████ ██████ for him to distribute amongst COWG members.
7.	<p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3pm, Tuesday, 18 June 2013, CCC Function Room, 53 Hereford Street

The meeting concluded at 4.20pm

Steering Group Actions List

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
1.	18/12/12	Sub-group to hold in abeyance until consenting pilots results returned.	Foundations Repair/ Rebuild Thresholds and Re-levelling		On review	Sub-group on hold
2.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to develop and host training workshops for all PMOs and Insurer reps and their design contractors on how to access, interpret and apply CCC published / held info on flood risk, floor levels and district plan existing use rights etc.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group		19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/13
3.	18/12/12	Guidance for the Building Industry on Flood Risk, Floor Levels & Existing Use Rights guide to be finalised and published informally within PMOs as a useful working guide.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group		19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/12
4.	18/12/12	Sub-group members to confirm that they agree its appropriate to merge this Sub-Group with the Foundation and Re-levelling Sub-Group	TC3 Foundation Design		19/2/13	STILL OUTSTANDING
5.	18/12/12	Develop /Host training workshops for all PMOs on flood risk guidance. ██████████ to arrange a meeting between himself, ██████████ to discuss this training and decide on format and dates.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group		1/3/13	STILL OUTSTANDING 19/2/12
6.	18/12/12	<u>Unknown Fill or Contaminated Sites</u> - PMOs to discuss and determine their actual information needs here including what access mechanism best suits them, and then communicate this directly to CCC.	N/A		19/3/13	PARTLY COMPLETED Some PMOs have been in touch with CCC.
7.	19/2/13	Discuss availability of BCOs assisting PMOs on site visits in relation to exempt building works.	N/A		19/3/12	OUTSTANDING
8.	19/03/13	PMOS to engage with their insurers to seek and obtain confirmation that they are comfortable and supportive of them sharing retaining wall ownership and claim status information between PMOS in order to help facilitate a more efficient retaining wall repair or rebuild.	Retaining Walls		16/4/13	OUTSTANDING
9.	21/05/13	██████████ to send a copy of the recommended outline of a Design Features Report to ██████████ for him to distribute amongst COWG members.	N/A		18/6/13	UNDERWAY

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
10.	21/05/13	██████████ (MBIE) to talk to MBIE's Determinations & Assurance team on this matter and report back along with some guidance and advice for CCC and COWG on this.	N/A	██████████	18/3/13	UNDERWAY
11.	21/05/13	PMOs to provide example case studies of repair projects to ██ ██	N/A	N/A	16/6/13	UNDERWAY

Actions Closed This Meeting

Item	Date Raised	Description	Sub-Group	Owner	Date Due	Status
12.	19/3/13	██████████ to arrange the first meeting of the merged groups.	TC3 Foundations & Superstructure Design Sub-Groups	██████████	16/4/13	COMPLETED
13.	19/03/13	██████████ (Arrow International) to update the flood risk guidance document and ██████████ (MWH Recovery) to draft a PowerPoint presentation for the upcoming workshops. This will be forwarded onto sub-group members for their review and feedback at the next meeting schedule to take place 17 April.	Flood Risk, Floor Levels and Existing Use Rights Sub-Group		21/5/13	COMPLETED 16/04/2013
14.	19/2/13	Engagement with design sector to see what their experiences/ needs are.	TC3 Superstructure Design Sub-Group		19/3/13	COMPLETED 16/04/13
15.	19/02/13	PMOs and BCAs to provide training topics for MBIE's Sector Education & Training team to consider delivering local training on. Cases encountered, 'head scratchers' etc.	All		21/5/13	COMPLETED 21/05/13
16.	19/03/13	██████████ to talk to ██████████ and ██████████ to agree on what the letter to the CEO of each insurance company needs to include and then socialise draft with CERA, before forwarding it onto the insurers.	Retaining Walls		16/4/13	COMPLETED 24/05/13
17.	19/03/13	MBIE ██████████ ██████████ to discuss with CERA the possibility of jointly communicating with insurers to raise The profile of and help them understand the complexity of issues surrounding retaining wall repairs/rebuilds, particularly those	Retaining Walls		16/4/13	COMPLETED 24/05/13

		crossing boundaries and ownership, and seek insurers support for the appropriate sharing of information amongst PMOs to help expedite the repair projects.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--