



**Flexible Learning Space Upgrade
– Canterbury Block**

Design Features Report

Ministry of Education

29 October 2015

Revision: 0

Reference: 246313

Document control record

Document prepared by:

Aurecon New Zealand Limited

Level 1, 102 Customhouse Quay
Wellington 6011

PO Box 1591
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

T +64 4 472 9589
F +64 4 472 9922
E wellington@aurecongroup.com
W aurecongroup.com

A person using Aurecon documents or data accepts the risk of:

- a) Using the documents or data in electronic form without requesting and checking them for accuracy against the original hard copy version.
- b) Using the documents or data for any purpose not agreed to in writing by Aurecon.


Document control		aurecon				
Report title		Design Features Report				
Document ID		Project number		246313		
File path		P:\246313\03 Project Delivery\Reports\Briefing Document - Canterbury Block.docx				
Client		Ministry of Education		Client contact		
Rev	Date	Revision details/status	Prepared by	Author	Verifier	Approver
0	29 October 2015	Issue to Client	PGD	PGD	MTM	JFF
Current revision		0				

Approval			
Author signature		Approver signature	
Name	Phil Don	Name	John Finnegan
CPEng No.	-	CPEng No.	145791
Title	Structural Engineer	Title	Technical Director



Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Existing Structure	3
3	Proposed Modifications	4
3.1	Scope/Function	4
3.2	Options	4
3.3	Gravity System	4
3.4	Roof/Ceiling Diaphragm	4
3.5	Wall Hold Downs	4
3.6	Lateral Load Resisting Elements	5
3.7	Foundations	5
4	Design Criteria	6
4.1	Design Standards and Codes	6
4.2	Design Gravity Loads	6
4.3	Seismic Load Parameters and Coefficients	7
4.4	Load Combinations	10
4.5	Site Geology	10
4.6	Importance Level	10
5	Methodology: Structural Analysis and Design	11
5.1	Design Method	11
5.2	Analysis	11
5.3	Documentation	11
6	Explanatory Notes	12



1 Introduction

A target strength of 67% of current New Zealand Building Code requirements as per NZS1170.5:2004 has been used for design.


Three options have been explored ranging from the minimum work to achieve the principles of the FLS, through to an optimum solution, given the limitations of the existing block layout.

The purpose of this report is to provide a technical description of structural design parameters, coefficients and loadings utilised in the design. Secondly it describes our design assumptions and the structural systems that are to be considered for the project.

The report is intended to act as a reflective brief and outlines our proposed structure so that the client can ensure the design meets their expectations in terms of function, performance and load capabilities.

2 Existing Structure

A typical Canterbury Block is composed of either 2 or 4 classrooms laid end to end. A cloakroom and toilet area is attached to the back of the classrooms. The figure below shows a plan and side elevation of a typical 4 classroom Canterbury Block.



Typical 4 classroom Canterbury Block Plan View (above) and Side Elevation (below)

Lateral bracing in the longitudinal direction governs the building's seismic response. This is due to the large proportion of full height windows on the longitudinal external walls. On these lines, particularly the front face there is very little wall that would be recognised as effective bracing wall under NZS 3604.

In the transverse direction, lateral bracing is provided by timber shear walls. These shear walls have been assumed to have no cross bracing but lined with a sheet material suitable to provide bracing resistance.

The roof consists of timber purlins spanning transversely onto the longitudinal shear walls. Steel timber trusses also run longitudinally along the classroom length, providing intermediate support for these rafters. The roof covering consists of corrugated iron fastened directly to timber sarking, which assists with seismic load transfer to the lateral bracing elements.

A typical Canterbury Block features concrete foundation walls. These walls are situated around the perimeter of the structure as well as underneath the the walls of the building. The foundations for the toilet area feature a concrete slab on grade.

Many of the Canterbury Blocks still in use by the MOE have undergone alterations ranging from minor to major. Specific site and building characteristics have a significant effect on the performance of buildings during a seismic event. This means that any strengthening methodologies outlined in this report will need to be reviewed by a local engineer to ensure they are suitable for the building in which they are to be applied.



3 Proposed Modifications

3.1 Scope/Function

The scope of the structural design is to provide a lateral force resisting system that can achieve 67% of current code requirements for the three options provided by Brewer Davidson. Where it has been possible to achieve a higher capacity without installing an excessive amount of additional structure a target of 100% of current code has been used. The work needed to meet these requirements involves re-lining a selection of walls with a more adequate bracing material, as well as ensuring hold-down fixings are adequate.

3.2 Options

Three options have been put together by Brewer Davidson to achieve the goals set out by the Innovative Learning Space Upgrade. Each option represents a different cost level. Option 1 sets out the minimum work required to achieve the desired goals. Option 3 is the optimum solution, given the limitations of the existing structure. Option 2 is an intermediate solution that provides some additional benefits over Option 1, while, taking in to consideration some cost savings.

3.3 Gravity System

The steel roof cladding is supported by purlins that are supported by the longitudinal timber framed walls as well as longitudinally spanning steel trusses. Loads are transferred through these elements either into the concrete foundation walls. The gravity system is not to be altered during the upgrade works to the building.

3.4 Roof/Ceiling Diaphragm

The required bracing capacities of the ceiling diaphragms were assessed based on the tributary areas of lateral resisting elements. The existing diaphragms' capacities were then estimated according to the method outlined in the NZSEE publication "Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes".

Original drawings show that roofing iron is fastened to diagonal timber sarking. The diagonal timber sarking provides the diaphragm for the roof level. This sarking is adequate to transfer seismic loads to the lateral load resisting elements as it stands, therefore no further strengthening is required.

3.5 Wall Hold Downs

Steel bolts are required to transfer shear between the timber wall bottom plate and the concrete foundation walls. These wall hold downs are also required to resist uplift forces on the ends of the shear walls.

Gib Braceline and Ecoply walls have minimum hold down requirements of a Gib HandiBrac at each end, secured with a 15kN tension capacity hold down bolt. These hold down bolts are to be 12mm diameter threaded steel rods, which can be readily installed by drilling through the bottom plate, into the foundations and inserting along with an epoxy based adhesive. NZS 3604 requires that hold downs of this type are present at a maximum of 900mm centres.



3.6 Lateral Load Resisting Elements

Earthquake demands were assessed as per the equivalent static method, outlined in NZS1170.5:2004 and structural elements were designed to resist these demands. Lateral load resisting elements were oriented within existing walls where possible to minimise the loss of window space. Care was taken to distribute these elements evenly and locate them as near as practical to the external faces of the building in order to provide good torsional response.

Lateral load resisting elements designed with reference to the Gib Ezy Brace Systems 2011 manual, the EcoPly Specification and Installation Guide 2011, the New Zealand Timber Structures Standard – NZS3603:1993 and the New Zealand Timber Framed Buildings Standard – NZS3604:2011.

The target strength can be achieved through the use of GIB Standard, GIB Braceline and EcoPly Plywood walls. The existing timber framed walls are also able to assist with providing bracing resistance in select areas without requiring re-lining. Connections between the new bracing elements and the roof and floor will also need to be upgraded to ensure a complete and resilient load path is able to transmit seismic loads safely into the ground.

3.7 Foundations

Foundations are required to transmit earthquake forces from the timber superstructure into the ground. The foundation loads have been assessed based on the equivalent static method, as set out in NZS1170.5.

No foundation works will be necessary except for connections between the bracing walls and the foundations.

4 Design Criteria

4.1 Design Standards and Codes

The following design standards and codes will be used in the structural strengthening:

4.1.1 General Design

AS/NZS1170.0:	Structural Design Actions – General Principles
AS/NZS1170.1:	Permanent, imposed other actions
AS/NZS1170.5:	Seismic Design Actions (NZ)
NZS3603:1993:	Timber Structures Standard
NZS3604:2011:	Timber Structures Standard (Non-Specific Design)

In addition, code commentaries for the above codes will be referenced where applicable.

4.2 Design Gravity Loads

4.2.1 Existing Lightweight Roofs:

Dead	0.40 kPa (member self-weights)
Live:	0 kPa (Non Accessible Roof)

4.2.2 Walls and Glazing:

Dead:	0.30 kPa (Timber Walls with Plasterboard and Glazing)
Dead:	1.80 kPa (Brick Veneer)

4.2.3 Floor Loadings:

Dead:	0.4 kPa (Timber Floor)
Live:	3.0 kPa (Classroom)

4.3 Seismic Load Parameters and Coefficients

4.3.1 Wellington

Hazard Factors from AS/NZS1170.5

Importance Level	=	2
Soil Class	=	C
$C_h(T)$	=	2.36 (assumed $T \leq 0.4s$)
Z	=	0.40 (Hazard factor – Wellington)
R	=	1.0 (Risk for Earthquake ULS = 1/500)
$N(T,D)$	=	1.0
$C(T)$	=	$C_h(T) Z R N(T,D)$
	=	$2.36 \times 0.40 \times 1.0 \times 1.0 = 0.9440$ (ULS)
μ	=	2.50 (ULS - existing timber framed bracing elements)
	=	3.00 (ULS - new timber framed lateral bracing elements)
S_p	=	0.5 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	0.7 ($\mu = 3.0$)
k_μ	=	1.857 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	2.143 ($\mu = 3.00$)

Seismic Coefficient:

$C_d(T)$	=	0.2542 ($\mu = 2.50, S_p = 0.5$)
$C_d(T)$	=	0.3084 ($\mu = 3.00, S_p = 0.7$)

4.3.2 Auckland

Hazard Factors from AS/NZS1170.5

Importance Level	=	2
Soil Class	=	D
$C_h(T)$	=	3.00 (assumed $T \leq 0.4s$)
Z	=	0.13 (Hazard factor – Auckland)
R	=	1.0 (Risk for Earthquake ultimate = 1/500)
$N(T,D)$	=	1.0
$C(T)$	=	$C_h(T) Z R N(T,D)$
	=	$3.00 \times 0.13 \times 1.0 \times 1.0 = 0.3900$ (ULS)
μ	=	2.50 (ULS - existing timber framed bracing elements)
	=	3.00 (ULS - new timber framed lateral bracing elements)
S_p	=	0.5 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	0.7 ($\mu = 3.0$)
k_μ	=	1.857 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	2.143 ($\mu = 3.00$)

Seismic Coefficient:

$C_d(T)$	=	0.1050 ($\mu = 2.50, S_p = 0.5$)
$C_d(T)$	=	0.1274 ($\mu = 3.00, S_p = 0.7$)

4.3.3 Christchurch

Hazard Factors from AS/NZS1170.5

Importance Level	=	2
Soil Class	=	D
$C_h(T)$	=	3.00 (assumed $T \leq 0.4s$)
Z	=	0.30 (Hazard factor – Christchurch)
R	=	1.0 (Risk for Earthquake ultimate = 1/500)
$N(T,D)$	=	1.0
$C(T)$	=	$C_h(T) Z R N(T,D)$
	=	$3.00 \times 0.30 \times 1.0 \times 1.0 = 0.9000$ (ULS)
μ	=	2.50 (ULS - existing timber framed bracing elements)
	=	3.00 (ULS - new timber framed lateral bracing elements)
S_p	=	0.5 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	0.7 ($\mu = 3.0$)
k_μ	=	1.857 ($\mu = 2.5$)
	=	2.143 ($\mu = 3.00$)

Seismic Coefficient:

$C_d(T)$	=	0.2423 ($\mu = 2.50, S_p = 0.5$)
$C_d(T)$	=	0.2940 ($\mu = 3.00, S_p = 0.7$)



4.4 Load Combinations

The following ultimate limit state load combination factor have been used as specified in AS/NZS1170.0, Section 0:

$$G + \Psi_c Q + E_u$$

G	=	Dead Load
Q	=	Live Load
E	=	Seismic Load
Ψ_c	=	Load Combination Factor

4.5 Site Geology

The site geology can have significant impact on the level of loading imparted on a building during an earthquake. Deep, soft soil conditions tend to amplify the ground motions, increasing the forces on a building structure.

Three sites have been selected for this design through consultation with the MOE. One in Wellington with site subsoil class C, one in Auckland with site subsoil class D and one in Christchurch with site subsoil class D. This is intended to provide a strengthening approach that has the flexibility to be applied widely, without being overly conservative. This site subsoil class is used to determine the elastic site hazard spectrum for the horizontal loading, 'C(T)' (Section 3 NZS 1170.5:2004).

When these FLS options are implemented at a specific school the site subsoil class will need to be defined by the Geotechnical Engineer for the specific classroom location. This will allow a structural engineer to revise this generic document package and produce a document package for the specific classroom.

4.6 Importance Level

The strengthening design has been carried out as for a normal classroom with an importance level of 2 and a design working life of 50 years. A return period factor 'R' of 1.0 has therefore been used.



5 Methodology: Structural Analysis and Design

5.1 Design Method

In terms of the Building Code, the structural design has followed the established principles of the verification method; part B1 - Structure (Part only).

5.2 Analysis

The building seismic loads have formed the basis of structural calculations for member sizing.

The calculations will rely on the use of numerous software packages for analysis, calculation and documentation of the structural systems. These will utilise theories of structural mechanics and input material strengths to refine the design. Excel Spreadsheets were also used to calculate the capacity of the Gib and plywood wall bracing systems and the various seismic coefficients for the structure.

The individual structural components (bracing walls) were modelled two dimensionally and individually.

5.3 Documentation

The following computer aided drafting (CAD) programs will be used for documentation of the structural drawings for the works:

- Revit: Three dimensional drawing package to produce structural drawings.



6 Explanatory Notes

- This report contains the professional opinion of Aurecon as to the matters set out herein, in the light of the information available to it during preparation, using its professional judgment and acting in accordance with the standard of care and skill normally exercised by professional engineers providing similar services in similar circumstances. No other express or implied warranty is made as to the professional advice contained in this report.
- We have prepared this report in accordance with the brief as provided and our terms of engagement. The information contained in this report has been prepared by Aurecon at the request of its client, the Ministry of Education, and is exclusively for its client's use and reliance. It is not possible to make a proper assessment of this strengthening scheme without a clear understanding of the terms of engagement under which it has been prepared, including the scope of the instructions and directions given to and the assumptions made by Aurecon. The strengthening will not address issues which would need to be considered for another party if that party's particular circumstances, requirements and experience were known and, further, may make assumptions about matters of which a third party is not aware. No responsibility or liability to any third party is accepted for any loss or damage whatsoever arising out of the use of or reliance on this assessment by any third party.
- The FLS and seismic strengthening scheme is also based on information that has been provided to Aurecon from other sources or by other parties. The strengthening has been prepared strictly on the basis that the information that has been provided is accurate, complete and adequate. To the extent that any information is inaccurate, incomplete or inadequate, Aurecon takes no responsibility and disclaims all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage that results from any conclusions based on information that has been provided to Aurecon.
- The enclosed FLS and seismic strengthening scheme assumes that the existing building is as per the enclosed original Canterbury Block drawings. The appropriateness of this assumption is to be verified on site by a suitably qualified structural engineer prior to the FLS and seismic strengthening being applied to any building. Aurecon accepts no liability for the strengthening of any building which has in any way been altered from the original drawings.



Aurecon New Zealand Limited

Level 1, 102 Customhouse Quay
Wellington 6011

PO Box 1591
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

T +64 4 472 9589

F +64 4 472 9922

E wellington@aurecongroup.com

W aurecongroup.com

Aurecon offices are located in:

Angola, Australia, Botswana, Chile, China,
Ethiopia, Ghana, Hong Kong, Indonesia,
Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mozambique,
Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria,
Philippines, Qatar, Singapore, South Africa,
Swaziland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda,
United Arab Emirates, Vietnam, Zimbabwe.