

 Phone
 07 839 1254

 Fax
 07 839 1255

Email admin@sandh.co.nz Office 214 Collingwood Street PO Box 718, Hamilton 3240 New Zealand

www.stilesandhooker.co.nz

Job No: 19-021

20 February 2019

Silverfin Level 12, AIG Building 41 Shortland St Auckland 1010

Attention: Miles Brown

Dear Miles,

Re: Initial Seismic Assessment Report – Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd: Matamata Hatchery.

We have now completed an Initial Seismic Assessment (ISA) of the building at Inghams Hatchery at Matamata using the Initial Evaluation Procedure (IEP) as described in the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering guideline document Assessment and Improvement of the Structural Performance of Buildings in Earthquakes, dated July 2017. The assessment was carried out after completing a site visit, a visual inspection of the building and a review of the original structural drawings.

Note that the buildings have largely been constructed during three major site developments. The evaluation has looked at the stages of construction of the main building. There has been a linked setter room added at the rear of the site in the last 5 years. This is relatively small and has been designed to 100% NBS so has not been considered further in this evaluation.

1 Executive Summary

Our ISA assessment for the buildings, carried out using the IEP for Importance Level 2 (IL2), indicates an overall potential seismic rating of 85%NBS or 100%NBS (IL2) (percentage of new building standard) and is therefore a Grade A building, as defined by the NZSEE building grading scheme. None of the buildings are considered as earthquake prone.

The ISA is considered to provide a relatively quick, high-level and qualitative measure of the building's performance. Where continued use of the building is required, a more reliable result will be obtained from a Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA). A DSA could find critical structural weaknesses (CSWs) not identified from the IEP, or that identified CSWs have been addressed in the design of the building.

Directors

IW Brown ME (Civil), CENG (UK), MIStructE, MIPENZ

RJ Baker BE (Civil) Hons, MIPENZ

GA McHardie ANZIA, Reg Arch, BArch

TD Wade NZCE (Civil), BE (Civil) (Hons) MIPENZ, CPEng IntPE (NZ)

Associates IM Gilby

NZCD (Arc

TELARC

19-021 2019 02 20 SM ISA Report



2 Background to the IEP and Its Limitations

The IEP procedure was developed in 2006 by the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) and updated in 2017 to reflect experience with its application and as a result of experience in the Canterbury earthquakes. It is a tool to assign a percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) score and associated grade to a building as part of an initial seismic assessment of existing buildings.

The IEP enables territorial authorities, building owners and managers to review their building stock as part of an overall risk management process.

Characteristics and limitations of the IEP include:

- An IEP assessment is primarily concerned with life safety. It does not consider the susceptibility of the building to damage, and therefore to economic losses.
- It tends to be somewhat conservative, identifying some buildings as earthquake prone, or having a lower grading, which subsequent detailed investigation may indicate is less than actual performance. However, there will be exceptions, particularly when critical structural weaknesses (CSWs) are present that have not been recognised from the level of investigation employed.
- It can be undertaken with variable levels of available information, e.g. exterior only inspection, structural drawings available or not, interior inspection, etc. The more information available the more representative the IEP result is likely to be. The IEP records the information that has formed the basis of the assessment and consideration of this is important when determining the likely reliability of the result.
- It is an initial, first-stage review. Buildings or specific issues which the IEP process flags as being problematic or as potentially critical structural weaknesses, need further detailed investigation and evaluation. A Detailed Seismic Assessment is recommended if the seismic status of a building is critical to any decision making.
- The IEP assumes that the buildings have been designed and built in accordance with the building standard and good practice current at the time. In some instances, a building may include design features ahead of its time leading to better than predicted performance. Conversely, some unidentified design or construction issues not picked up by the IEP process may result in the building performing not as well as predicted.
- It is a largely qualitative process, and should be undertaken or overseen by an experienced engineer. It involves considerable knowledge of the earthquake behaviour of buildings, and judgement as to key attributes and their effect on building performance. Consequently, it is possible that the grade derived for a building by independent experienced engineers may differ.
- An IEP may over-penalise some apparently critical features which could have been satisfactorily taken into account in the design.
- An IEP does not take into account the seismic performance of non-structural items such as ceiling, plant, services or glazing.

Experience to date is that the IEP is a useful tool to identify potential issues and expected overall performance of a building in an earthquake. However, the process and the associated grade should be considered as only indicative of the building's compliance with current code requirements.

A detailed investigation and analysis of the building will typically be required to provide a definitive assessment.

The IEP has been based on a review of drawings and an inspection of both the interior and exterior of the building and can be considered to be a comprehensive assessment at the DSA level.

The rating determined is greater than 35%NBS and therefore, if ratified by the TA, the building should not be considered as earthquake prone.

3 Basis for the Assessment

The information we have used for our IEP assessment includes:

Previous site visit, including an interior and exterior inspection, was carried out by a Stiles & Hooker Ltd Structural Engineer on 7 May 2014.

No geotechnical investigations have been carried out.

Limited architectural drawings and building consent documents were obtained from Matamata Piako District Council.

4 Building Description

The Inghams Hatchery buildings are located at Banks Road, Matamata are single storey structure designed in 1984 (Original Building) and 1997/2001 (Alternation and Extensions). They are currently used as chicken hatchery space.

4.1 Building Construction

There are two main adjoined buildings on site.

4.1.1 Original Building 1984

- The original building is a rectangular, single storey, structural steel portal frame structure with pitched roof to a central ridge line.
- Metal roof and wall cladding but with a brick cavity wall at low level to the perimeter.
- The building site is level and the foundations are inferred to consist of reinforced concrete strip and pad foundations. The ground floor is a concrete slab on grade.
- The walls and ceiling are made mostly of Insulated panel.

4.1.2 Alterations and Extensions 1997/2001

- Description similar to the above.
- Reinforced blockwork to a small plant room at the rear of the building, freestanding structure.

4.2 Building Lateral Load Resisting Systems

The building seismic loads are resisted by the following systems.

4.2.1 Original Building 1984

Portalised structural steel frames, in the transverse direction and cross bracing in the longitudinal direction.

4.2.2 Alterations and Extensions 1997/2001

• Portalised structural steel frames, in the transverse direction and cross bracing in the longitudinal direction.

4.3 Relationship to Neighbouring Buildings

The buildings are remote from neighbouring buildings.

5 IEP Assessment Results

Each of the buildings were assessed using the IEP as described in Part B of the guideline document, The Seismic Assessment of Existing Buildings, dated July 2017.

For each building the IEP assessment determines the seismic strength (%NBS) in the longitudinal and transverse directions. The minimum %NBS of each direction determines the overall earthquake rating for each building, corresponding to the building grading scheme as defined by the NZSEE.

Buildings with a final %NBS of 33% or less are classified as earthquake prone and the threshold for earthquake risk buildings is less than 67%NBS as recommended by the NZSEE. The results of each building assessment are summarised as follows.

Table 1: IEP Assessment Results

Building	Asse %N	essed NBS	Final %NBS	Earthquake Prone?	Building Grade
	Longitudinal	Transverse		Y/N	
1984 Original Building	87	87	85	Ν	А
1997-2001 Alterations and Extensions	102	102	100	Ν	А

The key assumptions made during our assessment are shown in the Table below. Refer also to the attached IEP assessment.

Table 2: IEP Assumptions

IEP Item	Assum	ption	Justification
	Original Building	Alterations & Extensions	
Date of Building Design	1984	1997 &2001	Provided by owner.
Soil Type	D	D	Site Subsoil Category based on previous local knowledge.
Building Importance Level	IL2	IL2	Normal structure.
Ductility of Structure	1.0 Longitudinal 1.0 Transvers	1.25 Longitudinal	For ductility 1.0, Conservative assessment due to age and lack of documentations.
		1.25 Transvers	For ductility 1.25, original design ductility confirmed.
Plan Irregularity Factor,	1.0 Longitudinal	1.0 Longitudinal	The building has a regular layout.
A	1.0 Transvers	1.0 Transvers	
Vertical Irregularity	1.0 Longitudinal	1.0 Longitudinal	Single storey level building.
Factor, B	1.0 Transvers	1.0 Transvers	
Short Columns Factor, C	N/A	N/A	Not applicable for a single story portal frame type structure.
Pounding Factor, D	1.0 Longitudinal	1.0 Longitudinal	No adjacent building.
	1.0 Transvers	1.0 Transvers	
Site Characteristics	1.0 Longitudinal	1.0 Longitudinal	The building site is flat and level and stability is
Factor, E	1.0 Transvers	1.0 Transvers	
Critical structural Weaknesses Identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Factor, F	1.0 Longitudinal	1.0 Longitudinal	As the building heights and structural forms
	1.0 Transvers	1.0 Transvers	are similar, pounding is not anticipated to result in decreased seismic capacity of the building.

6 IEP Grades and Relative Risk

Table 3 taken from the NZSEE Guidelines provides the basis of a proposed grading system for existing buildings, as one way of interpreting the %NBS score. It can be seen that occupants in Earthquake Prone buildings (less than 34%NBS) are exposed to more than 10 times the risk that they would be in a similar new building. For buildings that are potentially Earthquake Risk (less than 67%NBS), but not Earthquake Prone, the risk is at least 5 times greater than that of an equivalent new building. Broad descriptions of the life-safety risk can be assigned to the building grades as shown in Table 3.

Building Grade	Percentage of New Building Strength (%NBS)	Approx. Risk Relative to a New Building	Life-safety Risk Description
A+	>100	<1	Low risk
A	80 to 100	1 to 2 times	Low risk
В	67 to 79	2 to 5 times	Low to medium risk
С	34 to 66	5 to 10 times	Medium risk
D	20 to 33	10 to 25 times	High risk
E	<20	More than 25 times	Very high risk

Table 3: Relative Earthquake Risk

These buildings have been classified by the IEP as a grade A building and are therefore considered to be a low risk.

The New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (which provides authoritative advice to the legislation makers, and should be considered to represent the consensus view of New Zealand structural engineers) classifies a buildings achieving greater than 67%NBS as "Low Risk", and having "Acceptable (improvement may be desirable)" building structural performance.

7 Seismic Restraint of Non-Structural Items

During an earthquake, the safety of people can be put at risk due to non-structural items falling on them. These items should be adequately seismically restrained, where possible, to the NZS 4219:2009 "The Seismic Performance of Engineering Systems in Buildings".

An assessment has not been made of the bracing of the ceilings, in-ceiling ducting, services and plant or contents. We have also not checked whether tall or heavy furniture or equipment has been seismically restrained or not. These issues are outside the scope of this initial assessment but could be the subject of another investigation.

8 Limitations

This Report has been prepared for the sole use of Silverfin. This Report is not intended for use by other parties and no other party should rely on this Report without the prior written consent of Stiles and Hooker Ltd. The opinions expressed by Stiles and Hooker Ltd in this Report are based on the sources of information noted above.

The following limitations apply to this report:

- Stiles and Hooker and its employees and agents are not able to give any warranty or guarantee that all defects, damage, conditions or qualities have been identified.
- Inspections are primarily limited to visible structural components. As such, there will be concealed structural elements that will not be directly inspected.
- The inspections are limited to building structural components only.
- Inspection of building services, pipework, pavement, and fire safety systems is excluded from the scope of this report.

- Inspection of the glazing system, linings, carpets, claddings, finishes, suspended ceilings, partitions, tenant fit-out, or the general water tightness envelope is excluded from the scope of this report.
- Assessment of the lateral load capacity of the building/s is limited to a visual inspection only.
- Assumptions have been made in respect of the geotechnical conditions at the site, including the possibility of liquefaction.
- We have not undertaken any detailed checks of the gravity system, wind load capacity, or foundations.
- Our professional services are performed using a degree of care and skill normally exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable consultants practising in this field at this time. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice presented in this report.

9 Conclusion

Our ISA assessment for these buildings, carried out using the IEP indicates an overall score of 85%NBS or 100%NBS (IL2) which corresponds to a Grade A building, as defined by the NZSEE building grading scheme. This is above the threshold for Earthquake Prone Buildings (34%NBS) and below the threshold for Earthquake Risk Buildings (67%NBS) as defined by the NZSEE.

The ISA is considered to provide a relatively quick, high-level and qualitative measure of the building's performance. In order to confirm the seismic performance of this building with more reliability you may wish to request a DSA.

A DSA would also investigate other potential weaknesses that may not have been considered in the initial seismic assessment.

We trust this letter and initial seismic assessment meets your current requirements. We would be pleased to discuss further with you any issues raised in this report.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like clarification of any aspect of this letter.

Yours sincerely Stiles and Hooker Ltd

lan Kearney CPEng Reg No. 1151481 CMEngNZ Principal Structural Engineer

Appendix A IEP Assessment Original Building 1984

Initial Evaluation Proceed WARNING!! This initial evaluation ha	dure (IEP) Assessment - Co is been carried out solely as an initial seismic a cal Guidelines for Engineering Assessments.	sessment of the building following	the procedure set out in a	Page 1
accompanying report, and should not be them, have not been undertaken, and th	relied on by any party for any other purpose. ese may lead to a different result or seismic gr	Detailed inspections and engineerin ade.	ng calculations, or engine	ering judgements based on
Street Number & Name: AKA: Name of building: City:	Banks Road Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ptr Hatchery, Orginal Section, 19 Matamata	y Ltd 984	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 B
Table IEP-1 Initial Ev	aluation Procedure Step 1			
Step 1 - General Information	I			
.1 Photos (attach sufficient to	o describe building)			
	NOTE: THERE ARE MORE PH	IOTOS ON PAGE 1a ATTACH	ED	
LZ SKELCHES (PIAITS ELC, SINOW	NOTE: THERE ARE MORE SKE	NW NE SW SE S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	1ED	
1.3 List relevant features (Note	e: only 10 lines of text will print in t	this box. If further text requ	uired use Page 1a)	
ectangular, single storey structural rame action laterally, diagonal tens Vetal roof and wall cladding with ca Concrete floor slab on grade, likely t nghams Farming Manager advised o	steel portal frame structure. sion bracing longitudinally.Interior insula wity brick exterior cladding at low level. to be shallow strip and pad footings. construction was in 1984. 1984 is a thre	ated panel walls and ceiling. shold in the IEP, allow the desig	gn to be pre-1984.	
1.4 Note information sources	Tick as appropriate			
Visual Inspection of Exterior		Specifications		

KA:	er & Name:	Banks Road Inghams Enter	prises (NZ) Pty Ltd		•	Job No.: By:	<mark>19-021</mark> SM	
ame of build	ding:	Hatchery, Orgi	nal Section, 1984			Date:	20/02/2019	
able IEP-	2 Initial Ev	valuation Proce	dure Step 2			REVISION NO.:	B	
tep 2 - Dete Baseline (%NB	ermination of (% 3S) for particular buil	6 NBS) _b ding - refer Section B5)					
.1 Determine	e nominal (%NBS	;) = (%NBS) _{nom}			<u>Longitudinal</u>		<u>Transverse</u>	
a) Building S	Strengthening Data building is known to h	ave been strengthened	d in this direction					
If streng	gthened, enter perce	ntage of code the build	ling has been strengthene	d to	N/A		N/A	
b) Year of De	esign/Strengthening	g, Building Type and S	Seismic Zone					
				Р	re 1935 🔾		Pre 1935	0
				193	35-1965 O		1935-1965	0
				196	76-1984 🔺		1905-1976	ပ ချ
				198	34-1992		1984-1992	õ
				199	92-2004		1992-2004	0
				200 Post Au)4-2011 _O ug 2011 _O		2004-2011 Post Aug 2011	0 0
			Building Type:	Others	•	-	Others	•
			Seismic Zone:	Zone B			one B	
c) Soil Type F	rom NZS1170.5:200	04, CI 3.1.3 :		D Soft Soil		-) Soft Soil	
F (f	rom NZS4203:1992 for 1992 to 2004 and	, Cl 4.6.2.2 : d only if known)		0 301 301	Not applicabl	le	Not applicat	ole
d) Estimate	Period, T							
Commen	ot:			n _n = A _c =	5 1.00		5 1.00	m m²
Moment	Resisting Concrete F	Frames:	$T = \max\{0.09h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$		0		0	
Moment I	Resisting Steel Fram	nes:	$T = \max\{0.14h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$		0		0	
All Other	Erame Structures	ames:	$T = \max\{0.08h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$ $T = \max\{0.06h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$		0		O O	
Concrete	Shear Walls		$T = \max\{0.09h_n^{0.75}/A_c^{0.5}, 0.4\}$! }	0		0	
Masonry	Shear Walls:		<i>T</i> ≤ 0.4sec		ō		ō	
User Def	fined (input Period):				0		0	
	Where h _n = h uppermost se	height in metres from the ba eismic weight or mass.	se of the structure to the	T:	0.40		0.40	
e) Factor A:	Strengthening factor 1.0 if not strengthene	determined using result fron ed)	n (a) above (set to	Factor A:	1.00		1.00	
f) Factor B:	Determined from NZS results (a) to (e) abov	SEE Guidelines Figure 3A.1 /e	using	Factor B:	0.17		0.17	
g) Factor C:	For reinforced concre C = 1.2, otherwise ta	ete buildings designed betwe ake as 1.0.	en 1976-84 Factor	Factor C:	1.00		1.00	
h) Factor D:	For buildings designe Wellington and Napie 1.0, otherwise take a	ed prior to 1935 Factor D = 0 er (1931-1935) where Factor s 1.0.	.8 except for D may be taken as	Factor D:	1.00		1.00	
				(%NBS)	170/		17%	

ANA: Name of building: City:	: Bani Ingh Hato Mata	ks Road ams Ente hery, Org amata	erprises (NZ) jinal Section,	Pty Ltd 1984	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 B
Table IEP-2 Init	ial Evaluatio	on Proc	edure Step	2 continued		
2.2 Near Fault Scaling F If $T < 1.5$ sec, Factor	⁼ actor, Factor I r E = 1	Ξ				
a) Near Fault Factor $N($				Longitudinal	- I	Transverse
(from NZS1170.5:2004, CI	رم, 1 3.1.6)			N(1,D): 1		1
b) Factor E			= 1/N(T,D)	Factor E: 1.00]	1.00
2.3 Hazard Scaling Fact a) Hazard Factor, Z, for	tor, Factor F					
L	ocation: Matamat	a	•	Refer right for user-defined located	tions	
	Z =	0.19	(from NZS1170.	5:2004, Table 3.3)		
	Z ₁₉₉₂ =	0.8	(NZS4203:1992	Zone Factor from accompanying Figure 3.5(b))	
b) Factor F	∠ 2004 =	0.19	(from NZS1170.	5:2004, Table 3.3)		
For pre 1992		=	1/Z			
For 1992-2011		=	Z ₁₉₉₂ /Z			
For post 2011		=	Z_{2004}/Z	<u> </u>	_	
				Factor F: 5.26		5.26
(Set to 1 if not known. For bui public building set to 1.25. Fo public building set to 1.33 for b) Design Risk Factor, R (set to 1.0 if other than 1976 c) Return Period Factor, (from NZS1170.0:2004 Built	Idings designed prior r buildings designed Zone A or 1.2 for Zor 	to 1965 and ki 1965-1976 and 1e B. For 1976-	nown to be designed I known to be design -1984 set I value.) Choose Impo	as a ed as a $I = 1R_o = 1prtance Level O_{1} = 2 O_{2}$		
·				R = 1.0		1.0
d) Factor G		=	IR ₀ /R	Eactor G: 100		1.00
2.5 Ductility Scaling Fa	ctor, Factor H nt Ductility With	in Existing and lack of d	Structure	$\mu = \frac{1.00}{1.00}$.	1.00
a) Available Displaceme. Comment:						
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assessi						
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H	For pi For 1	re 1976 (ma }76 onwards	ximum of 2)	$k_{\mu} = 1.00$		κ _μ 1.00 1
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H	For pr For 1 14 Inelastic Spectrum	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor	ximum of 2) s	= 1.00 = 1 Factor H: 1.00 1 Table 3.3)	1	κ _μ 1.00 1 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200	For pi For 1! 14 Inelastic Spectrum nce Scaling F a	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor 1 ctor, Fact	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I	= 1.00 = 1 Factor H: 1.00 g Table 3.3)	1	κ _μ 1.00 1 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200 2.6 Structural Performan a) Structural Performan	For pi For 19 14 Inelastic Spectrum nce Scaling Fa 29 Factor, Sp	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Facto I ctor, Fact	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I	= 1.00 = 1 Factor H: 1.00 g Table 3.3)	1	κ _μ 1.00 1 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200 2.6 Structural Performan a) Structural Performance (from accompanying Figure Tick if light timber-fram	For pi For 19 14 Inelastic Spectrum Ince Scaling Fa ce Factor, S _p 3.4) 1ed construction i	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor I ctor, Fact n this directi	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I ion	$= 1.00 = 1$ Factor H: 1.00 g Table 3.3) $S_{p} = 1$]	k_{μ} 1.00 1 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200 2.6 Structural Performand (from accompanying Figure Tick if light timber-fram	For pi For 19 14 Inelastic Spectrum Ince Scaling Fa 2e Factor, S p 13.4) 1ed construction i	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor Ictor, Fact n this directi	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I ion = 1/S,	$Factor H: \begin{bmatrix} k_{\mu} \\ 1.00 \\ = 1 \\ 1.00 \\ 1.00 \end{bmatrix}$		k_{μ} 1.00 1 1.00 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200 2.6 Structural Performand (from accompanying Figure Tick if light timber-fram b) Structural Performand Note Factor B values for 19	For pi For 19 14 Inelastic Spectrum Ince Scaling Fa 29 Factor, S _p 13.4) 1ed construction i 20 construction i 20 construction poly to 2004 have beel	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor Inctor, Fact n this directi r n multiplied by	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I ion = 1/S _p 0.67 to account for S	$Factor H: 1.00$ $= 1$ $Factor H: 1.00$ $S_{p} = 1$ $S_{p} = 1$ $S_{p} = 1.00$ Factor I: 1.00		k_{μ} 1.00 1 1.00 1.00 1.00
a) Available Displaceme Comment: Conservative assess b) Factor H (where kµ is NZS1170.5:200 2.6 Structural Performand (from accompanying Figure Tick if light timber-fram b) Structural Performand Note Factor B values for 19 2.7 Baseline %NBS for (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x	For pi For 1! 14 Inelastic Spectrum Ince Scaling Fa se Factor, S _p 3.4) 1ed construction i ce Scaling Facto 92 to 2004 have been Building, (%/NE E x F x G x H 2)	re 1976 (ma 976 onwards Scaling Factor actor, Fact n this directi r n multiplied by 3S) b c I	ximum of 2) s r, from accompanying or I ion = 1/S _p 0.67 to account for S	$= 1.00$ $= 1$ Factor H: 1.00 g Table 3.3) $S_{p} = 1.00$ Factor I: 1.00 Sp in this period 87%		k_{μ} 1.00 1 1.00 1.00 87%

reet Number & Name:	Banks Road		Job No.:	19-021
(A:	Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Pty Lt	d	By:	SM
me of building:	Hatchery, Orginal Section, 1984		Date:	20/02/2019
ty:	Matamata		Revision No.:	В
able IEP-3 Initial E	valuation Procedure Step 3			
ep 3 - Assessment of Pe	erformance Achievement Ratio (PAR)			
efer Appendix B - Section B3.2)	(
Longitudinal Direction				
potential CSWs	Effect on Struc (Choose a value	tural Performance - Do not interpolate)		Facto
Effect on Structural Performa		Significant	Insignificant	Factor A 1.0
Regular structure		Signinicant	a magnineant	
Vortical Irrogularity				
Effect on Structural Performa		Significant	Insignificant	Factor B 1.0
Single level		Signincant		
Short Columns				
Effect on Structural Performa	ance o Severe OS	Significant	Insignificant	Factor C 1.0
N/A				
Note:				
Values given assume th pounding may be reduce	e building has a frame structure. For stiff bu ed by taking the coefficient to the right of th	uildings (eg shear walls), the e value applicable to frame	e effect of buildings.	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduce	e building has a frame structure. For stiff bu ed by taking the coefficient to the right of th 	uildings (eg shear walls), the e value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0]
Values given assume th pounding may be reduce Table for Selection of	e building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the Fac Fac of Factor D1 Separation	ildings (eg shear walls), the e value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h005<sep<.01< td=""><td>e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.005h005<sep<.01<>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	ildings (eg shear walls), the e value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant o <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<="" td=""><td>e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the Factor Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01</sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right of the right of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height anment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01 0.01 0.07</sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H 1 0 0.8	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduce Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right of the right of factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height of floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0 1 0 1 0 0 0.4 0 0.7</sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H 1 0 0.8 Direction: 1.0	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height nament of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect Factor D2	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<:005h 0.05<sep<:01<br="">0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 Control D2 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 0.4 0 0.7</sep<:005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.014	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of factor D1 Separation Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height ment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01 0.01 0.1 0.04 0.7 Control D2 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<="" td=""><td>e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01 0.01 0.07 0.04 0.7 0.05<sep<.01 0.07 0.07 0.04 0.07 0.04 0.07 0.04</sep<.01 </sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.(Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.(H Sep>.01H © 1 O 1	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01 01 01 004 007 tor D2 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0.05<sep<.01 0.04 0.7 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05<sep<.01 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0</sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.01 </sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H © 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	Ididings (eg shear walls), the value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.01< td=""> 0<1</sep<.01<></sep<.005h<>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H © 1 O 1 O 1 O 1	
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">01 01 0.4 0.7 Severe Significant 0.5 Sep<.005H .005<sep<.01 0.0 0.4 0.7 Severe Significant 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0.4 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.1 0.1</sep<.005h></sep<.01 </sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H © 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1	Factor D 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.5 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.5 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.5 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.5 0 0.7 0 0.5 0 0.5</sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<:005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.7 0 0.9 0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.7 0 0.9 0 1 0 1</sep<:005h>	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of	tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01<br="">0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.1 0 1 0 0.4 0 0.7 0 0.1 0 1</sep<.005h>	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0 rrspective Factor E 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures. 5 Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level 5 Other Factors - for allowan Record rationale for ch	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right part of the coefficient to the right of the right part of Floors within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the right part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height part of the right par	idings (eg shear walls), the value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.01< td=""> 0<1</sep<.01<></sep<.005h<>	e effect of buildings. Direction: 1.0 Insignificant IH Sep>.01H © 1 O 0.8 Direction: 1.0 Insignificant H Sep>.01H © 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O 1 O	Factor D 1.0 respective Factor E 1.0 Factor F 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures. 5 Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level 5 Other Factors - for allowal Record rationale for ch Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right paration fractor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height ament of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect Difference Effect Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 3 storeys Height Difference < 4 storeys Height Difference < 3 storeys Height Difference < 3 storeys Height Difference < 3 storeys Height Difference < 4 storeys Height Difference < 4 storeys Height Difference < 5 storeys Height Difference < 6 storeys Height Difference < 6 storeys Height Difference < 6 storeys Height Difference < 7 storeys Height Difference < 6 storeys Height Difference < 7 store	idings (eg shear walls), the value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.01< td=""> 0 1 0 1 0 0.4 0.7 tor D2 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0<sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.01< td=""> 0<0.4</sep<.01<></sep<.005h<></sep<.01<></sep<.005h<>	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0 rrspective Factor E 1.0 Factor F 1.0
Values given assume the pounding may be reducted by the poundit by the pounding may be reducted by the pounding may be reducted	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right paration of factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height Difference Effect Tac Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 3 Storey Height Difference < 4 Storeys Height Difference < 4 Storeys Height Difference < 5 Storeys Height Difference < 6 Storeys Height Difference < 6 Storeys Height Difference < 7 Storeys Height Difference < 6 Storeys Height Difference < 7 Storeys Height Difference < 8 Storeys Height Difference < 8 Storeys Height Difference < 9 Storeys Height Differenc	idings (eg shear walls), the value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.01< td=""> 0<1</sep<.01<></sep<.005h<>	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0 rspective Factor E 1.0 Factor F 1.0
Values given assume th pounding may be reduct Table for Selection of Align No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Height Table for Selection of No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level Other Factors - for allowal Record rationale for ch Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building has a frame structure. For stiff builded by taking the coefficient to the right of the right and the right of Factor D1 Separation Difference Effect Difference Effect Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 3 Severe Height Difference < 4 Storeys Height Difference < 4 Storeys Height Difference < 5 Severe Height Difference < 5 Severe Height Difference < 5 Severe Height Characterstics of the builtoice of Factor F:	ilidings (eg shear walls), the value applicable to frame tor D1 For Longitudinal D Severe Significant 0<5ep<0.05H	e effect of buildings.	Factor D 1.0 respective Factor E 1.0 Factor F 1.0 PAI ongitudinal 1.00

KA: Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd By: SM ame of building: Hatchery, Orginal Section, 1984 Date: 20022 ty: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 Revision No.: B able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 Revision No.: B ep 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) Fefect on B3.2) Fransverse Direction potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) Insignificant Fact 1 Plan Irregularity Structural Performance O Severe Significant Insignificant Fact 2 Vertical Irregularity Significant Insignificant Fact 3 Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Insignificant Fact	2019 Fac
ame of building: Hatchery, Orginal Section, 1984 Date: 2002/ ty: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 ep 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) efer Appendix B - Section B3.2) Transverse Direction potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance Q Severe Significant I Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance Q Severe Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance Q Severe Significant Insignificant Fact Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Insignificant Fact	Fac
Ity: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 rep 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) efer Appendix B - Section B3.2) Fransverse Direction potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) 1 Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Structural steel portal frame structure Significant 2 Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Significant Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Image: Structural steel portal frame structure Significant	Fac
able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 able IEP-3 Initial Evaluation Procedure Step 3 approximation of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) afer Appendix B - Section B3.2) Transverse Direction potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure Structural steel portal frame structure	Fac
ap 3 - Assessment of Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) fer Appendix B - Section B3.2) Transverse Direction potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure	Fac
Transverse Direction Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) Insignificant Fact Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fact Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fact Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fact Structural steel portal frame structure O Significant Insignificant Fact	Fac
potential CSWs Effect on Structural Performance (Choose a value - Do not interpolate) Figure 1 Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fact Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Insignificant Fact Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fact Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Insignificant Fact	or A 1.
Plan Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Structural steel portal frame structure Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fifect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Structural steel portal frame structure	or A 1.
Structural steel portal frame structure Significant Insignificant Factor Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Factor Structural steel portal frame structure Structural steel portal frame structure Structural steel portal frame structure Factor	
Vertical Irregularity Effect on Structural Performance O Severe Structural steel portal frame structure	
Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Fac	
Structural steel portal frame structure	tor B
Short Columns	
Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant	tor C 1.
Factor D1 For Transverse Direction: 1.0	
Table for Selection of Factor D1 Severe Significant Insignificant	
Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height O_1 O_1 $@_1$	
Alizzarentet Elene estuditis 000/ ef Otenu Unicht	
No adjacent structures.	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Severe Significant Insignificant 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01h="" sep="">.01H</sep<.005h>	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Ubit d Difference 2 4 Storeys 0 0.4 Q 0.7 1 1	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Feight Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference > 2 Storeys Heig	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Severe Significant Insignificant O <sep<:005h< td=""> Height Difference > 4 Storeys No adjacent structures.</sep<:005h<>	
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys No adjacent structures.	tor D
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Severe Significant Understand Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 4 Storeys No. adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Stability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as it affects the structural performance from a life-safety perspective	tor D 1
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys O 0.4 O 0.7 O 0.9 O 1 O 1 No adjacent structures. Ste Characteristics - Stability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as it affects the structural performance from a life-safety perspective	tor D <u>1</u>
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1.0 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Very Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys 0.1 0.2 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.1 1 <t< td=""><td>tor D 1. re tor E 1.</td></t<>	tor D 1. re tor E 1.
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 10 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Verse Significant Verse Significant Verse Verse Verse </td <td>tor D<u>1</u>. /e tor E<u>1</u>.</td>	tor D <u>1</u> . /e tor E <u>1</u> .
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 1 1	tor D 1. re tor E 1. tor F 1.
b) Factor D2: - Height Difference Effect Factor D2 For Transverse Direction: 10 10 Table for Selection of Factor D2 Severe Significant Insignificant 0-4 Height Difference > 4 Storeys 0.4 0.7 0.1 Height Difference > 4 Storeys 0.4 0.7 0.1 No adjacent structures. Fac Site Characteristics - Stability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as it affects the structural performance from a life-safety perspective Effect on Structural Performance O Severe O Significant Insignificant Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowance of all other relevant characteristics of the building Otherwise - Maximum value 2.5 Notherwise - Maximum value 2.5 Notherwise - Maximum value 1.5 Notherwise - Maximum value 2.5 Nil.	tor D 1. re tor E 1. tor F 1.(

KA:	me:	Banks Road				Job No.:	<mark>19-021</mark>	
1		nghams Ente	erprises (NZ)	Pty Ltd		By:	SM	
lame of building: Sity:	r N	latchery, Org latamata	ginal Section	, 1984		Revision	No.: B	019
able IEP-4	nitial Evalu	ation Proc	edure Step	s 4, 5, 6 aı	nd 7			
tep 4 - Percentag	e of New Bui	Iding Standa	ard (%NBS)					
					Longi	tudinal	Transv	erse
.1 Assessed Base (from Table IE	eline %NBS (% P - 1)	% NBS) _b			87	7%	87%	6
.2 Performance A (from Table IE	Achievement R P - 2)	atio (PAR)			1.	00	1.00	0
.3 PAR x Baseline	e <i>(%NBS)</i> _b				8	5%	85%	6
.4 Percentage Ne (Use lower of	w Building States two values from	andard (%NB: Step 4.3)	S) - Seismic R	ating			85%	6
tep 5 - Is <i>%NBS</i> <	< 34?						NC	
Step 6 - Potentially	/ Earthquake	Risk (is %N	BS < 67)?				NC	
tep 7 - Provisiona Additional Comr Conservative ducti 1.25 confirmed. Th	al Grading fo nents (items of lity allowance has be outcome would	r Seismic Ris note affecting I resulted in a Seis still be grade A. I	sk based on EP based seisn mic Grade A, poss Note that maximu	IEP nic rating) sibility that a high m ductility which	er percentage co could be assigne	Seismic (uld be justified on c d is 2.	Grade A	luctility
Relationshi	p between	Grade and	%NBS:					
_	Grade:	A+	A	В	С	D	E	
	%NBS:	> 100	100 to 80	79 to 67	66 to 34	< 34 to 20	< 20	

Stre AKA Nam City	et Number & Name: .: e of building: :	Banks Road Inghams Enterprises Hatchery, Orginal Se Matamata	s (NZ) Pty Ltd cction, 1984	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 : B
ak	ole IEP-5 Initial E	valuation Procedure S	Step 8		
tep	9 8 - Identification of p significant risk to	otential Severe Structura a significant number of c	l Weaknesses (SSWs) th occupants	at could result in	
1	Number of storeys abo	ve ground level			1
2	Presence of heavy con	crete floors and/or concrete	e roof? (Y/N)		N
	Potential Severe	e Structural Weakne	esses (SSWs):		
	Note: Options that are greye	ed out are not applicable and nee	ed not be considered.		
	Occupancy not consi	idered to be significant -	no further consideration	required	
	Risk not considered	to be significant - no furtl	her consideration requir	ed	
	The following potenti in the building that co	al Severe Structural Wea ould result in significant i	knesses (SSWs) have b risk to a significant num	een identified ber of occupants:	
	1. None identified				
	2. Weak or soft store	y (except top storey)			
	3. Brittle columns and not constrained by	d/or beam-column joints other structural element	the deformations of whi s	ch are	
	4. Flat slab buildings connections	with lateral capacity relia	ant on low ductility slab	to-column	
	5. No identifiable con	nection between primary	structure and diaphrag	ms	
	o. Leuge and gap sta	115			
			Hunny		
	IEP Assessme	ent Confirmed by	1 -/	Signature	
			lan Kearny	Name	
			1151481	CPEng. No	
NΔ	RNING!! This initial evaluation	has been carried out solelv as an initial	seismic assessment of the building for	lowing the procedure set out in "Th	e Seismic Assessment of Existina



Appendix B IEP Assessment Alterations & Extensions 1997/2001



treet Number KA: ame of build ity:	* & Name: ing:	Banks Road Ingham Enterprise Hatchery, 1997 & 2 Matamata	s (NZ) Pty Ltd 001 Additions		Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 B
able IEP-2	Initial Eva	luation Procedure	e Step 2			
tep 2 - Detei	mination of (%	NBS) _b				
Baseline (%NBS	b) for particular build	ling - refer Section B5)			1	
1 Determine	nominai (%NBS)	= (%NBS) _{nom}		<u>Longitudin</u>	al	Transverse
a) Building S	trengthening Data					
Tick if bui	lding is known to ha	ve been strengthened in th	is direction			
If strengt	nened, enter percent	tage of code the building ha	as been strengthened t	o N/A		N/A
b) Year of De	sign/Strengthening	, Building Type and Seis	mic Zone			
				Pre 1935 (b	Pre 1935 O
				1935-1965	»	1935-1965 _O
				1965-1976	>	1965-1976 _O
				1976-1984	>	1976-1984 O
				1984-1992 (1982-2004		1984-1992 O
				2004-2011		2004-2011 O
				Post Aug 2011		Post Aug 2011 0
			Building Type:	Not applie	able	Not applicable
			Seismic Zone:	Not applie	able	Not applicable
c) Soil Type	From NZS1170.5:	2004. CI 3.1.3 :		De les l		D Soft Soil
	From NZS4203:19	92, Cl 4.6.2.2 :		D Soft Soil		
	(for 1992 to 2004 a	and only if known)		Flexible		Flexible
d) Estimate F Comment:	Period, T			h _n = 7		7 m
				A _c = 1.00		1.00 m ²
Moment R	esisting Concrete Fr	rames: T =	= max{0.09 <i>h</i> ₀ ^{0.75} , 0.4}	0		0
Moment R	esisting Steel Frame	es: T =	$= \max\{0.14h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$	0		0
All Other F	ily Braced Steel Fra	mes: T =	= $\max\{0.06h_n^{0.75}, 0.4\}$	0		0
Concrete S	Shear Walls	, - T =	$= \max\{0.09h_n^{0.75}/A_c^{0.5}, 0.4\}$	•		0
Masonry S	hear Walls:	Τ <	< 0.4sec	õ		õ
User Defin	ed (input Period):			0		0
	Where $h_n = h_n$	eight in metres from the base of th	he structure to the	T . 0.40		0.40
	appornion ou	enie weight er maee.		1. 0.40		0.40
			/		_	
e) Factor A:	Strengthening factor de if not strengthened)	etermined using result from (a) ab	ove (set to 1.0	Factor A: 1.00		1.00
a) Factor B:	results (a) to (e) above	EE Guidelines Figure 3A.1 using	76-84 Factor	Factor B: 0.22		0.22
	C = 1.2, otherwise tak	e as 1.0.				1.00
h) Factor D:	For buildings designed and Napier (1931-1938 take as 1.0.	I prior to 1935 Factor D = 0.8 exce 5) where Factor D may be taken a	ept for Wellington is 1.0, otherwise	Factor D: 1.00		1.00
<i>(</i>			((WRS)	_	0001

WARNING!! This initial evaluation has been carried out solely as an initial seismic assessment of the building following the procedure set out in "The Seismic Assessment of Existing Buildings" Technical Guidelines for Engineering Assessments, July 2017. This spreadsheet must be read in conjunction with the limitations set out in the accompanying report, and should not be relied on by any party for any other purpose. Detailed inspections and engineering calculations, or engineering judgements based on them, have not been undertaken, and these may lead to a different result or seismic grade.

Table 1E-2 Initial Evaluation Proceedure Step 2 continued 2. Answer Fault Scaling Factor, Factor E If T 1. Seec., Factor F = 1 (T + 1. Seec., Factor F	Street Number & Name: AKA: Name of building: City:	Banks Road Ingham Enter Hatchery, 199 Matamata	prises (NZ) P 7 & 2001 Add	ty Ltd itions	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.:	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 B
2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor, Factor E 11 $r = 1$, Suee, Factor E = 1 1 $r = 1$, Suee, Factor S = 1 1 $r = 1$, N(T,D): 1 1 $r = 1$ 1 $r = 1$ 1 $r = 1$ 2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F 9) Hazard Factor, Z, for the Z = 0 1 $Z = 0$ 1 $Z $	Table IEP-2 Initial Ev	aluation Proce	dure Step 2	continued		
If $J \leq 1$ asset, Pattor Pattor P = 1 is near Fault Factor, N(T,D) is near X2511726.2004 (2014) b) Factor F a) Hazard Factor, 7, Factor F b) Factor F Counter f Counter f Counter f c) Factor C c) Factor C c) Factor F c) Factor C c) Factor F c) Factor C c) Factor C	2.2 Near Fault Scaling Factor,	Factor E				
e) Ner Fault Factor, $N(T,D)$ (if on KS21170.5200; 0.3.18) b) Factor E = 1.N(T,D) Factor E: 1.00 1.00 2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F e) Hazard Factor, Z for site Location: Internation: Internation: Refer right for user-defined locations $Z = \frac{1}{0.8}$ $Z = \frac{1}{0$	If $I \leq 1.5 \text{ sec}$, Factor E = 1	1		Longitudin	<u>al</u>	Transverse
$ \begin{array}{c} (\text{if mirk MS31170.2004, Cl 3.1.6)} \\ \textbf{b) Factor F} & -1 (M(T,D) & Factor FE & 100 \\ \hline 100 \\ \textbf{2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F} \\ \textbf{3) Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F} \\ \textbf{3) Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F} \\ \textbf{3) Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F} \\ \textbf{100} & \textbf$	a) Near Fault Factor, N(T,D)			N(T,D): 1		1
2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F a) Hazard Factor, Z for site Location: Metamata $Z_{avv} = 0.19$ The right for user-defined locations $Z_{avv} = 0.12$ The right for us	(from NZS1170.5:2004, Cl 3.1.6) b) Factor E		= 1/N(T,D)	Factor E: 1.00		1.00
2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Factor F a) Hazard Factor, Z, for site Location: $\frac{Z}{2 \log \frac{1}{\log \log $,					
Location: Matamate \mathbb{R} Refer right for user-defined locations $Z_{trace} = \frac{0.19}{0.10}$ (mon XZS1170.5.200, Take 3.3) $Z_{trace} = \frac{1}{0.010}$ (mon XZS1170.5.200, Take 3.3) b) Factor F For pre 1992 = 1/2 For post 2011 = $Z_{trace}/2$ For post 2011 = $Z_{trace}/2$ Factor F: 4.21 421 c c Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor G e) Design Importance Level, 1 (Bort 1 if norm, For building designed prior to 1965 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1965-197 and known to be designed as a puble building stero 1.38. For traffs (1970-1970 and case are puble) c attragery IV c attrager attrace attrace attrace at a c attragery IV c attrace at a star 2000 at a star 2000 at a star c attrace at a star 2000 at a star 2000 at a star c attrace at a star 2000 at a star 2000 at a star 2000 at a star c attrace at a star 2000 at a	2.3 Hazard Scaling Factor, Fa a) Hazard Factor, <i>Z</i> , for site	ctor F				
	Location	n: Matamata	•	Refer right for user-defined loc	ations	
		Z = 0.19	(from NZS1170.	5:2004, Table 3.3)		
b) Factor F For prot 1992 = 1/2 For post 2011 = Z_{000}/Z Factor F: 421 421 2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor G a) Design Importance Level, I Cete 51 if and two-in: for building designed and its 1588 and hown to be designed as a post building design description for the state of the stat	Z ₁₉₉	92 = 0.8	(NZS4203:1992	Zone Factor from accompanying Figure 3.5	i(b))	
For pre 1992 = $1/Z$ For 1992.2011 = Z_{100}/Z For post 2011 = Z_{100}/Z Factor F: 4.21 4.21 2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor G a) Design Risk Factor, R (set to 1.0 if other than 197-2004, or not known) to be designed as a public building to 1.3 to 2 code B. For 1976 1988 set (value,) b) Design Risk Factor, R (set to 1.0 if other than 197-2004, or not known) c) Return Period Factor, R (trem N251170.0.2004 Building Importance Level) c) Return Period Factor, R (trem N251170.0.2004 Building Importance Level) c) Factor G = IR_c/R 7.5 Ductility Scaling Factor, Factor H a) Available Displacement Ductility Within Existing Structure Comment: b) Factor H b) Factor H b) Factor H c) Factor R c) The pre 1976 (maximum of 2) c) Factor H b) Factor H c) The pre 1976 (maximum of 2) c) The pre 1976 (maximum of 2) c) 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.15 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.14 1.1.15 1.1.15 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.17 1.1.17 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16 1.1.16	∠ ₂₀₀ b) Factor F	0.19	(Trom NZS1170.	5.∠004, Table 3.3)		
For 1982-2011 = Z_{100}/Z For post 2011 = Z_{200}/Z Factor F: 4.21 421 421 421 421 421 421 421 421	For pre 1992	=	_1/Z			
Factor F: 4.21 Factor F: 4.21 4.2	For 1992-2011 For post 2011	=	Z ₁₉₉₂ /Z Z ₂₀₀₄ /Z			
2.4 Return Period Scaling Factor, Factor G a) Design Inportance Level, I (Set to 1 find known, For buildings designed prior to 1805 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.35. For buildings designed 1980-1976 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.36 for buildings designed 1980-1976 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.36 for buildings designed 1980-1976 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.36 for buildings designed 1980-1976 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.36 for buildings designed 1980 + 1076 and known to be designed as a public building set to 1.36 for building set to 1.36 for building set to 1.36 for building limportance Level I =	101 2011	-	- 2004 -	Factor F: 4.21		4.21
d) Factor G = $IR_{\nu}R$ Factor G: 1.00 1.25	 b) Design Risk Factor, R_o (set to 1.0 if other than 1976-2004, of c) Return Period Factor, R (from NZS1170.0:2004 Building Imp 	or not known) bortance Level)	<u>Choose Impo</u>	Category IV $R_o = 1$ ortance Level O1 ©2 O3 R = 1.0	Cate 04 01	egory IV •
2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor, Factor H 1.00 1.00 a) Available Displacement Ductility Within Existing Structure $\mu = 1.25$ 1.25 Coringinal design ductility confirmed $\mu = 1.25$ 1.25 b) Factor H For pre 1976 (maximum of 2) $= 1.14$ 1.14 For 1976 onwards $= 1$ 1 (where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) Factor H: 1.00 1.00 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Gactor, S _p 0.93 0.93 (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Icos Icos 0.93 0.93 b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor $= 1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 1.02% 102%	d) Factor G	=	IR₀/R	Factor G: 1 00		1.00
a) Available Displacement Ductility Within Existing Structure Comment: $\mu = 1.25$ 1.25 Driginal design ductility confirmed b) Factor H k_{μ} For pre 1976 (maximum of 2) = 1.14 For 1976 onwards = 1 Factor H: 1.00 (where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Scaling Factor = 1/S _p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction $S_p = 0.93$ b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor = 1/S _p Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)	2.5 Ductility Scaling Factor, F	actor H	e	1.00		1.00
Original design ductility confirmed k_{μ} k_{μ} b) Factor HFor pre 1976 (maximum of 2)=1.14For 1976 onwards=1For accompanying Figure 3.4)IIfick if light timber-framed construction in this directionIsp =0.930.93b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor=1/SpNote Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this periodI2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS)_b (equals (%NBS)_nom x E x F x G x H x I)I102%	Comment:	tility within Existing	Structure	$\mu = 1.25$		1.25
b) Factor H For pre 1976 (maximum of 2) = 1.14 For 1976 onwards = 1 Factor H: 1.00 (where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Factor, S _p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction \Box b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor $= 1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)	Original design ductility confi	irmed				
For pre 1976 (maximum of 2) = 1.14 For pre 1976 (maximum of 2) = 1.14 For 1976 onwards = 1 Factor H: 1.00 (where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Factor, S _p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor = $1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)	b) Factor H			k		k
For 1976 onwards=1Factor H:1.00(where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Factor, S_p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction□ $S_p = 0.933$ 0.93 b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period1.08 2.7 Baseline %/NBS for Building, (%/NBS) (equals (%/NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)102%	-, 1 40101 11	For pre 1976 (ma	iximum of 2)	= 1.14		1.14
(where kµ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelastic Spectrum Scaling Factor, from accompanying Table 3.3) 2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Factor, S _p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction $S_p = 0.93$ b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor $= 1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 1.09 (requals for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)		For 1976 onward	S	= 1 Factor H: 1.00		1
2.6 Structural Performance Scaling Factor, Factor I a) Structural Performance Factor, S_p (from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed construction in this direction $S_p = 0.93$ b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor $= 1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)	(where $k\mu$ is NZS1170.5:2004 Inelast	stic Spectrum Scaling Factor	or, from accompanying	g Table 3.3)		
(from accompanying Figure 3.4) Image: Comparison of the problem	2.6 Structural Performance So a) Structural Performance Fac	caling Factor, Fact tor, S _p	or I			
b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor = $1/S_p$ Factor I: 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b [102%] (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I)	(from accompanying Figure 3.4) Tick if light timber-framed cons	struction in this directi	on			
b) Structural Performance Scaling Factor = 1/S _p Factor I: 1.08 1.08 Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I) 102%				S _p = 0.93		0.93
Note Factor B values for 1992 to 2004 have been multiplied by 0.67 to account for Sp in this period 2.7 Baseline %NBS for Building, (%NBS) _b (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F x G x H x I) 102%	b) Structural Performance Sca	ling Factor	= 1/S _p	Factor I: 1.08		1.08
102% 102%	Note Factor B values for 1992 to 20	004 have been multiplied by	0.67 to account for S	p in this period		
	2.7 Baseline %NBS for Buildin (equals (%NBS) _{nom} x E x F :	ng, <i>(%NBS)</i> ь xGxHxI)		102%		102%

et Number & Name:	Banks Road		J	ob No.:	19-021
A:	Ingham Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd		B	у:	SM
ne of building:	Hatchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions		D	ate:	20/02/2019
:	Matamata		R	evision No.:	В
ble IEP-3 Initial E	valuation Procedure Step 3				
er Appendix B - Section B3.2)					
ongitudinal Direction					
potential CSWs	Effect on Struct (Choose a value -	Do not interpo	ance plate)		Fac
Effect on Structural Performa	ance o Severe o S	ianificant		Insignificant	Factor A 1.
Regular structure		grincan		• msignineant	
Vertical Irregularity					
Effect on Structural Performa	ance o Severe o S	ignificant		Insignificant	Factor B 1.
Short Columns					
Effect on Structural Performa Not Applicable	ance o Severe o Si	ignificant		Insignificant	Factor C 1.
Note: Values given assume th	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil	dings (eg shea	nr walls), the effe	ect of pounding]
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact	dings (eg shea licable to frame or D1 For Lo	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire	ect of pounding	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation	dings (eg shea dicable to frame cor D1 For Lor Severe 0 <sep<.005h< td=""><td>nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Ser>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></td></sep<.005h<>	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h< td=""><td>ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Ser>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.01h<>	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Ser>.01H	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shea licable to frame cor D1 For Loo Severe 0 <sep<.005h O1</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the efficiency of t	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H © 1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shea licable to frame cor D1 For Loo Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice e buildings. ngitudinal Direct Significant .005 <sep<.01h O1</sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: <u>1.(</u> Insignificant Sep>.01H @1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shea licable to frame or D1 For Loo Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 004</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h O1 00.7</sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep01H	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height t Difference Effect	dings (eg shea licable to frame or D1 For Lou Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h 01 00.7</sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H @1 O0.8 O0.8 ection: 1.0	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height nt Difference Effect Fact on of Factor D2	dings (eg shea licable to frame cor D1 For Loo Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice buildings. ngitudinal Direct Significant .005 <sep<.01h O1 00.7</sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height nt Difference Effect Fact on of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 cor D2 For Lot Severe 0<sep<.005h 0<sep<.005h< td=""><td>nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h O1 00.7 ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></sep<.01h </sep<.01h </td></sep<.005h<></sep<.005h </sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h O1 00.7 ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h .005<sep<.01h< td=""><td>ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1</td><td></td></sep<.01h<></sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height nt Difference Effect Fact on of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 cor D2 For Loi Severe 0<sep<.005h 0<sep<.005h 0<sep<.005h 0.0.4</sep<.005h </sep<.005h </sep<.005h </sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h 01 00.7 ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h 00.7 00.9</sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H @1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H @1 O1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height on t Difference Effect Fact on of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame or D1 For Loo Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.5ep<.005H 0<sep<.005h 0.04 0.0.7 0.1</sep<.005h </sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H e1 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height on to Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Fact Meight Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 0</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 00.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01	Factor D
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height on to Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Meight Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 0</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 O1	Factor D 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height on of Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 3 Storeys Ability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as it affect hance o Severe o S	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.7 00.7 01 00.7 01 00.7 01 00.7 01</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effe e buildings. ngitudinal Dire Significant .005 <sep<.01h 01 00.7 00.7 Ngitudinal Dire Significant .005<sep<.01h 0.7 0.9 01 performance from</sep<.01h </sep<.01h 	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 00.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 01 01 n a life-safety pers Insignificant Insignificant	Factor D 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Stat Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowan Record rationale for ch Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height nt Difference Effect Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Streight Difference < 2 Storeys Streight Difference < 3 Storey Storey Height nance o Severe o S nance o Severe o S	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 0</sep<.005h 	rr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O0.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H ©1 O1 O1 O1 n a life-safety pers © Insignificant imum value 2.5 imum value 1.5. minimum.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowal Record rationale for ch Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height on Difference Effect Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Steight Difference < 2 Storeys Neight Difference < 3 Storey Storey Height Difference < 3 Storey Storey Height Difference < 3 Storey Storey Storey Storey Storey Height Difference < 4 Storeys Storey Storey Height Difference < 3 Storey Sto	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.4 00.5 00.4 00.4 00.4</sep<.005h 	nr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 00.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H 1 01 01 01 01 n a life-safety pers Insignificant imum value 2.5 imum value 1.5. ninimum.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowan Record rationale for ch Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value app Fact on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height and Difference Effect The Difference Effect The Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Strength Difference 2 to 5 Storeys Strength Difference 2 to 5 Storeys Strength Difference 2 to 6 Storeys Strength Difference 2 to 7 Storeys Strength Difference 2 Storeys Strength Difference 2 to 6 Storeys	dings (eg shea licable to frame Severe 0 <sep<.005h 01 004 004 004 005ep<.005H 004 00.7 01 s the structural tignificant</sep<.005h 	rr walls), the effice buildings.	ect of pounding ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H e1 00.8 ection: 1.0 Insignificant Sep>.01H e1 01 01 01 01 01 n a life-safety pers e Insignificant imum value 2.5 imum value 1.5. ninimum.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.

et Number & Name:	Banks Road		Job No.:	19-021
:	Ingham Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd		By:	SM
e of building:	Hatchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions		Date:	20/02/2019
	Matamata		Revision No.:	В
ble IEP-3 Initial E	valuation Procedure Step 3			
er Appendix B - Section B3.2,				
ransverse Direction				Fac
potential CSWs	Effect on Stru (Choose a value	uctural Performance e - Do not interpolate)		
Plan Irregularity				
Effect on Structural Perform	nance o Severe o S	Significant	Insignificant	t Factor A 1.
Structural steel portal frame				
Vertical Irregularity				
Effect on Structural Perform	nance o Severe o S	Significant	Insignificant	t Factor B 1.
Suuctural steel portal frame	e su uciule			
Short Columns				····
Effect on Structural Perform	nance o Severe o S	Significant	Insignificant	t Factor C 1.
IN/A				
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings.	effect of pounding]
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appl	dings (eg shear walls), the icable to frame buildings.	effect of pounding	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buik ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Fa	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Separation	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.t<="" td=""><td>e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.01="" 01<="" td=""><td>Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1</td><td></td></sep<.005h>	Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">01 01 00.4 00.7</sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant 01H Sep>.01H @1 O0.8	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<:005h .005<sep<.<br="">01 01 0.04 00.7</sep<:005h>	Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1 00.8	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height to Difference Effect	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">01 01 00.4 00.7</sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ©1 00.8	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selectio	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appled in the coefficient to the right of the value appled in the coefficient to the right of the value appled in the coefficient to the right of the coefficient to the coefficient to the right of the right of the coefficient to the right of t	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.<br="">01 01 00.4 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan</sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant 01H Sep>.01H 1 00.8 Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff built ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Fa on of Factor D1 Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height nument of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height to Difference Effect Fa	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significa 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">01 01 0.0.4 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significa 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<="" td=""><td>e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ©1 C0.8 Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H</td><td></td></sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ©1 C0.8 Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height nt Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.04 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.04 00.7</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1 O0.8 Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection <u>Alig</u> No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Int Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.04 00.7 Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.04 00.7 0.0.7 0.09</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant DH Sep>.01H III Sep>.01H O0.8 Direction: 1.0 nt Insignificant DH Sep>.01H III Sep>.01H IIII Sep>.01H III Sep>.01H IIII Sep>.01H IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selection Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selection	e building has a frame structure. For stiff buil ng the coefficient to the right of the value appl Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gnment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height the Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">01 01 0.0.4 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significar 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.4 00.7 0.0.7 00.9 0.1 01</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	Direction: 1.0 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value applered of the coefficient to the right of the value applered of factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height and the provide of the coefficient of the coeffic	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significar 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.04 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significar 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.05<sep<.007 0.0.7 0.9 0.1 01</sep<.007 </sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1 00.8 Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H @1 01 01	
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value applied of the coefficient to the right of the value applied of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height and Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.1< td=""> 01 01 00.4 00.7 Severe Severe Significan 0.04 00.7 0.05 .005<sep<.0< td=""> 0<0.4</sep<.0<></sep<.1<></sep<.005h<>	Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H 1 00.8 Direction: 1.0 t Insignificant 11H Sep>.01H 11H Sep>.01H 11H Sep>.01H 11 01 01 01	2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling to the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 Storeys applied to the coefficient of the coefficie	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h< td=""> .005<sep<.1< td=""> 01 01 00.4 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Severe Significan 0<0.4</sep<.1<></sep<.005h<>	Perfect of pounding Direction: 1.0 Insignificant DIH Sep>.01H Insignificant C0.8 Direction: 1.0 Int Insignificant DIH Sep>.01H Int Sep>.01H Int Sep>.01H Int Insignificant C0.1 C0.1 C0.1 C0.1 C0.1 C0.1 C0.1 C0.1	Factor D 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gramment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for the Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys 	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">01 01 0.0.4 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.0.4 00.7 0.0.7 00.9 0.1 01 s the structural performance</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 It Insignificant DIH Sep>.01H It O0.8 Direction: 1.0 It Insignificant It Insignificant It Sep>.01H It O1 O	Factor D 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value applied of the coefficient to the right of the value applied of the coefficient to the right of the value applied of factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height apprend of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height apprend of Floo	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<:005h .005<sep<.<br="">01 01 00.4 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<:005h .005<sep<.<br="">0.0.4 00.7 0.0.7 0.09 01 01 s the structural performance Significant</sep<:005h></sep<:005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1 ①1	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height appendix of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys appendix of the threat, liquefaction etc as it affect appendix of Storey (Storey	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significal 0-Sep<.005H .005 <sep<.0 01 01 00.4 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significal 0-Sep<.005H .005<sep<.0 0.4 00.7 0.0.7 00.9 01 01 s the structural performance Significant</sep<.0 </sep<.0 	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.0 It Insignificant It Insignificant O0.8 Direction: 1.0 It Insignificant	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height and the provide the store of the store	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">01 01 00.4 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.04 00.7 0.09 01 01 s the structural performance Significant ling For ≤ 3 storeys - otherwise -</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(Int Insignificant IH Sep>.01H III 00.8 Direction: 1.(Int Insignificant III Sep>.01H III 01 01 01 01 from a life-safety pers Insignificant Maximum value 2.5 Maximum value 1.5.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowa Record rationale for	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gramment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height from Difference Effect The Difference Effect Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference > 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys The store of all other relevant characterstics of the build choice of Factor F:	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.04 00.7 0.4 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.04 00.7 0.05 0.05 Severe Significant s the structural performance Significant fing For ≤ 3 storeys - otherwise -</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant 11H Sep>.01H 00.8 Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant 11H Sep>.01H 01 01 01 01 from a life-safety pers Insignificant Maximum value 2.5 Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowa Record rationale for o Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height gramment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height gramment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height free the transformer of Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys height Difference 3 to 4 Storeys height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys height Difference 3 to 4 Storeys height Difference 4 Storeys height Difference 5 to 5 t	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0 <sep<.005h .005<sep<.1<br="">0.04 00.7 Ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0<sep<.005h .005<sep<.0<br="">0.04 00.7 0.03 0.1 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01</sep<.005h></sep<.005h>	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(It Insignificant It Insignificant O0.8 Direction: 1.(It Insignificant I	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowa Record rationale for o Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appled to the coefficient to the right of the value appled on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height grimment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height for Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference > 4 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys Height Difference < 2 Storeys ability, landslide threat, liquefaction etc as it affect france o Severe o	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0-Sep<:005H .005 <sep<.1 0.04 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0-Sep<:005H .005<sep<.1 0.04 00.7 0.07 00.9 0.1 01 s the structural performance Significant ling For \leq 3 storeys - otherwise -</sep<.1 </sep<.1 	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H e1 00.8 Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant 11H Sep>.01H e1 01 01 from a life-safety pers e Insignificant Maximum value 2.5 Maximum value 1.5. No minimum.	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigl Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowa Record rationale for o Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling the coefficient to the right of the value appling to the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height applied to the coefficient of the coefficient of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 2 to 4 Stor	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0.Sep<.005H .005 <sep<. 0.01 01 0.04 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0.Sep<.005H .005<sep<. 0.04 00.7 0.05</sep<. </sep<. 	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ① 1 ① 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Factor D 1. spective Factor E 1. Factor F 1.
Note: Values given assume th may be reduced by takin Table for Selectio Alig No adjacent structures. b) Factor D2: - Heigh Table for Selectio No adjacent structures. Site Characteristics - Sta Effect on Structural Perform Site is flat and level. Other Factors - for allowa Record rationale for on Nil.	e building has a frame structure. For stiff building the coefficient to the right of the value applied of the coefficient to the right of the value applied on of Factor D1 Separation Alignment of Floors within 20% of Storey Height grimment of Floors not within 20% of Storey Height from the Difference Effect Factor D2 Height Difference 2 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 3 to 4 Storeys Height Difference 5 to 5 Storeys Height Difference 5 to 5 Storeys 1 to 5 Storey 5 Height Difference 5 to 5 Storey 5 Height 5 Sto	dings (eg shear walls), the licable to frame buildings. ctor D1 For Transverse Severe Significan 0.Sep<.005H .005 <sep<. 0.01 01 0.0.4 00.7 ctor D2 For Transverse Severe Significan 0.Sep<.005H .005<sep<. 0.04 0.7 0.07 0.09 0.1 01 s the structural performance Significant ling For ≤ 3 storeys - otherwise -</sep<. </sep<. 	e effect of pounding Direction: 1.(nt Insignificant D1H Sep>.01H ① 1 ① 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Factor D 1. spective Factor F 1. Factor F 1. Factor F 1. Factor F 1.0

A: Ingham Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd By: SM we of building: Matamata Date: 20022019 y: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 Revision No.: B ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse if com Table IEP -1 102% 102% 102% if com Table IEP -1 100 1.00 1.00 if com Table IEP -1 1.00 1.00 1.00 if com Table IEP -2 1.00% 100% 100% if percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating 1.00% 1.00% if ub lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (frems of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. NO NO Relationship between Grade and %NBS: NO NO NO	A: Ingham Enterprises (N2) Pty Ltd By: SM we of building: Matamata Dete: SM222019 we of building: Matamata Dete: Matamata we of building: Matamata Dete: Matamata we of building: Matamata Dete: Dete: Matamata we of building: Matamata Dete: Dete: Dete: Dete: Dete: Dete: Matamata we of building: Standard (%MBS) Dete:	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) By:	Adv Ingham Enterprises (NZ) Pty Ltd By: By: Statchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions Date: 2002/2019 with the original function of the second		ame:	Banks Road			Job N	lo.:	19-021
ame of building: Hatchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions Date: 2002/2019 by: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 eep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse 1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS) _b (from Table IEP - 1) 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS) _b 100% 100% 100% 100% 2 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) eep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? No eep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? No eep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Eatimation of the set of the	ame of building: Hatchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions Date: 20022019 typ: Matamata Revision No.: B able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse 1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), 102% 02% (from Table IEP - 1) 100 100 100 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 100 100 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 00% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating 00% (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 00% 00% ep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? No ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Environments (item	ame of building: Hatchery, 1997 & 2001 Additions Date: 20022013 by: Matamata Revision No.: B Be of the expectation of the set of the s	ame of building: Hatchery, 1997 & 2007 Additions Date: 20022019 by: Revision No: B Bether P4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 ep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal Transverse 1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 102% 102% 1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 100% 100 1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 100% 100 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% c) Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100 100 ep 5 - Is %/NBS < 34? NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %/NBS: Seismic Brade: A + A B B C A S A < A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	KA:		Ingham Enter	prises (NZ) Pty Ltd		By:		SM
p	(j) Junction (Normation) (Normation) able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse 1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS) _b 102% 102% 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 1) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS) _b 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% tep 5 - Is %NBS < 347 NO tep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade ▲ Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E A Relationship between Grade and %NBS: E NO E Stands is in 200 in 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20 Seismic 34 to 20 < 20	yward (1) Jack (1) able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 lep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%/NBS) Longitudinal Transverse 1 Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), (102%) 102% 102% 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (100 100 100 3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), (100%) 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating (Uae lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %/NBS < 67)? NO NO ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %/NBS < 67)? NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Contervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Contervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Contervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E E E ep 5 - 100 100 100 100 To a	yp Internet Internet Description able IEP-4 Initial Evaluation Procedure Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7 tep 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Internet Internet 1 Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table EF - 1) Internet Internet 2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) Internet Internet 3 PAR x Baseline (%MBS), Internet Internet 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating Internet Internet 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating Internet Internet 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating Internet Internet 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating Internet Internet 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) < 67)? No No https: 1 No No No https: 5 Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Contenvalue assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Contenvalue assessments throughout result on 100% rating. No No	ame of building:		Hatchery, 199	7 & 2001 Additions		Date:	ion No ·	20/02/2019 B
ap 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS) _b 102% 102% (from Table IEP - 1) 1.00 1.00 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) 100% 100% (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? NO ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO ap 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. A Relationship between Grade and %NBS : E E E E	ap 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %NBS (%NBS), (from Table IEP - 1) 100 100 ep 4 - Percentage Advisement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 100% 100% ep 7 - Procentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? NO 100% 100% ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Exp 8 to 10 to 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20 20	ap 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%ABS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %ABS (%ABS) _b 102% 102% (from Table EP - 1) 100 100 if Portornance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 100 100 (from Table EP - 2) 100% 100% if PAR x Baseline (%ABS) _b 100% 100% (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ap 5 - Is %ABS < 34? NO NO ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %ABS) < 5eismic Rating 100% A ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %ABS < 67)? NO NO ap 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E E Relationship between Grade and %NBS: NO NO NO 20 Seismic Size > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	ap 4 - Percentage of New Building Standard (%ABS) Longitudinal Transverse Assessed Baseline %ABS (%ABS), (from Table EP - 1) 100 100 ? Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table EP - 2) 100 100 ? Percentage New Building Standard (%ABS) - Seismic Rating (Jee lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ap 5 - Is %ABS < 34? NO NO NO ap 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %ABS < 67)? NO NO ap 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: N E Seismic Size > 100 100 80 79 to 67 64 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	ble IFP-4	Initial Eval	uation Proce	dure Steps 4, 5, 6	and 7	Revie		5
Longitudinal Transverse Longitudinal Longitudi	Longitudinal Transverse Longitudinal Transverse Longitudinal Transverse Longitudinal Transverse (remote Rate IEP - 1) 102% 102% 102% (remote Table IEP - 1) 100 100 100 100 (remote Table IEP - 2) 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100	Longitudinal Transverse 1: Assessed Baseline %//BS (%//BS), (from Table IEP - 1) 2: Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 3: PAR x Baseline (%//BS), 1:00 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 4: Percentage New Building Standard (%//BS) - Seismic Rating 5: Porvisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP 5: Seismic Grade A 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 5: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 6: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) 6: Additional Commenta (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic ra	$Longitudinal Transverse$ $Longitudinal Transverse$ $I Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS)_h 102% 102% 102% 100% 100% 100 KBS (FAR) 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10$	ep 4 - Percentag	ge of New Bu	uilding Standar	d (%NBS)				
Assessed Baseline %/NBS (%/NBS), 102% 102% (from Table IEP - 1) 1.00 1.00 ? Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 1.00 ? PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 100% 100% ? PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 100% 100% ? Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% ? Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% ? Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% ? Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% ? Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %/NBS < 34? NO NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) ? Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %/NBS : E E D E D E <td>Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS), (from Table IEP - 1) 102% 102% Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 PAR x Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% IP PAR x Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% IP Parcentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% IP 5 - Is %MBS < 34?</td> NO NO Image: Seismic Rating 100% IP 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP NO Image: Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (Items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Image: A+ A B C D E Image: A+ A B C D C Z D Image: A+ A B C D Z Z D Image: A+ A B C D C Z D Image: A+ B C D C Z D Image: A+ B C D C Z D Image: A+ B C D Z Z D< <td>Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS), (from Table IEP - 1) 102% 102% Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 P PAx Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% It Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %MBS < 34?</td> NO 100% 100% ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %MBS < 67)? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Seismic State <td>Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS)₀. 102% 102% (from Table IEP - 1) 1.00 1.00 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 100% 100% P Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %MBS < 347</td> NO 100% ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Censervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E E E Relationship between Grade and %MBS : E D E E E \$\square{S} > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20 20 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Lo</td> <td>ngitudinal</td> <td></td> <td>Transverse</td>	Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS), (from Table IEP - 1) 102% 102% Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 PAR x Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% IP PAR x Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% IP Parcentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% IP 5 - Is %MBS < 34?	Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS), (from Table IEP - 1) 102% 102% Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 P PAx Baseline (%MBS), 100% 100% It Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %MBS < 34?	Assessed Baseline %MBS (%MBS)₀. 102% 102% (from Table IEP - 1) 1.00 1.00 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 100% 100% P Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating 100% 100% (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %MBS < 347					Lo	ngitudinal		Transverse
2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (from Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS) _b 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? NO NO NO ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS : Example 2 (2) 20 <td< th=""><td>2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table LEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Shep 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?</td> NO NO NO ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. E E Relationship between Grade and %NBS: XBS (S 0) 79 to 67 (66 to 34 (34 to 20 (20)) E<td>2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (rom Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS)_b. 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?</td> NO NO 100 NO ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Image: A + A B C D E Mo Seismic Si > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20<td>2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 (trum Table IEP - 2) 100% 100% 100% 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 347</td> NO NO ep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO ep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Censervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Censervative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: To a b c o b c o b c mode of the true of the top of top of the top of the top of the top of top<td>Assessed Bas (from Table I</td><td>Seline %NBS EP - 1)</td><td>(%NBS)_b</td><td></td><td></td><td>102%</td><td></td><td>102%</td></td<>	2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (trom Table LEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Shep 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) (rom Table IEP - 2) 1.00 1.00 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS) _b . 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	2 Performance Achievement Ratio (PAR) 1.00 1.00 (trum Table IEP - 2) 100% 100% 100% 3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 347	Assessed Bas (from Table I	Seline %NBS EP - 1)	(%NBS) _b			102%		102%
3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS) _b 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% exp 5 - Is %NBS < 34? NO exp 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? NO exp 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade A Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. A Relationship between Grade and %NBS : Seismic C a b c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c	a PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% ep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	3 PAR x Baseline (%NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% exp 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	3 PAR x Baseline (%/NBS), 100% 100% 4 Percentage New Building Standard (%/NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% ep 5 - Is %/NBS < 34?	2 Performance (from Table I	Achievement EP - 2)	Ratio (PAR)			1.00		1.00
4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% tep 5 - Is %NBS < 34? No tep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? No tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Seismic Grade Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	4 Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% tep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	A Percentage New Building Standard (%NBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% kep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	4 Percentage New Building Standard (%MBS) - Seismic Rating (Use lower of two values from Step 4.3) 100% Impose of two values from Step 4.3) NO NO NO Rep 5 - Is %MBS < 34?	3 PAR x Baselir	ne (%NBS) _b				100%		100%
http://www.statep.sci.is. http://www.statep.sci.is. http://www.statep.sci.is. No No <tr< th=""><td>hep 5 - Is %///BS < 34?</td> NO hep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %///BS < 67)? NO hep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %////////////////////////////////////<td>tep 5 - Is %//BS < 34?</td> tep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %//BS < 67)? tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %////BS:<td>tep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?</td> tep 5 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Seismic Grade Seismic Grade Seismic Grade<td>4 Percentage N (Use lower c</td><td>ew Building S of two values fro</td><td>Standard (%NBS m Step 4.3)</td><td>s) - Seismic Rating</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>100%</td></tr<>	hep 5 - Is %///BS < 34?	tep 5 - Is %//BS < 34?	tep 5 - Is %NBS < 34?	4 Percentage N (Use lower c	ew Building S of two values fro	Standard (%NBS m Step 4.3)	s) - Seismic Rating				100%
tep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)? tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Seismic Grade Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS :	tep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)?	hep 6 - Potentially Earthquake Risk (is %NBS < 67)?	http://www.setup.op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/op/o	tep 5 - Is <i>%NBS</i>	< 34?						NO
tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS:	tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Grade: A + A B C D %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34	tep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Searce: At a B Conservative assessments in 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	bep 7 - Provisional Grading for Seismic Risk based on IEP Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Seize: A+ A B C MNBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20	tep 6 - Potentiall	y Earthquak	e Risk (is <i>%NB</i>	S < 67)?				NO
Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Grade: A+ A B C D E	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Grade: A+ A+ B C D %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Belationship between Grade and %NBS: Grade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20	Additional Comments (items of note affecting IEP based seismic rating) Conservative assessments throughout result on 100% rating. Relationship between Grade and %NBS: Sector A + A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	tep 7 - Provision	al Grading f	or Seismic Ris	k based on IEP				
Grade: A+ A B C D E 000000000000000000000000000000000000	Grade: A+ A B C D E Grade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Grade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Grade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Additional Corr Conservative as	ments (items o	of note affecting IE ughout result on 10	EP based seismic rating) 00% rating.		Seism	ic Grade	
	Stade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Brade: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Oracle: A+ A B C D E %NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20	Additional Com Conservative as	ments (items o	of note affecting IB ughout result on 10	EP based seismic rating) 00% rating.		Seism		A
%NBS: > 100 100 to 80 79 to 67 66 to 34 < 34 to 20 < 20				Additional Com Conservative as Relationsh	ip betweer	of note affecting IB ughout result on 10 on Grade and	EP based seismic rating) 0% rating. %NBS:		Seism		1
				Additional Com Conservative as Relationsh	ip betweer Grade: %NBS:	of note affecting IB ughout result on 10 a Grade and A+ > 100	EP based seismic rating) 30% rating. %NBS: A B 100 to 80 79 to	C 67 66 to 3	Seism	E < 20	
				Additional Com Conservative as Relationsh	ip betweer Grade: %NBS:	of note affecting IB ughout result on 10 a Grade and A+ > 100	EP based seismic rating) 30% rating. %NBS: A B 100 to 80 79 to	C 67 66 to 3	Seism	E < 20	
				Additional Com Conservative as Relationsh	ip betweer Grade: %NBS:	of note affecting IB ughout result on 10 an Grade and $\frac{A+}{>100}$	EP based seismic rating) 30% rating. %NBS: A B 100 to 80 79 to	C 67 66 to 3	Seism	E < 20	

	t Number & Name: e of building:	Banks Road Ingham Enterprises Hatchery, 1997 & 200 Matamata	(NZ) Pty Ltd D1 Additions	Job No.: By: Date: Revision No.	19-021 SM 20/02/2019 :: B
))	le IEP-5 Initial Ev 8 - Identification of p significant risk to	valuation Procedure S otential Severe Structural a significant number of o	tep 8 Weaknesses (SSWs) ccupants) that could result in	
	Number of storeys abo	ove ground level			1
	Presence of heavy con	crete floors and/or concrete	e roof? (Y/N)		N
	Potential Sever	e Structural Weakner red out are not applicable and ner	esses (SSWs): ed not be considered.		
	Occupancy not cons	idered to be significant - I	no further considerat	ion required	
	Risk not considered	to be significant - no furth	ner consideration req	uired	
	The following potent in the building that c	ial Severe Structural Wea ould result in significant i	knesses (SSWs) have risk to a significant n	been identified umber of occupants:	
	1. None identified				
	2. Weak or soft store	y (except top storey)			
	3. Brittle columns an not constrained by	d/or beam-column joints to other structural elements	the deformations of v s	vhich are	
	4. Flat slab buildings connections	with lateral capacity relia	nt on low ductility sla	ab-to-column	
	5. No identifiable cor	nection between primary	structure and diaphr	agms	
	6. Leage and gap sta	irs			
	IEP Assessm	nent Confirmed by	flanger y	Signature	
		<u></u>	lan Kearney	Name	
			1151481	CPEng. No	

