### 6. EARTHQUAKE PRONE, DANGEROUS AND INSANITARY BUILDINGS POLICY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, 941-8462
fficer responsible:	Environmental Policy & Approvals Manager
Author:	John Buchan, Building Control Manager

## **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To report to the Council on the Policy and any recommended amendments thereto.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2. The Council adopted the Earthquake Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings policy on 25 May 2006. (Appendix A) The adoption of a policy was a requirement of the Building Act 2004.
- 3. The Council, at the time of the adoption of the policy, asked for annual reports on the policy and any recommended amendments thereto with the policy being subject to a full review no later than 2010.
- 4. Since the adoption of the policy in May 2006, 19 consents have been issued for earthquake strengthening work.
- 5. One area of the policy that it is suggested will need to be evaluated when a full review of the policy is carried out is the definition of "significant alteration" which triggers the requirement for an upgrade.
- 6. The methodology for undertaking the desktop study which is proposed in the policy has been the subject of recent work with GNS Science and National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research (NIWA), as well as Canterbury University.

# **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The cost of the studies have been provided for in Environmental Policy & Approvals budgets.

## Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

8. Yes.

## **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. When a full review is undertaken due consultation in terms of the Local Government Act 2002 is required.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. Yes.

# ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Yes.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

12. Yes.

## **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

Consistent with policy.

# Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes.

### **CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

Not required.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee receive the report.

# **BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

- 16. In the adopted policy the Council proposes to carry out an initial desktop review to ascertain the number of possible earthquake prone buildings and to establish reliable data on the number of buildings which were considered earthquake prone buildings under the 1991 Act and the degree of strengthening, if any, which has been undertaken to date.
- 17. The adopted policy also states that buildings will be categorised depending on the importance of the building and this data will be used to review the policy and set times for implementation of the strengthening programme.
- 18. Since the policy was adopted in May 2006 there have been 19 consent applications for consents involving earthquake strengthening. One area of confusion that has arisen in the operation of the policy is in the definition of "significant alteration". The definition is currently "Significant alteration, for the purposes of the policy, is building work on the structural support of the building or building work that has a value of more than the rateable value of the building" There have been questions as to whether this value includes the land value. There has also been a suggestion that a series of applications could be made and in this way the trigger level could be avoided. Some other organisations policies have a statement on the accumulative affect of a series of applications. These matters can be considered when a full review of the Policy is undertaken. A full review requires due consultation in terms of section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002
- 19. Since the policy was adopted there have been discussions with GNS Science and NIWA who are developing a Regional risk modelling tool for New Zealand. The modelling tool when completed will make it possible to quantify the relative role of the risks from different natural hazards.
- 20. We have been assisting the Project by providing building related information to assist in the development of a database of buildings in the Christchurch area.
- 21. We have been given access to information gathered during the research relating to buildings that we will be able to refine and check to assist in our objective of ascertaining the number of possible earthquake prone buildings.
- 22. An initial summation of the information produced the following figures:

1880 – 1889	5
1890 – 1899	27
1900 – 1909	130
1910 – 1919	153
1920 – 1929	173
1930 – 1939	124
1940 – 1949	66
1950 – 1959	354
1960 – 1969	765
1970 – 1979	1065
Missed/Remodelled	<u>762</u>
	3624

- 23. We have also been assisting a major research project which is being undertaken by a joint venture of Canterbury University and Auckland University and also involves collaboration with Universities in Italy and Australia. The research project is developing methods for retrofitting and strengthening Earthquake Prone buildings and producing information on costs.
- 24. As part of this project they are developing a classification system for building types and we will investigate the value of aligning our data with those building types.
- 25. The next stage of the desk top study is to check a sample of inner city blocks and establish if Webmap Geographical Information System (GIS) computer records correctly record the status of the building and any strengthening work that has been done. The importance level in terms of Appendix B of the policy will also be checked.
- 26. We intend to engage consultants for this section of work. Current budgets provide for this expenditure. The work is planned for completion in 2009 to allow the information to be used in the full review scheduled for 2010.