

50 The Octagon, PO Box 5045, Moray Place Dunedin 9058, New Zealand Telephone: 03 477 4000, Fax: 03 474 3594 Email: dcc@dcc.govt.nz

www.dunedin.govt.nz

Guidance for requesting peer review and producer statement (PS2) for structural design

Situations where peer review may be required:

- An author of a PS1 is not CPEng or on the Southern Building Control Group producer statement authors' register.
- Structures containing fabricated steel trusses span further than 20 metres. It is noted that lower pitches present greater risk as drainage falls may become insufficient due to roof deflections. The peer review would be limited to the trusses, supports, foundations and connections. *Note: Weld testing may be required to AS/NZS 1554, as referenced in NZS 3404 clause 9.7.1.1 (B1/VM1).*
- Cold formed portal frames, other than by proprietary manufacturers (such as Totalspan Buildings), span further than 10 metres. It is noted that lower pitches present greater risk as drainage falls may become insufficient due to roof deflections.
- New buildings of importance level 3 or above as defined by Clause A3 of the NZ Building Code. There will be exceptions, such as a 250 person primary school building consisting of simple single level spaces.
- New buildings, apart from detached dwellings, having more than three levels above ground.
- Any significant structural alterations are made to buildings of importance level 4 or 5, as defined by Clause A3 of the NZ Building Code.
- Structural designs involving alternative solutions, other than tested proprietary systems or products such as the Gib EzyBrace system.
- Projects involving significant structural work and an estimated build value exceeding \$5 million.

Notes:

- The spans above refer to the horizontal distance between supporting elements.
- A request for peer review is at the discretion of the Building Control Authority and is not solely limited to the situations above.
- Guidance on who can undertake a peer review is provided in section 2.3 of IPENZ
 Practice Note 2. Ideally the peer reviewer should be independent of the design or
 assessing engineer and their organisation and have no financial or other interest in
 the outcome of the peer review. See Practice Note 2 for further information.
- We recognise that some of the above guidelines are open to interpretation. In these cases we recommend discussion be held between designer and BCA at an early stage to determine the requirement for peer review.

Page **1** of **1** Date Issued: 12/05/2018