

**GEOTECHNICAL RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR PITTWATER  
FORM NO. 1 – To be submitted with Development Application**

Development Application for _____	Name of Applicant
Address of site <b>1 Bakers Road, Church Point</b>	

**Declaration made by geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist or coastal engineer (where applicable) as part of a geotechnical report**

I, **Agi Zenon** on behalf of **JK GEOTECHNICS**  
 (Insert Name) (Trading or Company Name)

on this the **3 December 2024** certify that I am a geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist or coastal engineer as defined by the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 and I am authorised by the above organisation/company to issue this document and to certify that the organisation/company has a current professional indemnity policy of at least \$2million.  
 We/I:

**Please mark appropriate box**

- have prepared the detailed Geotechnical Report referenced below in accordance with the Australia Geomechanics Society's Landslide Risk Management Guidelines (AGS 2007) and the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- Are willing to technically verify that the detailed Geotechnical Report referenced below has been prepared in accordance with the Australian Geomechanics Society's Landslide Risk Management Guidelines (AGS 2007) and the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- have examined the site and the proposed development in detail and have carried out a risk assessment in accordance with Section 6.0 of the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009. We/I confirm that the results of the risk assessment for the proposed development are in compliance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 and further detailed geotechnical reporting is not required for the subject site.
- have examined the site and the proposed development/alteration in detail and are/am of the opinion that the Development Application only involves Minor Development/Alteration that does not require a Geotechnical Report or Risk Assessment and hence my/our Report is in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 requirements.
- have examined the site and the proposed development/alteration is separate from and is not affected by a Geotechnical Hazard and does not require a Geotechnical Report or Risk Assessment and hence my Report is in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 requirements.
- have provided the coastal process and coastal forces analysis for inclusion in the Geotechnical Report


**Geotechnical Report Details:**

Report Title: <b>Geotechnical Assessment</b>	Report Ref No: <b>37190Zrpt</b>
Report Date: <b>3 Dec 24</b>	
Author: <b>Agi Zenon</b>	
Author's Company/Organisation: <b>JK GEOTECHNICS</b>	

**Documentation which relate to or are relied upon in report preparation:**

<b>Atelier Haefeli drawings A.01 to A.06, dated 16/09/24</b>

We are aware that the above Geotechnical Report, prepared for the abovementioned site is to be submitted in support of a Development Application for this site and will be relied on by Pittwater Council as the basis for confirming that the Geotechnical Risk Management aspects of the proposed development have been adequately addressed to achieve an "Acceptable Risk Management" level for the life of the structure, taken as at least 100 years unless otherwise stated and justified in the Report and that reasonable and practical measures have been identified to remove foreseeable risk, as discussed in the Report.

Signature .....   
 Name ..... **Agi Zenon** .....  
 Chartered Professional Status..... **CPEng; FIEAust** .....  
 Membership No. .... **2132971** .....  
 Company..... **JK GEOTECHNICS**.....

**GEOTECHNICAL RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR PITTWATER**  
**FORM NO. 1(a) - Checklist of Requirements For Geotechnical Risk Management Report for Development Application**

Development Application for _____	Name of Applicant
Address of site <u>1 Bakers Road, Church Point</u>	

The following checklist covers the minimum requirements to be addressed in a Geotechnical Risk Management Geotechnical Report. This checklist is to accompany the Geotechnical Report and its certification (Form No. 1).


**Geotechnical Report Details:**

Report Title: <b>Geotechnical Assessment</b>	Report Ref No: <b>37190Zrpt</b>
Report Date:	
Author: <b>Agi Zenon</b>	
Author's Company/Organisation: <b>JK GEOTECHNICS</b>	

**Please mark appropriate box**

- Comprehensive site mapping conducted 11 November 2024  
(date)
- Mapping details presented on contoured site plan with geomorphic mapping to a minimum scale of 1:200 (as appropriate)
- Subsurface investigation required
  - No Justification .....
  - Yes Date conducted 21/11/24 .....
- Geotechnical model developed and reported as an inferred subsurface type-section
- Geotechnical hazards identified
  - Above the site
  - On the site
  - Below the site
  - Beside the site
- Geotechnical hazards described and reported
- Risk assessment conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
  - Consequence analysis
  - Frequency analysis
- Risk calculation
- Risk assessment for property conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- Risk assessment for loss of life conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- Assessed risks have been compared to "Acceptable Risk Management" criteria as defined in the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- Opinion has been provided that the design can achieve the "Acceptable Risk Management" criteria provided that the specified recommendations presented in the Report are adopted.
- Design Life Adopted:
  - 100 years
  - Other .....
- Geotechnical Conditions to be applied to all four phases as described in the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 have been specified
- Additional action to remove risk where reasonable and practical have been identified and included in the report.
- Risk assessment within Bushfire Asset Protection Zone.

We are aware that Pittwater Council will rely on the Geotechnical Report, to which this checklist applies, as the basis for confirming that the geotechnical risk management aspects of the proposal have been adequately addressed to achieve an "Acceptable Risk Management" level for the life of the structure, taken as at least 100 years unless otherwise stated, and justified in the Report and that reasonable and practical measures have been identified to remove foreseeable risk as discussed in the Report.

Signature ..... 

Name ... Agi Zenon .....

Chartered Professional Status ... CPEng; FIEAust .....

Membership No. .... 2132971 .....

Company ..... JK GEOTECHNICS .....



---

**REPORT TO  
PETER BYFORD**

**ON  
GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT  
(In Accordance with Pittwater Council Risk  
Management Policy)**

**FOR  
PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS**

**AT  
1 BAKERS ROAD, CHURCH POINT, NSW**

Date: 3 December 2024  
Ref: 37190Zrpt2

**JKGeotechnics**  
[www.jkgeotechnics.com.au](http://www.jkgeotechnics.com.au)

T: +61 2 9888 5000  
JK Geotechnics Pty Ltd  
ABN 17 003 550 801



Report prepared by:



**Agi Zenon**  
Principal Consultant | Geotechnical Engineer

Report reviewed by:



**Paul Stubbs**  
Principal | Geotechnical Engineer

For and on behalf of  
JK GEOTECHNICS  
PO BOX 976  
NORTH RYDE BC NSW 1670

#### DOCUMENT REVISION RECORD

Report Reference	Report Status	Report Date
37190Zrpt	Final Report	3 December 2024

© Document copyright of JK Geotechnics

This report (which includes all attachments and annexures) has been prepared by JK Geotechnics (JKG) for its Client, and is intended for the use only by that Client.

This Report has been prepared pursuant to a contract between JKG and its Client and is therefore subject to:

- JKG's proposal in respect of the work covered by the Report;
- The limitations defined in the Client's brief to JKG;
- The terms of contract between JKG and the Client, including terms limiting the liability of JKG.

If the Client, or any person, provides a copy of this Report to any third party, such third party must not rely on this Report, except with the express written consent of JKG which, if given, will be deemed to be upon the same terms, conditions, restrictions and limitations as apply by virtue of (a), (b), and (c) above.

Any third party who seeks to rely on this Report without the express written consent of JKG does so entirely at their own risk and to the fullest extent permitted by law, JKG accepts no liability whatsoever, in respect of any loss or damage suffered by any such third party.

At the Company's discretion, JKG may send a paper copy of this report for confirmation. In the event of any discrepancy between paper and electronic versions, the paper version is to take precedence. The USER shall ascertain the accuracy and the suitability of this information for the purpose intended; reasonable effort is made at the time of assembling this information to ensure its integrity. The recipient is not authorised to modify the content of the information supplied without the prior written consent of JKG.



## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Walkover Survey	4
2.2	Subsurface Investigation	5
<b>3</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>8</b>
6.1	Potential Landslide Hazards	8
6.2	Risk Analysis	8
6.3	Risk Assessment	9
<b>7</b>	<b>COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>10</b>
7.1	Conditions Recommended to Establish the Design Parameters	10
7.2	Conditions Recommended to the Detailed Design to be Undertaken for the Construction Certificate	11
7.3	Conditions Recommended During the Construction Period	11
7.4	Conditions Recommended for Ongoing Management of the Site/Structure(s)	12
<b>8</b>	<b>OVERVIEW</b>	<b>12</b>

### **ATTACHMENTS**

**Borehole Log 1**

**Dynamic Cone Penetration Test Results**

**Figure 1: Site Location Plan**

**Figure 2: Test Location Plan**

**Appendix A: Landslide Risk Management Terminology**

**Appendix B: Some Guidelines For Hillside Construction**

**Appendix C: Borehole Logs and Location Plan (November 1980)**

**Report Explanation Notes**

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of our geotechnical assessment of the site of the proposed alterations and additions at 1 Bakers Road, Church Point, NSW. The location of the site is shown in Figure 1. The assessment was commissioned by Mr Peter Byford via signed 'Acceptance of Proposal' form which was attached to his email dated 17 November 2024. The commission was on the basis of our proposal (Ref: P70480Z) dated 24 October 2024. The site was inspected by the author of this report on 21 November 2024, in order to assess the existing stability of the site and the effect on stability of the proposed development. A geotechnical investigation was carried out concurrently with the stability assessment.

Details of the proposed development are presented in Section 5 below. In summary, however, it is proposed to construct a workshop, install a lift and reconfigure the interior of the house. Bulk excavations will not be required.

This report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater (2009) as discussed in Section 6 below. We understand that the report will be submitted to Council as part of the DA documentation. Our report is preceded by the completed Council Forms 1 and 1a.

We note that whilst preparing this report we inadvertently discovered that we had carried out an investigation on this site in November 1980. The original search of our geographic data base (which is our standard practice) did not identify this investigation report, as the site was incorrectly addressed as Baker, and not Bakers, Road. We have used the results of the previous investigation to supplement the results of the current investigation. We note however, that the logging terminology used in 1980 is different to that currently used and which is defined in the attached Report Explanation Notes.

## 2 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Walkover Survey

This stability assessment is based upon a detailed inspection of the topographic, surface drainage and geological conditions of the site and its immediate environs. These features were compared to those of other similar lots in neighbouring locations to provide a comparative basis for assessing the risk of instability affecting the proposed development. The attached Appendix A defines the terminology adopted for the risk assessment together with a flowchart illustrating the Risk Management Process based on the guidelines given in AGS 2007c (Reference 1).

A summary of our observations is presented in Section 3 below. Our specific recommendations regarding the proposed development are discussed in Section 7 following our geotechnical assessment.

Attached Figure 2 includes the existing features of the site, including spot heights, ground contours and existing improvements.

---

## 2.2 Subsurface Investigation

The fieldwork for the current subsurface investigation was carried out on Thursday 21 November 2024 and comprised the drilling of a single hand augered borehole (BH101) to a depth of 3.1m and the completion of three Dynamic Cone Penetration (DCP) tests (DCP101 to DCP103) to practical refusal at depths between 3.9m and 5.0m.

The investigation locations, as indicated on Figure 2, were set out using taped measurements from the existing building and were cleared of buried services using electromagnetic techniques and reference to 'Before You Dig Australia' drawings, prior to drilling and testing commencing. The surface Reduced Levels (RLs) at the investigation locations were estimated by interpolation between spot heights shown on architectural drawing A.01. The datum of the RLs is not indicated and we have taken it to be an assumed datum.

The composition of the subsoils was assessed by logging the materials recovered during drilling. The apparent compaction of the fill and strength of the underlying natural soils were assessed from the results of hand penetrometer testing and an interpretation of the DCP test results. Groundwater observations were made in the borehole during and on completion of drilling. No longer term groundwater observations were carried out.

Our geotechnical engineer was present full time on site during the fieldwork and set out the investigation locations, oversaw the electromagnetic scan, and prepared the borehole log and DCP test results sheet, copies of which are attached to this report. The Report Explanation Notes provide further details on the investigation techniques adopted, their limitations and the logging terms and symbols used.

Geotechnical laboratory testing was not carried out as it was not deemed appropriate. Contamination screen testing of the site soils was not within the agreed scope of this investigation.

The fieldwork for the previous investigation, which was carried out in November 1980, included the spiral auger drilling of three boreholes (BH1 to BH3) to depths between 5.4m and 12.0m using a truck mounted Edson R16 drilling rig. As previously mentioned, the logging terminology used in 1980 was different to that currently used and which is defined in the attached Report Explanation Notes. Also, the ground levels at the borehole locations were not indicated and are unknown. A copy of the previous borehole logs and the borehole location plan are presented in Appendix C to this report.

## 3 SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS

In order to facilitate descriptions, Bakers Road has been assumed to bound the site to the north.

The site is located just beyond the toe of a south-east facing hillside over a relatively flat coastal strip within approximately 25m of the Pittwater foreshore, which lies to the east. The site itself has a trapezoidal plan shape being an average of about 60m long (east to west) by about 10m to 30m wide (north to south), covers



---

an area of just under 1,200m<sup>2</sup> and is bounded by Bakers Road and Pittwater Road to the north and east, respectively.

At the time of our current investigation, the western portion of the site was occupied by a one and two storey house with an additional attic level. The house was of rendered and timber clad construction with a metal sheet roof, and appeared in good external condition based on a cursory inspection. A glass fenced pool area occupied the western corner of the site and included an in-ground pool with associated cabana and plant room. A double garage was incorporated over the northern portion of the house at ground floor level and a concrete driveway sloped down almost 1m from Bakers Road, before curving across as a paved driveway to the garage.

The house platform and pool area were on a roughly level area, which was supported along the southern and eastern sides by a brick wall up to 0.7m high. Hedges were located within a garden strip along the crest of the walls. Along the northern side, the building platform had been cut into the hillslope, which was supported by a brick wall up to 0.5m high. Gardens were located behind the crest of the wall. The house platform was surfaced with sandstone and concrete pavers. The pool surrounds were sandstone paved and included minor lawn areas.

The eastern portion of the site beyond the brick retaining wall was covered by lawn, included a perimeter hedge and several trees, and sloped down towards the east at approximately 4°.

A two storey unit building with basement was located approximately 2m beyond the southern site boundary. The extent of the basement was, however, not evident. Ground levels across the southern site boundary were similar, although the previously mentioned brick wall supporting the house platform on the subject site was set back a minimum of 1m from the boundary.

A two storey clad house was located a minimum of 0.5m beyond the southern end of the western site boundary. Ground levels across the western site boundary were similar.

Ground surface levels beyond the western site boundary sloped up at approximately 10°. Ground surface levels sloped up from the northern side of Bakers Road at approximately 12°. Viewing along the western boundary fence and the kerbs on each side of Bakers Road did not indicate any evidence of downslope movement or soil creep.

#### **4 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS**

The published 1:100,000 geological map of Sydney indicates that the site overlies the Newport Formation of the Narrabeen Group. The MinView portal (MinView is a NSW Government web map application that incorporates digital Seamless Geology) indicates that at the location of the site, the Newport Formation is overlain by Anthropogenic Deposits probably over Alluvial Valley or Estuarine Deposits, of Quaternary and Holocene age, respectively. The Anthropogenic Deposits *“vary from large man-made clasts (concrete blocks to building demolition rubble) to quarried natural boulders, with interstitial sand-sized to clay matrix”*. The Alluvial Valley Deposits comprise *“very fine-to fine grained (sporadically medium grained) lithic-quartz*

*sand (fluvial deposited), silt, clay, shell material”, whilst the Estuarine Deposits comprise “clay, silt, shell, very fine- to fine-grained lithic-quartz ( $\pm$  carbonate) sand (fluvially - and/or marine-deposited)”.*

The boreholes from both investigations have revealed a subsurface profile comprising relatively shallow fill over interbedded silty sand, clayey sand, sandy clay and clayey silt deposits. It should be noted that the near-surface conditions at the time of the original investigation may have changed substantially by the existing development. Bedrock was encountered at variable depth (in the moderate to deep range) and was overlain by clayey, possibly residual, soil. Groundwater was noted at relatively shallow depth. A summary of the encountered subsurface conditions is presented below:

- Concrete pavers 80mm thick over an 180mm thick sand bedding was encountered at the surface of BH101.
- Fill was encountered below the paving in BH101 and from the surface of BH1 to BH3. In BH101 the upper 0.24m of fill comprised silty clay of high plasticity with ironstone gravel. This was underlain to 1.1m depth by a silty sand fill with ironstone gravel, clay nodules, ash and concrete fragments. The fill in BH1 to BH3 comprised sandy gravelly clay and extended to 0.35m depth. The fill in BH101 was assessed to be poorly to moderately compacted.
- The fill was underlain by interbedded silty sand, clayey sand, clayey silt, and silty clay deposits which extended to depths of at least 3.1m (BH101), 11.2m (BH1), 4.8m (BH2) and 5.15m (BH3). The sandy soils were generally very loose or loose, whilst the clayey soils were generally soft or firm. The deep soils on the southern side of the house were generally much weaker than those to the north. The strength/density generally improved with depth. The clays below 8.2m in BH1 were of very stiff to hard strength. It is possible that the deeper of the above soils are residual.
- Siltstone bedrock was encountered at 11.2m depth in BH1 and extended to the borehole termination depth at 12.0m. Sandstone bedrock was encountered between 4.8m and 5.4m depth in BH2, and was underlain by claystone bedrock which extended to the borehole termination depth at 6.2m. The encountered bedrock generally had a ‘weak’ strength. Siltstone bedrock was inferred between 5.3m and 5.4m depth in BH3 at which depth “V” bit refusal occurred indicating rock probably of at least very low strength.
- Groundwater was noted in all of the boreholes. A groundwater level was measured between 1.4m and 1.8m depth up to 1 hour following completion of drilling each borehole. We note that the groundwater levels may not have stabilised during the limited observation period, Longer-term groundwater monitoring was not carried out. It is likely however, that the groundwater level below the site is tidal.

## 5 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

We understand from the provided preliminary Atelier Haefeli architectural drawings (A.01 to A.06, date stamped 16 September 2024), that the proposed alterations and additions will include the following:

- A workshop which will be attached to the southern elevation of the house. The building will comprise a light structure comprising timber cladding and a Colorbond sheeted roof, with a floor level approximately at existing grade.

- A lift will be located adjacent to the south-eastern corner of the pergola covered verandah to the north-west of the house. The lift will extend between the ground and first floor levels.
- The interior will be reconfigured, including a new staircase to the attic level.

We have assumed that typical structural loads (in the low range) for this type of development apply.

The footprints of the proposed workshop and lift development are indicated on Figure 2.

## 6 GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

The site itself is relatively flat, and includes relatively low landscape retaining walls. Therefore, although the site is shown to fall within Hazard Zone H1 on the Pittwater Geotechnical Hazard Map, instability issues on the site itself are not credible. However, there are ground slopes between approximately 10° and 12° beyond the western and northern site boundaries, where bedrock is likely to be present at shallow or moderate depth. Our inspection indicated no evidence of any recent mass soil and/or rock slope instability or downslope soil creep.

### 6.1 Potential Landslide Hazards

We consider that the potential landslide hazards associated with the site to be the stability of the hillslopes beyond the western and northern site boundaries. As a result of any such instability, the site may be impacted by debris deposition. Due to the shallow hillside slopes and the distance of the hillslope toes from the site, we consider that the debris may extend to, or just into, the site, but is unlikely to extend to any buildings or structures on site. We note that as these landslide hazards are located beyond the site boundaries and were therefore not captured by the site survey, which forms the basis of the attached Figure 2.

### 6.2 Risk Analysis

A summary of our qualitative assessment of the potential landslide hazards and of the consequences to property should the landslide hazard occur is tabulated below. Use has been made of data in MacGregor *et al* (2007) to assist with our assessment of the likelihood of a potential hazard occurring.

Assessed Likelihood	Assessed Consequences	Risk
Unlikely	Insignificant to Minor	Very Low to Low

The terminology adopted for this qualitative assessment is in accordance with Table A1 given in Appendix A. The table above indicates that the assessed risk to property varies between Very Low and Low, which would be considered 'acceptable' in accordance with the criteria given in Reference 1 and the Pittwater Council Risk Management Policy.



We have also used the indicative probabilities associated with the assessed likelihood of instability to calculate the risk to life. The temporal, vulnerability and spatial factors that have been adopted are given in the table below, together with the resulting risk calculation.

Assessed Likelihood	Indicative Annual Probability	Persons at Risk	Temporal Probability	Probability of Not Evacuating	Spatial Probability	Vulnerability to Life	Risk for Person Most at Risk
Unlikely	$10^{-4}$	Person in Northern or Western Yard	2hrs/day ie. 0.08	60% ie.0.6	80% ie. 0.8	0.3	$10^{-6}$

Our assessed risk to life for the person most at risk is about  $10^{-6}$ . This would be considered to be ‘acceptable’ in relation to the criteria given in Reference 1 and the Pittwater Council Risk Management Policy.

### 6.3 Risk Assessment

The Pittwater Risk Management Policy requires suitable measures ‘to remove risk’. It is recognised that, due to the many complex factors that can affect a site, the subjective nature of a risk analysis, and the imprecise nature of the science of geotechnical engineering, the risk of instability for a site and/or development cannot be completely removed. It is, however, essential that risk be reduced to at least that which could be reasonably anticipated by the community in everyday life and that landowners are made aware of reasonable and practical measures available to reduce risk as far as possible. Hence, where the policy requires that ‘reasonable and practical measures have been identified to remove risk’, it means that there has been an active process of reducing risk, but it does not require the geotechnical engineer to warrant that risk has been completely removed, only reduced, as removing risk is not currently scientifically achievable.

Similarly, the Pittwater Risk Management Policy requires that the design project life be taken as 100 years unless otherwise justified by the applicant. This requirement provides the context within which the geotechnical risk assessment should be made. The required 100 years baseline broadly reflects the expectations of the community for the anticipated life of a residential structure and hence the timeframe to be considered when undertaking the geotechnical risk assessment and making recommendations as to the appropriateness of a development, and its design and remedial measures that should be taken to control risk. It is recognised that in a 100 year period external factors that cannot reasonably be foreseen may affect the geotechnical risks associated with a site. Hence, the Policy does not seek the geotechnical engineer to warrant the development for a 100 year period, rather to provide a professional opinion that foreseeable geotechnical risks to which the development may be subjected in that timeframe have been reasonably considered.

In preparing our recommendations given below, we have adopted the above interpretations of the Risk Management Policy requirements. We have also assumed that no activities on surrounding land which may affect the risk on the subject site would be carried out. We have further assumed that all Council’s buried services are, and will be regularly maintained to remain, in good condition.

---

**We consider that our risk analysis has shown that the site and existing and proposed development can achieve the ‘Acceptable Risk Management’ criteria in the Pittwater Risk Management Policy provided that the recommendations given in Section 7 below are adopted. These recommendations form an integral part of the Landslide Risk Management Process.**

## **7 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

We consider that the proposed development may proceed provided the following specific design, construction and maintenance recommendations are adopted to maintain and reduce the present risk of instability of the site and to control future risks. These recommendations address geotechnical issues only and other conditions may be required to address other aspects.

### **7.1 Conditions Recommended to Establish the Design Parameters**

7.1.1 Based on the recommendations of our previous report and the existing good condition of the existing house, it is highly probable that the existing house is supported by pile footings founded in the underlying bedrock. Also, based on the current and previous investigations, the poorer density/strength soils extend to greater depths over the southern portion of the site (ie. BH1, BH101, DCP101 and DCP102).

7.1.2 Given the poor subsoils which underlie the site, which are compressible with low density/strength, a suitable footing system for the proposed relatively light and flexible workshop structure, is a stiffened raft or waffle raft. However, the bearing pressure at founding level must be limited to no higher than 50kPa. The stiffened raft or waffle raft can be designed based on shrink-swell movements associated with a Class S site, in accordance with AS2870-2011, though we recommend that a stiffer raft be used than that for a Class S site to help to limit the effects of differential settlements that may occur due to the poor foundation materials. This option of constructing on high-level footings is associated with some risk of the actual total and/or differential settlements being significant, as the subsoils are poor and variable, and their performance is difficult to predict. Architectural detailing of internal and external finishes, including incorporation of articulation, is particularly important so as to reduce the effects of excessive settlements.

The lift can be supported on a slab footing provided that it is founded on sandy clay/clayey sand soils of at least stiff/medium dense strength/relative density as indicated by the higher blow counts in DCP103 below 1.2m depth, though it should be noted that excavations to these depths may well encounter seepage and may be difficult to manage. As the lift will tie-in to the existing house it is important that it is founded on competent materials such that differential settlements between the lift and the main structure do not cause performance issues. Some shoring/timbering of the excavation may be necessary and care would be required to ensure the excavation does not disturb existing structures.

7.1.3 In order to reduce potential settlements and remove the risks in this regard, the proposed workshop and lift shafts should be piled. The piles should be founded in the underlying bedrock, which in BH1 was encountered at 11.2m depth. We note that this depth should be used for

guidance only as the surface RL of BH1 is not known. Further, the strength and quality of the bedrock which was penetrated by BH1 is relatively low/poor. We therefore recommend that the proposed piles be founded in bedrock of at least low strength (as defined in the attached Report Explanation Notes) where an allowable end bearing pressure of 700kPa is appropriate. In addition, an allowable side adhesion value of 50kPa may be adopted for rock sockets in low, or higher strength, bedrock.

Given the subsurface conditions encountered, including relatively loose sands and shallow groundwater, suitable pile types include continuous flight auger (CFA) concrete/grout piles or steel screw piles. Steel screw piles should be designed for end bearing only, as effective rock sockets cannot be formed. Both of these pile types are generally certified by the piling contractor, who must confirm that the installed piles are adequate to safely support the nominated structural loads.

- 7.1.4 The following subgrade preparation is recommended. Following the removal of the pavers and the stripping of the bedding sand, the footprint of the workshop and of the lift shaft should be excavated to suit their respective design subgrade levels. The exposed subgrade at the proposed workshop location should then be proof rolled with a 5 tonne minimum deadweight smooth drum roller. An impact rammer is probably best suited to proof roll the subgrade at the proposed lift location. The proof rolling should be carried out under the direction of an experienced earthworks foreman, geo-technician or geotechnical engineer to assist in the detection of soft spots or unstable areas. Any soft spots or unstable areas which are identified during proof rolling should be locally excavated down to a firm base and replaced with well compacted granular fill (eg. DGB20 compacted to 95% Standard Maximum Dry Density). A sub-base layer comprising DGB20 at least 100mm thick should be placed below the slab and compacted to at least 98% of Standard Maximum Dry Density to provide a more uniform support for the slab.

## **7.2 Conditions Recommended to the Detailed Design to be Undertaken for the Construction Certificate**

- 7.2.1 All structural design drawings must be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer who should endorse that the recommendations contained in this report have been adopted in principle.
- 7.2.2 All hydraulic design drawings must be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer who should endorse that the recommendations contained in this report have been adopted in principle.
- 7.2.3 All landscape design drawings must be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer who should endorse that the recommendations contained in this report have been adopted in principle.

## **7.3 Conditions Recommended During the Construction Period**

- 7.3.1 The piles must be certified by the piling contractor, if appropriate.
- 7.3.2 Any high level footings should be inspected and tested by a geotechnical engineer who should be prepared to sign Form 3 on completion.



- 
- 7.3.3 Proof rolling must be directed by an experienced earthworks foreman, geo-technician or geotechnical engineer.
  - 7.3.4 The geotechnical engineer must confirm that the proposed alterations and additions have been completed in accordance with the geotechnical reports.

We note that all above Conditions must be complied with. Where this has not been done, it may not be possible for Form 3, which is required for the Occupation Certificate to be signed.

#### **7.4 Conditions Recommended for Ongoing Management of the Site/Structure(s)**

The following recommendations have been included so that the current and future owners of the subject property are aware of their responsibilities:

- 7.4.1 All existing and proposed surface (including roof) and subsurface drains must be subject to ongoing and regular maintenance by the property owners. In addition, such maintenance must also be carried out by a plumber at no more than ten yearly intervals; including provision of a written report confirming scope of work completed (with reference to the 'as-built' drawing) and identifying any required remedial measures.
- 7.4.2 No cut or fill in excess of 0.5m (eg. for landscaping, buried pipes, retaining walls, etc), is to be carried out on site without prior consent from Pittwater Council.
- 7.4.3 Where the structural engineer has indicated a design life of less than 100 years then the structure and/or structural elements must be inspected by a structural engineer at the end of their design life; including a written report confirming scope of work completed and identifying the required remedial measures to extend the design life over the remaining 100 year period.

### **8 OVERVIEW**

The recommendations presented in this report include specific issues to be addressed during the design and construction phase of the project. In the event that any of the advice presented in this report is not implemented, the general recommendations may become inapplicable and JK Geotechnics accept no responsibility whatsoever for the performance of the structure where recommendations are not implemented in full and properly tested, inspected and documented.

Occasionally, the subsurface conditions between the completed boreholes and DCP tests may be found to be different (or may be interpreted to be different) from those expected. Variation can also occur with groundwater conditions, especially after climatic changes. If such differences appear to exist, we recommend that you immediately contact this office.

This report provides advice on geotechnical aspects for the proposed civil and structural design. As part of the documentation stage of this project, Contract Documents and Specifications may be prepared based on our report. However, there may be design features we are not aware of or have not commented on for a variety of reasons. The designers should satisfy themselves that all the necessary advice has been obtained.



---

If required, we could be commissioned to review the geotechnical aspects of contract documents to confirm the intent of our recommendations has been correctly implemented.

A waste classification is required for any soil and/or bedrock excavated from the site prior to offsite disposal. Subject to the appropriate testing, material can be classified as Virgin Excavated Natural Material (VENM), Excavated Natural Material (ENM), General Solid, Restricted Solid or Hazardous Waste. Analysis can take up to seven to ten working days to complete, therefore, an adequate allowance should be included in the construction program unless testing is completed prior to construction. If contamination is encountered, then substantial further testing (and associated delays) could be expected. We strongly recommend that this requirement is addressed prior to the commencement of excavation on site.

This report has been prepared for the particular project described and no responsibility is accepted for the use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose. If there is any change in the proposed development described in this report then all recommendations should be reviewed. Copyright in this report is the property of JK Geotechnics. We have used a degree of care, skill and diligence normally exercised by consulting engineers in similar circumstances and locality. No other warranty expressed or implied is made or intended. Subject to payment of all fees due for the investigation, the client alone shall have a licence to use this report. The report shall not be reproduced except in full.

- Reference 1: Australian Geomechanics Society (2007c) *'Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management'*, Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, pp63-114.
- Reference 2: MacGregor, P, Walker, B, Fell, R, and Leventhal, A (2007) *'Assessment of Landslide Likelihood in the Pittwater Local Government Area'*, Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, pp183-196.
-

# JKGeotechnics

## BOREHOLE LOG



Borehole No.  
**101**  
1/1

**Client:** MR AND MRS BYFORD  
**Project:** PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS  
**Location:** 1 BAKERS STREET, CHURCH POINT, NSW

**Job No.:** 37190Z      **Method:** HAND AUGER      **R.L. Surface:** ≈ 4.7m  
**Date:** 21/11/24      **Datum:** ASSUMED  
**Plant Type:** -      **Logged/Checked by:** A.M./

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES			Field Tests	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa.)	Remarks
	FS	USO	DB									
				REFER TO DCP TEST RESULTS SHEET	0		-	BRICK PAVERS: 80mm.t FILL: Silty sand, fine to medium grained, brown.	M			APPEARS POORLY TO MODERATELY COMPACTED
					0.5			FILL: Silty clay, high plasticity, orange and red brown, trace of fine to medium grained sand, fine grained ironstone gravel, and ash.	w>PL		250 300 310	
					1			FILL: Silty sand, fine to medium grained, brown, with fine to medium grained igneous gravel, trace of clay nodules, ash, slag, concrete fragments and root fibres. as above, but without inclusions.	M			
					1.5		SM	Silty SAND: fine to medium grained, grey, trace of fine to medium grained ironstone gravel. as above, but light brown and grey, without ironstone gravel.	M	L		ALLUVIAL
					2		SC	Clayey SAND: fine to medium grained, grey and light brown.	W	VL-L		
					2.5		ML	Clayey SILT: low plasticity, dark grey, trace of fine to medium grained sand.	w>PL	S	30 40 50	
					3		SM	Silty SAND: fine to coarse grained, dark grey.	W	L		
					3.1			END OF BOREHOLE AT 3.1m				TARGET DEPTH REACHED
					3.5							



## DYNAMIC CONE PENETRATION TEST RESULTS

Client:		MR AND MRS BYFORD					
Project:		PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS					
Location:		1 BAKERS STREET, CHURCH POINT, NSW					
Job No.	37190Z	Hammer Weight & Drop: 9kg/510mm					
Date:	21-11-24	Rod Diameter: 16mm					
Tested By:	A.M.	Point Diameter: 20mm					
Test Location	<b>101</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	Test Location	<b>101</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>
Surface RL	≈4.7m	≈4.7m	≈4.9m	Surface RL	≈4.7m	≈4.7m	≈4.9m
Depth (mm)	Blows per 100mm Penetration			Depth (mm)	Blows per 100mm Penetration		
0 - 100	1	1	SUNK	3000-3100	6	7	17
100 - 200	3	2	2	3100-3200	4	14	17
200 - 300	4	2	1	3200-3300	4	10	16
300 - 400	6	3	↓	3300-3400	7	13	19
400 - 500	4	20	2	3400-3500	8	17	17
500 - 600	5	7	1	3500-3600	18	15	15
600 - 700	6	4	↓	3600-3700	20	14	20
700 - 800	5	4	3	3700-3800	17	16	19
800 - 900	3	2	↓	3800-3900	14	19	19
900 - 1000	3	2	3	3900-4000	12	15	END
1000 - 1100	3	3	3	4000-4100	12	19	
1100 - 1200	3	2	5	4100-4200	9	12	
1200 - 1300	3	4	7	4200-4300	6	19	
1300 - 1400	3	2	9	4300-4400	6	18	
1400 - 1500	2	2	11	4400-4500	7	19	
1500 - 1600	2	2	12	4500-4600	7	17	
1600 - 1700	2	2	11	4600-4700	7	16	
1700 - 1800	1	1	13	4700-4800	5	17	
1800 - 1900	5	↓	15	4800-4900	6	20	
1900 - 2000	1	↓	15	4900-5000	6	END	
2000 - 2100	2	1	13	5000-5100	END		
2100 - 2200	3	↓	12	5100-5200			
2200 - 2300	3	1	12	5200-5300			
2300 - 2400	3	↓	12	5300-5400			
2400 - 2500	4	3	13	5400-5500			
2500 - 2600	4	4	12	5500-5600			
2600 - 2700	3	5	14	5600-5700			
2700 - 2800	3	6	14	5700-5800			
2800 - 2900	2	9	21	5800-5900			
2900 - 3000	3	7	19	5900-6000			
Remarks:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The procedure used for this test is described in AS1289.6.3.2-1997 (R2013)</li> <li>Usually 8 blows per 20mm is taken as refusal</li> <li>Datum of levels is ASSUMED</li> </ol>						



AERIAL IMAGE SOURCE: MAPS.AU.NEARMAP.COM


Title:		<b>SITE LOCATION PLAN</b>	
Location:		1 BAKERS ROAD, CHURCH POINT, NSW	
Report No:	37190Z	Figure No:	1



This plan should be read in conjunction with the JK Geotechnics report.

**JK Geotechnics**

PLOT DATE: 26/11/2024 3:04:02 PM DWG FILE: J:\WF GEOTECHNICAL JOBS\37000\S37190Z CHURCH POINT\CAD\37190Z.DWG



- LEGEND**
- BOREHOLE
  - ⊕ DCP TEST

<p>SCALE 1:200 @A3 METRES</p>	<p>Title: <b>TEST LOCATION PLAN</b></p> <p>Location: 1 BAKERS ROAD, CHURCH POINT, NSW</p> <p>Report No: 37190Z Figure No: 2</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">JKGeotechnics</p>	
This plan should be read in conjunction with the JK Geotechnics report.		



# **APPENDIX A**

---

**LANDSLIDE RISK  
MANAGEMENT  
TERMINOLOGY**



## LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT

### Definition of Terms and Landslide Risk

Risk Terminology	Description
<b>Acceptable Risk</b>	A risk for which, for the purposes of life or work, we are prepared to accept as it is with no regard to its management. Society does not generally consider expenditure in further reducing such risks justifiable.
<b>Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)</b>	The estimated probability that an event of specified magnitude will be exceeded in any year.
<b>Consequence</b>	The outcomes or potential outcomes arising from the occurrence of a landslide expressed qualitatively or quantitatively, in terms of loss, disadvantage or gain, damage, injury or loss of life.
<b>Elements at Risk</b>	The population, buildings and engineering works, economic activities, public services utilities, infrastructure and environmental features in the area potentially affected by landslides.
<b>Frequency</b>	A measure of likelihood expressed as the number of occurrences of an event in a given time. See also 'Likelihood' and 'Probability'.
<b>Hazard</b>	A condition with the potential for causing an undesirable consequence (the landslide). The description of landslide hazard should include the location, volume (or area), classification and velocity of the potential landslides and any resultant detached material, and the likelihood of their occurrence within a given period of time.
<b>Individual Risk to Life</b>	The risk of fatality or injury to any identifiable (named) individual who lives within the zone impacted by the landslide; or who follows a particular pattern of life that might subject him or her to the consequences of the landslide.
<b>Landslide Activity</b>	The stage of development of a landslide; pre failure when the slope is strained throughout but is essentially intact; failure characterised by the formation of a continuous surface of rupture; post failure which includes movement from just after failure to when it essentially stops; and reactivation when the slope slides along one or several pre-existing surfaces of rupture. Reactivation may be occasional (eg. seasonal) or continuous (in which case the slide is 'active').
<b>Landslide Intensity</b>	A set of spatially distributed parameters related to the destructive power of a landslide. The parameters may be described quantitatively or qualitatively and may include maximum movement velocity, total displacement, differential displacement, depth of the moving mass, peak discharge per unit width, or kinetic energy per unit area.
<b>Landslide Risk</b>	The AGS Australian GeoGuide LR7 (AGS, 2007e) should be referred to for an explanation of Landslide Risk.
<b>Landslide Susceptibility</b>	The classification, and volume (or area) of landslides which exist or potentially may occur in an area or may travel or retrogress onto it. Susceptibility may also include a description of the velocity and intensity of the existing or potential landsliding.
<b>Likelihood</b>	Used as a qualitative description of probability or frequency.
<b>Probability</b>	<p>A measure of the degree of certainty. This measure has a value between zero (impossibility) and 1.0 (certainty). It is an estimate of the likelihood of the magnitude of the uncertain quantity, or the likelihood of the occurrence of the uncertain future event.</p> <p>These are two main interpretations:</p> <p>(i) Statistical – frequency or fraction – The outcome of a repetitive experiment of some kind like flipping coins. It includes also the idea of population variability. Such a number is called an 'objective' or relative frequentist probability because it exists in the real world and is in principle measurable by doing the experiment.</p>

Risk Terminology	Description
<b>Probability (continued)</b>	(ii) Subjective probability (degree of belief) – Quantified measure of belief, judgment, or confidence in the likelihood of an outcome, obtained by considering all available information honestly, fairly, and with a minimum of bias. Subjective probability is affected by the state of understanding of a process, judgment regarding an evaluation, or the quality and quantity of information. It may change over time as the state of knowledge changes.
<b>Qualitative Risk Analysis</b>	An analysis which uses word form, descriptive or numeric rating scales to describe the magnitude of potential consequences and the likelihood that those consequences will occur.
<b>Quantitative Risk Analysis</b>	An analysis based on numerical values of the probability, vulnerability and consequences and resulting in a numerical value of the risk.
<b>Risk</b>	A measure of the probability and severity of an adverse effect to health, property or the environment. Risk is often estimated by the product of probability x consequences. However, a more general interpretation of risk involves a comparison of the probability and consequences in a non-product form.
<b>Risk Analysis</b>	The use of available information to estimate the risk to individual, population, property, or the environment, from hazards. Risk analyses generally contain the following steps: scope definition, hazard identification and risk estimation.
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	The process of risk analysis and risk evaluation.
<b>Risk Control or Risk Treatment</b>	The process of decision-making for managing risk and the implementation or enforcement of risk mitigation measures and the re-evaluation of its effectiveness from time to time, using the results of risk assessment as one input.
<b>Risk Estimation</b>	The process used to produce a measure of the level of health, property or environmental risks being analysed. Risk estimation contains the following steps: frequency analysis, consequence analysis and their integration.
<b>Risk Evaluation</b>	The stage at which values and judgments enter the decision process, explicitly or implicitly, by including consideration of the importance of the estimated risks and the associated social, environmental and economic consequences, in order to identify a range of alternatives for managing the risks.
<b>Risk Management</b>	The complete process of risk assessment and risk control (or risk treatment).
<b>Societal Risk</b>	The risk of multiple fatalities or injuries in society as a whole: one where society would have to carry the burden of a landslide causing a number of deaths, injuries, financial, environmental and other losses.
<b>Susceptibility</b>	See 'Landslide Susceptibility'.
<b>Temporal Spatial Probability</b>	The probability that the element at risk is in the area affected by the landsliding, at the time of the landslide.
<b>Tolerable Risk</b>	A risk within a range that society can live with so as to secure certain net benefits. It is a range of risk regarded as non-negligible and needing to be kept under review and reduced further if possible.
<b>Vulnerability</b>	The degree of loss to a given element or set of elements within the area affected by the landslide hazard. It is expressed on a scale of 0 (no loss) to 1 (total loss). For property, the loss will be the value of the damage relative to the value of the property; for persons, it will be the probability that a particular life (the element at risk) will be lost, given the person(s) is affected by the landslide.

**NOTE:** Reference should be made to Figure A1 which shows the inter-relationship of many of these terms and the relevant portion of Landslide Risk Management.

Reference should also be made to the paper referenced below for Landslide Terminology and more detailed discussion of the above terminology.

**This appendix is an extract from PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT as presented in Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, which discusses the matter more fully.**




FIGURE A1: Flowchart for Landslide Risk Management.

This figure is an extract from GUIDELINE FOR LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBILITY, HAZARD AND RISK ZONING FOR LAND USE PLANNING, as presented in Australian Geomechanics Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, which discusses the matter more fully.

**TABLE A1: LANDSLIDE RISK ASSESSMENT  
QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY**

**QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD**

Approximate Annual Probability		Implied Indicative Landslide Recurrence Interval		Description	Descriptor	Level
Indicative Value	Notional Boundary					
10 <sup>-1</sup>	5×10 <sup>-2</sup>	10 years	20 years	The event is expected to occur over the design life.	ALMOST CERTAIN	A
10 <sup>-2</sup>		100 years		The event will probably occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	LIKELY	B
10 <sup>-3</sup>	5×10 <sup>-3</sup>	1000 years	200 years	The event could occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	POSSIBLE	C
10 <sup>-4</sup>	5×10 <sup>-4</sup>	10,000 years	2000 years	The event might occur under very adverse circumstances over the design life.	UNLIKELY	D
10 <sup>-5</sup>	5×10 <sup>-5</sup>	100,000 years	20,000 years	The event is conceivable but only under exceptional circumstances over the design life.	RARE	E
10 <sup>-6</sup>	5×10 <sup>-2</sup>	1,000,000 years	200,000 years	The event is inconceivable or fanciful over the design life.	BARELY CREDIBLE	F

**Note:** (1) The table should be used from left to right; use Approximate Annual Probability or Description to assign Descriptor, not *vice versa*.

**QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY**

Approximate cost of Damage		Description	Descriptor	Level
Indicative Value	Notional Boundary			
200%	100%	Structure(s) completely destroyed and/or large scale damage requiring major engineering works for stabilisation. Could cause at least one adjacent property major consequence damage.	CATASTROPHIC	1
60%		Extensive damage to most of structure, and/or extending beyond site boundaries requiring significant stabilisation works. Could cause at least one adjacent property medium consequence damage.	MAJOR	2
20%	40%	Moderate damage to some of structure, and/or significant part of site requiring large stabilisation works. Could cause at least one adjacent property minor consequence damage.	MEDIUM	3
5%	10%	Limited damage to part of structure, and/or part of site requiring some reinstatement stabilisation works.	MINOR	4
0.5%	1%	Little damage. (Note for high probability event (Almost Certain), this category may be subdivided at a notional boundary of 0.1%. See Risk Matrix.)	INSIGNIFICANT	5

**Notes:** (2) The Approximate Cost of Damage is expressed as a percentage of market value, being the cost of the improved value of the unaffected property which includes the land plus the unaffected structures.

(3) The Approximate Cost is to be an estimate of the direct cost of the damage, such as the cost of reinstatement of the damaged portion of the property (land plus structures), stabilisation works required to render the site to tolerable risk level for the landslide which has occurred and professional design fees, and consequential costs such as legal fees, temporary accommodation. It does not include additional stabilisation works to address other landslides which may affect the property.

(4) The table should be used from left to right; use Approximate Cost of Damage or Description to assign Descriptor, not *vice versa*.

Extract from PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT as presented in Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, which discusses the matter more fully.

**TABLE A1: LANDSLIDE RISK ASSESSMENT**  
**QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY (continued)**

**QUALITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX – LEVEL OF RISK TO PROPERTY**

LIKELIHOOD		CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY (With Indicative Approximate Cost of Damage)				
	Indicative Value of Approximate Annual Probability	1: CATASTROPHIC 200%	2: MAJOR 60%	3: MEDIUM 20%	4: MINOR 5%	5: INSIGNIFICANT 0.5%
<b>A – ALMOST CERTAIN</b>	10 <sup>-1</sup>	VH	VH	VH	H	M or L (5)
<b>B – LIKELY</b>	10 <sup>-2</sup>	VH	VH	H	M	L
<b>C – POSSIBLE</b>	10 <sup>-3</sup>	VH	H	M	M	VL
<b>D – UNLIKELY</b>	10 <sup>-4</sup>	H	M	L	L	VL
<b>E – RARE</b>	10 <sup>-5</sup>	M	L	L	VL	VL
<b>F – BARELY CREDIBLE</b>	10 <sup>-6</sup>	L	VL	VL	VL	VL

- Notes:** (5) Cell A5 may be subdivided such that a consequence of less than 0.1% is Low Risk.  
(6) When considering a risk assessment it must be clearly stated whether it is for existing conditions or with risk control measures which may not be implemented at the current time.

**RISK LEVEL IMPLICATIONS**

Risk Level		Example Implications (7)
VH	VERY HIGH RISK	Unacceptable without treatment. Extensive detailed investigation and research, planning and implementation of treatment options essential to reduce risk to Low; may be too expensive and not practical. Work likely to cost more than value of the property.
H	HIGH RISK	Unacceptable without treatment. Detailed investigation, planning and implementation of treatment options required to reduce risk to Low. Work would cost a substantial sum in relation to the value of the property.
M	MODERATE RISK	May be tolerated in certain circumstances (subject to regulator's approval) but requires investigation, planning and implementation of treatment options to reduce the risk to Low. Treatment options to reduce to Low risk should be implemented as soon as practicable.
L	LOW RISK	Usually acceptable to regulators. Where treatment has been required to reduce the risk to this level, ongoing maintenance is required.
VL	VERY LOW RISK	Acceptable. Manage by normal slope maintenance procedures.

- Note:** (7) The implications for a particular situation are to be determined by all parties to the risk assessment and may depend on the nature of the property at risk; these are only given as a general guide.

Extract from PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT as presented in Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007, which discusses the matter more fully.



## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR2 (LANDSLIDES)

### What is a Landslide?

Any movement of a mass of rock, debris, or earth, down a slope, constitutes a “landslide”. Landslides take many forms, some of which are illustrated. More information can be obtained from Geoscience Australia, or by visiting its Australian landslide Database at [www.ga.gov.au/urban/factsheets/landslide.jsp](http://www.ga.gov.au/urban/factsheets/landslide.jsp). Aspects of the impact of landslides on buildings are dealt with in the book “Guideline Document Landslide Hazards” published by the Australian Building Codes Board and referenced in the Building Code of Australia. This document can be purchased over the internet at the Australian Building Codes Board’s website [www.abcb.gov.au](http://www.abcb.gov.au).

Landslides vary in size. They can be small and localised or very large, sometimes extending for kilometres and involving millions of tonnes of soil or rock. It is important to realise that even a 1 cubic metre boulder of soil, or rock, weighs at least 2 tonnes. If it falls, or slides, it is large enough to kill a person, crush a car, or cause serious structural damage to a house. The material in a landslide may travel downhill well beyond the point where the failure first occurred, leaving destruction in its wake. It may also leave an unstable slope in the ground behind it, which has the potential to fall again, causing the landslide to extend (regress) uphill, or expand sideways. For all these reasons, both “potential” and “actual” landslides must be taken very seriously. They present a real threat to life and property and require proper management.

Identification of landslide risk is a complex task and must be undertaken by a geotechnical practitioner (GeoGuide LR1) with specialist experience in slope stability assessment and slope stabilisation.

### What Causes a Landslide?

Landslides occur as a result of local geological and groundwater conditions, but can be exacerbated by inappropriate development (GeoGuide LR8), exceptional weather, earthquakes and other factors. Some slopes and cliffs never seem to change, but are actually on the verge of failing. Others, often moderate slopes (Table 1), move continuously, but so slowly that it is not apparent to a casual observer. In both cases, small changes in conditions can trigger a landslide with serious consequences. Wetting up of the ground (which may involve a rise in groundwater table) is the single most important cause of landslides (GeoGuide LR5). This is why they often occur during, or soon after, heavy rain. Inappropriate development often results in small scale landslides which are very expensive in human terms because of the proximity of housing and people.

### Does a Landslide Affect You?

Any slope, cliff, cutting, or fill embankment may be a hazard which has the potential to impact on people, property, roads and services. Some tell-tale signs that might indicate that a landslide is occurring are listed below:

- Open cracks, or steps, along contours
- Groundwater seepage, or springs
- Bulging in the lower part of the slope
- Hummocky ground
- trees leaning down slope, or with exposed roots
- debris/fallen rocks at the foot of a cliff
- tilted power poles, or fences
- cracked or distorted structures

These indications of instability may be seen on almost any slope and are not necessarily confined to the steeper ones (Table 1). Advice should be sought from a geotechnical practitioner if any of them are observed. Landslides do not respect property boundaries. As mentioned above they can “run-out” from above, “regress” from below, or expand sideways, so a landslide hazard affecting your property may actually exist on someone else’s land.

Local councils are usually aware of slope instability problems within their jurisdiction and often have specific development and maintenance requirements. **Your local council is the first place to make enquiries if you are responsible for any sort of development or own or occupy property on or near sloping land or a cliff.**

TABLE 1 – Slope Descriptions

Appearance	Slope Angle	Maximum Gradient	Slope Characteristics
Gentle	0° - 10°	1 on 6	Easy walking.
Moderate	10° - 18°	1 on 3	Walkable. Can drive and manoeuvre a car on driveway.
Steep	18° - 27°	1 on 2	Walkable with effort. Possible to drive straight up or down roughened concrete driveway, but cannot practically manoeuvre a car.
Very Steep	27° - 45°	1 on 1	Can only climb slope by clutching at vegetation, rocks, etc.
Extreme	45° - 64°	1 on 0.5	Need rope access to climb slope.
Cliff	64° - 84°	1 on 0.1	Appears vertical. Can abseil down.
Vertical or Overhang	84° - 90±°	Infinite	Appears to overhang. Abseiler likely to lose contact with the face.

Some typical landslides which could affect residential housing are illustrated below:

**Rotational or circular slip failures (Figure 1)** - can occur on moderate to very steep soil and weathered rock slopes (Table 1). The sliding surface of the moving mass tends to be deep seated. Tension cracks may open at the top of the slope and bulging may occur at the toe. The ground may move in discrete "steps" separated by long periods without movement. More rapid movement may occur after heavy rain.




Figure 1

**Translational slip failures (Figure 2)** - tend to occur on moderate to very steep slopes (Table 1) where soil, or weak rock, overlies stronger strata. The sliding mass is often relatively shallow. It can move, or deform slowly (creep) over long periods of time. Extensive linear cracks and hummocks sometimes form along the contours. The sliding mass may accelerate after heavy rain.




Figure 2

**Wedge failures (Figure 3)** - normally only occur on extreme slopes, or cliffs (Table 1), where discontinuities in the rock are inclined steeply downwards out of the face.

**Rock falls (Figure 3)** - tend to occur from cliffs and overhangs (Table 1).

Cliffs may remain, apparently unchanged, for hundreds of years. Collections of boulders at the foot of a cliff may indicate that rock falls are ongoing. Wedge failures and rock falls do not "creep". Familiarity with a particular local situation can instil a false sense of security since failure, when it occurs, is usually sudden and catastrophic.




Figure 3

**Debris flows and mud slides (Figure 4)** - may occur in the foothills of ranges, where erosion has formed valleys which slope down to the plains below. The valley bottoms are often lined with loose eroded material (debris) which can "flow" if it becomes saturated during and after heavy rain. Debris flows are likely to occur with little warning; they travel a long way and often involve large volumes of soil. The consequences can be devastating.




Figure 4

More information relevant to your particular situation may be found in other Australian GeoGuides:

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR3 - Soil Slopes
- GeoGuide LR4 - Rock Slopes
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

The Australian GeoGuides (LR series) are a set of publications intended for property owners; local councils; planning authorities; developers; insurers; lawyers and, in fact, anyone who lives with, or has an interest in, a natural or engineered slope, a cutting, or an excavation. They are intended to help you understand why slopes and retaining structures can be a hazard and what can be done with appropriate professional advice and local council approval (if required) to remove, reduce, or minimise the risk they represent. The GeoGuides have been prepared by the [Australian Geomechanics Society](#), a specialist technical society within Engineers Australia, the national peak body for all engineering disciplines in Australia, whose members are professional geotechnical engineers and engineering geologists with a particular interest in ground engineering. The GeoGuides have been funded under the Australian governments' National Disaster Mitigation Program.

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR7 (LANDSLIDE RISK)

### Concept of Risk

Risk is a familiar term, but what does it really mean? It can be defined as *"a measure of the probability and severity of an adverse effect to health, property, or the environment."* This definition may seem a bit complicated. In relation to landslides, geotechnical practitioners (see GeoGuide LR1) are required to assess risk in terms of the likelihood that a particular landslide will occur and the possible consequences. This is called landslide risk assessment. The consequences of a landslide are many and varied, but our concerns normally focus on loss of, or damage to, property and loss of life.

### Landslide Risk Assessment

Some local councils in Australia are aware of the potential for landslides within their jurisdiction and have responded by designating specific **"landslide hazard zones"**. Development in these areas is normally covered by special regulations. If you are contemplating building, or buying an existing house, particularly in a hilly area, or near cliffs, then go first for information to your local council.

**Landslide risk assessment must be undertaken by a geotechnical practitioner.** It may involve visual inspection, geological mapping, geotechnical investigation and monitoring to identify:

- potential landslides (there may be more than one that could impact on your site);
- the likelihood that they will occur;
- the damage that could result;
- the cost of disruption and repairs; and
- the extent to which lives could be lost.

Risk assessment is a predictive exercise, but since the ground and the processes involved are complex, prediction tends to lack precision. If you commission a landslide risk assessment

for a particular site you should expect to receive a report prepared in accordance with current professional guidelines and in a form that is acceptable to your local council, or planning authority.

### Risk to Property

Table 1 indicates the terms used to describe risk to property. Each risk level depends on an assessment of how likely a landslide is to occur and its consequences in dollar terms. "Likelihood" is the chance of it happening in any one year, as indicated in Table 2. "Consequences" are related to the cost of the repairs and temporary loss of use if the landslide occurs. These two factors are combined by the geotechnical practitioner to determine the Qualitative Risk.

**TABLE 2 – LIKELIHOOD**

Likelihood	Annual Probability
Almost Certain	1:10
Likely	1:100
Possible	1:1,000
Unlikely	1:10,000
Rare	1:100,000
Barely credible	1:1,000,000

The terms "unacceptable", "may be tolerable" etc. in Table 1 indicate how most people react to an assessed risk level. However, some people will always be more prepared, or better able, to tolerate a higher risk level than others.

Some local councils and planning authorities stipulate a maximum tolerable risk level of risk to property for developments within their jurisdictions. In these situations the risk must be assessed by a geotechnical practitioner. If stabilisation works are needed to meet the stipulated requirements these will normally have to be carried out as part of the development, or consent will be withheld.

**TABLE 1 – RISK TO PROPERTY**

Qualitative Risk		Significance - Geotechnical engineering requirements
Very high	VH	<b>Unacceptable</b> without treatment. Extensive detailed investigation and research, planning and implementation of treatment options essential to reduce risk to Low. May be too expensive and not practical. Work likely to cost more than the value of the property.
High	H	<b>Unacceptable</b> without treatment. Detailed investigation, planning and implementation of treatment options required to reduce risk to acceptable level. Work would cost a substantial sum in relation to the value of the property.
Moderate	M	<b>May be tolerated</b> in certain circumstances (subject to regulator's approval) but requires investigation, planning and implementation of treatment options to reduce the risk to Low. Treatment options to reduce to Low risk should be implemented as soon as possible.
Low	L	<b>Usually acceptable</b> to regulators. Where treatment has been needed to reduce the risk to this level, ongoing maintenance is required.
Very Low	VL	<b>Acceptable.</b> Manage by normal slope maintenance procedures.

## Risk to Life

Most of us have some difficulty grappling with the concept of risk and deciding whether, or not, we are prepared to accept it. However, without doing any sort of analysis, or commissioning a report from an "expert", we all take risks every day. One of them is the risk of being killed in an accident. This is worth thinking about, because it tells us a lot about ourselves and can help to put an assessed risk into a meaningful context. By identifying activities that we either are, or are not, prepared to engage in, we can get some indication of the maximum level of risk that we are prepared to take. This knowledge can help us to decide whether we really are able to accept a particular risk, or to tolerate a particular likelihood of loss, or damage, to our property (Table 2).

In Table 3, data from NSW for the years 1998 to 2002, and other sources, is presented. A risk of 1 in 100,000 means that, in any one year, 1 person is killed for every 100,000 people undertaking that particular activity. The NSW data assumes that the whole population undertakes the activity. That is, we are all at risk of being killed in a fire, or of choking on our food, but it is reasonable to assume that only people who go deep sea fishing run a risk of being killed while doing it.

It can be seen that the risks of dying as a result of falling, using a motor vehicle, or engaging in water-related activities (including bathing) are all greater than 1:100,000 and yet few people actively avoid situations where these risks are present. Some people are averse to flying and yet it represents a lower risk than choking to death on food. The data also indicate that, even when the risk of dying as a consequence of a particular event is very small, it could still happen to any one of us today. If this were not so, there would be no risk at all and clearly that is not the case.

In NSW, the planning authorities consider that 1:1,000,000 is the maximum tolerable risk for domestic housing built near an obvious hazard, such as a chemical factory. Although not specifically considered in the NSW guidelines there is little difference between the hazard presented by a neighbouring factory and a landslide: both have the capacity to destroy life and property and both are always present.

**TABLE 3 – RISK TO LIFE**

Risk (deaths per participant per year)	Activity/Event Leading to Death (NSW data unless noted)
1:1,000	Deep sea fishing (UK)
1:1,000 to 1:10,000	Motor cycling, horse riding, ultra-light flying (Canada)
1:23,000	Motor vehicle use
1:30,000	Fall
1:70,000	Drowning
1:180,000	Fire/burn
1:660,000	Choking on food
1:1,000,000	Scheduled airlines (Canada)
1:2,300,000	Train travel
1:32,000,000	Lightning strike

### More information relevant to your particular situation may be found in other Australian GeoGuides:

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR3 - Soil Slopes
- GeoGuide LR4 - Rock Slopes
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

The Australian GeoGuides (LR series) are a set of publications intended for property owners; local councils; planning authorities; developers; insurers; lawyers and, in fact, anyone who lives with, or has an interest in, a natural or engineered slope, a cutting, or an excavation. They are intended to help you understand why slopes and retaining structures can be a hazard and what can be done with appropriate professional advice and local council approval (if required) to remove, reduce, or minimise the risk they represent. The GeoGuides have been prepared by the [Australian Geomechanics Society](#), a specialist technical society within Engineers Australia, the national peak body for all engineering disciplines in Australia, whose members are professional geotechnical engineers and engineering geologists with a particular interest in ground engineering. The GeoGuides have been funded under the Australian governments' National Disaster Mitigation Program.



---

# APPENDIX B

---

## SOME GUIDELINES FOR HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION



## SOME GUIDELINES FOR HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION


ADVICE	GOOD ENGINEERING PRACTICE	POOR ENGINEERING PRACTICE
GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	Obtain advice from a qualified, experienced geotechnical consultant at early stage of planning and before site works.	Prepare detailed plan and start site works before geotechnical advice.
<b>PLANNING</b>		
SITE PLANNING	Having obtained geotechnical advice, plan the development with the risk arising from the identified hazards and consequences in mind.	Plan development without regard for the Risk.
<b>DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</b>		
HOUSE DESIGN	Use flexible structures which incorporate properly designed brickwork, timber or steel frames, timber or panel cladding. Consider use of split levels. Use decks for recreational areas where appropriate.	Floor plans which require extensive cutting and filling. Movement intolerant structures.
SITE CLEARING	Retain natural vegetation wherever practicable.	Indiscriminately clear the site.
ACCESS & DRIVEWAYS	Satisfy requirements below for cuts, fills, retaining walls and drainage. Council specifications for grades may need to be modified. Driveways and parking areas may need to be fully supported on piers.	Excavate and fill for site access before geotechnical advice.
EARTHWORKS	Retain natural contours wherever possible.	Indiscriminant bulk earthworks.
CUTS	Minimise depth. Support with engineered retaining walls or batter to appropriate slope. Provide drainage measures and erosion control.	Large scale cuts and benching. Unsupported cuts. Ignore drainage requirements.
	FILLS	Loose or poorly compacted fill, which if it fails, may flow a considerable distance (including onto properties below). Block natural drainage lines. Fill over existing vegetation and topsoil. Include stumps, trees, vegetation, topsoil, boulders, building rubble etc. in fill.
ROCK OUTCROPS & BOULDERS	Remove or stabilise boulders which may have unacceptable risk. Support rock faces where necessary.	Disturb or undercut detached blocks or boulders.
RETAINING WALLS	Engineer design to resist applied soil and water forces. Found on bedrock where practicable. Provide subsurface drainage within wall backfill and surface drainage on slope above. Construct wall as soon as possible after cut/fill operation.	Construct a structurally inadequate wall such as sandstone flagging, brick or unreinforced blockwork. Lack of subsurface drains and weepholes.
FOOTINGS	Found within bedrock where practicable. Use rows of piers or strip footings oriented up and down slope. Design for lateral creep pressures if necessary. Backfill footing excavations to exclude ingress of surface water.	Found on topsoil, loose fill, detached boulders or undercut cliffs.
SWIMMING POOLS	Engineer designed. Support on piers to rock where practicable. Provide with under-drainage and gravity drain outlet where practicable. Design for high soil pressures which may develop on uphill side whilst there may be little or no lateral support on downhill side.	
DRAINAGE	SURFACE	Discharge at top of fills and cuts. Allow water to pond bench areas.
	SUBSURFACE	Discharge of roof run-off into absorption trenches.
SEPTIC & SULLAGE	Usually requires pump-out or mains sewer systems; absorption trenches may be possible in some areas if risk is acceptable. Storage tanks should be water-tight and adequately founded.	Discharge sullage directly onto and into slopes. Use of absorption trenches without consideration of landslide risk.
EROSION CONTROL & LANDSCAPING	Control erosion as this may lead to instability. Revegetate cleared area.	Failure to observe earthworks and drainage recommendations when landscaping.
<b>DRAWINGS AND SITE VISITS DURING CONSTRUCTION</b>		
DRAWINGS	Building Application drawings should be viewed by a geotechnical consultant.	
SITE VISITS	Site visits by consultant may be appropriate during construction.	
<b>INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE BY OWNER</b>		
OWNER'S RESPONSIBILITY	Clean drainage systems; repair broken joints in drains and leaks in supply pipes. Where structural distress is evident seek advice. If seepage observed, determine cause or seek advice on consequences.	

This table is extracted from PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT as presented in *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007 which discusses the matter more fully.

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR8 (CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE)

Sensible development practices are required when building on hillsides, particularly if the hillside has more than a low risk of instability (GeoGuide LR7). Only building techniques intended to maintain, or reduce, the overall level of landslide risk should be considered. Examples of good hillside construction practice are illustrated below.

### EXAMPLES FOR GOOD HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE



#### WHY ARE THESE PRACTICES GOOD?

**Roadways and parking areas** - are paved and incorporate kerbs which prevent water discharging straight into the hillside (GeoGuide LR5).

**Cuttings** - are supported by retaining walls (GeoGuide LR6).

**Retaining walls** - are engineer designed to withstand the lateral earth pressures and surcharges expected, and include drains to prevent water pressures developing in the backfill. Where the ground slopes steeply down towards the high side of a retaining wall, the disturbing force (see GeoGuide LR6) can be two or more times that due to level ground. Retaining walls must be designed taking these forces into account.

**Sewage** - whether treated or not is either taken away in pipes or contained in properly founded tanks so it cannot soak into the ground.

**Surface water** - from roofs and other hard surfaces is piped away to a suitable discharge point rather than being allowed to infiltrate into the ground. Preferably, the discharge point will be in a natural creek where ground water exits, rather than enters, the ground. Shallow, lined, drains on the surface can fulfill the same purpose (GeoGuide LR5).

**Surface loads** - are minimised. No fill embankments have been built. The house is a lightweight structure. Foundation loads have been taken down below the level at which a landslide is likely to occur and, preferably, to rock. This sort of construction is probably not applicable to soil slopes (GeoGuide LR3). If you are uncertain whether your site has rock near the surface, or is essentially a soil slope, you should engage a geotechnical practitioner to find out.


**Flexible structures** - have been used because they can tolerate a certain amount of movement with minimal signs of distress and maintain their functionality.

**Vegetation clearance** - on soil slopes has been kept to a reasonable minimum. Trees, and to a lesser extent smaller vegetation, take large quantities of water out of the ground every day. This lowers the ground water table, which in turn helps to maintain the stability of the slope. Large scale clearing can result in a rise in water table with a consequent increase in the likelihood of a landslide (GeoGuide LR5). An exception may have to be made to this rule on steep rock slopes where trees have little effect on the water table, but their roots pose a landslide hazard by dislodging boulders.

Possible effects of ignoring good construction practices are illustrated on page 2. Unfortunately, these poor construction practices are not as unusual as you might think and are often chosen because, on the face of it, they will save the developer, or owner, money. You should not lose sight of the fact that the cost and anguish associated with any one of the disasters illustrated, is likely to more than wipe out any apparent savings at the outset.

#### ADOPT GOOD PRACTICE ON HILLSIDE SITES

## EXAMPLES FOR **POOR** HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE



### WHY ARE THESE PRACTICES POOR?

**Roadways and parking areas** - are unsurfaced and lack proper table drains (gutters) causing surface water to pond and soaks into the ground.

**Cut and fill** - has been used to balance earthworks quantities and level the site leaving unstable cut faces and added large surface loads to the ground. Failure to compact the fill properly has led to settlement, which will probably continue for several years after completion. The house and pool have been built on the fill and have settled with it and cracked. Leakage from the cracked pool and the applied surface loads from the fill have combined to cause landslides.

**Retaining walls** - have been avoided, to minimise cost, and hand placed rock walls used instead. Without applying engineering design principles, the walls have failed to provide the required support to the ground and have failed, creating a very dangerous situation.

**A heavy, rigid, house** - has been built on shallow, conventional, footings. Not only has the brickwork cracked because of the resulting ground movements, but it has also become involved in a man-made landslide.

**Soak-away drainage** - has been used for sewage and surface water run-off from roofs and pavements. This water soaks into the ground and raises the water table (GeoGuide LR5). Subsoil drains that run along the contours should be avoided for the same reason. If felt necessary, subsoil drains should run steeply downhill in a chevron, or herringbone, pattern. This may conflict with the requirements for effluent and surface water disposal (GeoGuide LR9) and if so, you will need to seek professional advice.

**Rock debris** - from landslides higher up on the slope seems likely to pass through the site. Such locations are often referred to by geotechnical practitioners as "debris flow paths". Rock is normally even denser than ordinary fill, so even quite modest boulders are likely to weigh many tonnes and do a lot of damage once they start to roll. Boulders have been known to travel hundreds of metres downhill leaving behind a trail of destruction.

**Vegetation** - has been completely cleared, leading to a possible rise in the water table and increased landslide risk (GeoGuide LR5).

### DON'T CUT CORNERS ON HILLSIDE SITES - OBTAIN ADVICE FROM A GEOTECHNICAL PRACTITIONER

More information relevant to your particular situation may be found in other Australian GeoGuides:

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| • GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction     | • GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk                    |
| • GeoGuide LR3 - Soil Slopes      | • GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction             |
| • GeoGuide LR4 - Rock Slopes      | • GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal |
| • GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage | • GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides               |
| • GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls  | • GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping                   |

The Australian GeoGuides (LR series) are a set of publications intended for property owners; local councils; planning authorities; developers; insurers; lawyers and, in fact, anyone who lives with, or has an interest in, a natural or engineered slope, a cutting, or an excavation. They are intended to help you understand why slopes and retaining structures can be a hazard and what can be done with appropriate professional advice and local council approval (if required) to remove, reduce, or minimise the risk they represent. The GeoGuides have been prepared by the [Australian Geomechanics Society](#), a specialist technical society within Engineers Australia, the national peak body for all engineering disciplines in Australia, whose members are professional geotechnical engineers and engineering geologists with a particular interest in ground engineering. The GeoGuides have been funded under the Australian governments' National Disaster Mitigation Program.



# **APPENDIX C**


---

**BOREHOLE LOGS AND  
LOCATION PLAN  
(NOVEMBER 1980)**

# BOREHOLE LOG

Client: *G. TRUWELL & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD*  
 Project: *PROPOSED RESIDENCE*  
 Location: *LOT 4 CNR. PITTWATER & BAKER ROADS CHURCH POINT*

Job No. *1375* Method: *SPIRAL AUGER*  
 Date: *18.11.80* *EDSON R16*

Groundwater record	Samples	FIELD TESTS	Depth (m.)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition	Consistency/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings kPa.	Remarks
						<i>FILL: sandy gravelly clay red</i>				
					LL	<i>SILTY CLAY: medium plasticity, grey with frequent roots</i>	MC>PL	F		
	<i>DS</i>	<i>N=3 (3.2.1)</i>	<i>1</i>		SM	<i>SILTY SAND: fine to medium grained, grey</i>		V.L.		
<i>▲</i> <i>Ally</i> <i>1.5r</i>					SC-CL	<i>CLAYEY SAND / SANDY CLAY medium plasticity, dark grey sand fine grained: organic odour</i>	MC>PL	V.S.		
		<i>SELF WT.</i> <i>N=1/500mm</i>	<i>2</i>							
			<i>3</i>		OH	<i>ORGANIC CLAY: high plasticity dark grey</i>	MC>PL	F		
		<i>N=1/500mm</i>	<i>4</i>		SC	<i>CLAYEY SAND: fine to medium grained: fine medium plasticity, grey</i>	MC>PL	S (VL)		
			<i>5</i>							
			<i>6</i>							
			<i>7</i>							

# BOREHOLE LOG

Client: <i>G. TRUWELL &amp; ASSOCIATES PTY LTD</i>										
Project: <i>PROPOSED RESIDENCE</i>										
Location: <i>LOT 4 COR. PITTWATER &amp; BAKER ROADS CHURCH POINT</i>										
Job No. <i>1375</i>					Method: <i>SPIRAL AUGER</i>					
Date: <i>18.11.80</i>					<i>ERSON R16</i>					
Groundwater record	Samples	FIELD TESTS	Depth (m.)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition	Consistency/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings KPa.	Remarks
			7		SC	<i>as above</i>				
			8		CL	<i>SANDY CLAY: medium plasticity, reddish brown</i>		<i>F to SE to VSE</i>		
			9		CH	<i>CLAY: high plasticity light grey</i>	<i>ML:PL</i>	<i>VST-H</i>		
			10							
			11							
			12			<i>SILTSTONE: greyish brown very weak to weak to medium strong.</i>				
			13			<i>END BHE 12.0m</i>				

# BOREHOLE LOG


Client: *G. TRUWELL & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD*  
 Project: *PROPOSED RESIDENCE*  
 Location: *LOT 4 CNR. PITTWATER & BAKER ROADS CHURCH POINT*

Job No. *1375* Method: *SPIRAL AUGER*  
 Date: *18.11.80* *EDSON R16*

Groundwater record	Samples	FIELD TESTS	Depth (m.)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition	Consistency/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings kPa.	Remarks
				X		<i>FILL: sandy gravelly clay red</i>				
			1	SM		<i>SILTY SAND: fine grained grey, some roots.</i>		L		
			2	CL-SC		<i>SANDY CLAY / CLAYEY SAND</i>	ML@PL	SE		
	DS	N=10 (3,5,5)				<i>medium plasticity: sand fine to medium grained grey</i>			180 270 250 380 320	
			3							
	DS	N=13 (1,8,5)				<i>as above but with reddish brown mottling.</i>				
			4							
			5			<i>SANDSTONE: extremely to highly weathered, weak to medium strength, red, iron stained.</i>				<i>V BIT REFUSAL</i>
			6			<i>CLAYSTONE: extremely to highly weathered weak grey with red iron stains.</i>				
						<i>END BHR 6.2m</i>				
			7							

▼  
after 1 hour





LOCATION OF BOREHOLES.

# REPORT EXPLANATION NOTES

## INTRODUCTION

These notes have been provided to amplify the geotechnical report in regard to classification methods, field procedures and certain matters relating to the Comments and Recommendations section. Not all notes are necessarily relevant to all reports.

The ground is a product of continuing natural and man-made processes and therefore exhibits a variety of characteristics and properties which vary from place to place and can change with time. Geotechnical engineering involves gathering and assimilating limited facts about these characteristics and properties in order to understand or predict the behaviour of the ground on a particular site under certain conditions. This report may contain such facts obtained by inspection, excavation, probing, sampling, testing or other means of investigation. If so, they are directly relevant only to the ground at the place where and time when the investigation was carried out.

## DESCRIPTION AND CLASSIFICATION METHODS

The methods of description and classification of soils and rocks used in this report are based on Australian Standard 1726:2017 'Geotechnical Site Investigations'. In general, descriptions cover the following properties – soil or rock type, colour, structure, strength or density, and inclusions. Identification and classification of soil and rock involves judgement and the Company infers accuracy only to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice.

Soil types are described according to the predominating particle size and behaviour as set out in the attached soil classification table qualified by the grading of other particles present (eg. sandy clay) as set out below:

Soil Classification	Particle Size
Clay	< 0.002mm
Silt	0.002 to 0.075mm
Sand	0.075 to 2.36mm
Gravel	2.36 to 63mm
Cobbles	63 to 200mm
Boulders	> 200mm

Non-cohesive soils are classified on the basis of relative density, generally from the results of Standard Penetration Test (SPT) as below:

Relative Density	SPT 'N' Value (blows/300mm)
Very loose (VL)	< 4
Loose (L)	4 to 10
Medium dense (MD)	10 to 30
Dense (D)	30 to 50
Very Dense (VD)	> 50

Cohesive soils are classified on the basis of strength (consistency) either by use of a hand penetrometer, vane shear, laboratory testing and/or tactile engineering examination. The strength terms are defined as follows.

Classification	Unconfined Compressive Strength (kPa)	Indicative Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)
Very Soft (VS)	≤ 25	≤ 12
Soft (S)	> 25 and ≤ 50	> 12 and ≤ 25
Firm (F)	> 50 and ≤ 100	> 25 and ≤ 50
Stiff (St)	> 100 and ≤ 200	> 50 and ≤ 100
Very Stiff (VSt)	> 200 and ≤ 400	> 100 and ≤ 200
Hard (Hd)	> 400	> 200
Friable (Fr)	Strength not attainable – soil crumbles	

Rock types are classified by their geological names, together with descriptive terms regarding weathering, strength, defects, etc. Where relevant, further information regarding rock classification is given in the text of the report. In the Sydney Basin, 'shale' is used to describe fissile mudstone, with a weakness parallel to bedding. Rocks with alternating inter-laminations of different grain size (eg. siltstone/claystone and siltstone/fine grained sandstone) is referred to as 'laminite'.

## SAMPLING

Sampling is carried out during drilling or from other excavations to allow engineering examination (and laboratory testing where required) of the soil or rock.

Disturbed samples taken during drilling provide information on plasticity, grain size, colour, moisture content, minor constituents and, depending upon the degree of disturbance, some information on strength and structure. Bulk samples are similar but of greater volume required for some test procedures.

Undisturbed samples are taken by pushing a thin-walled sample tube, usually 50mm diameter (known as a U50), into the soil and withdrawing it with a sample of the soil contained in a relatively undisturbed state. Such samples yield information on structure and strength, and are necessary for laboratory determination of shrink-swell behaviour, strength and compressibility. Undisturbed sampling is generally effective only in cohesive soils.

Details of the type and method of sampling used are given on the attached logs.

## INVESTIGATION METHODS

The following is a brief summary of investigation methods currently adopted by the Company and some comments on their use and application. All methods except test pits, hand auger drilling and portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometers require the use of a mechanical rig which is commonly mounted on a truck chassis or track base.

**Test Pits:** These are normally excavated with a backhoe or a tracked excavator, allowing close examination of the insitu soils and 'weaker' bedrock if it is safe to descend into the pit. The depth of penetration is limited to about 3m for a backhoe and up to 6m for a large excavator. Limitations of test pits are the problems associated with disturbance and difficulty of reinstatement and the consequent effects on close-by structures. Care must be taken if construction is to be carried out near test pit locations to either properly recompact the backfill during construction or to design and construct the structure so as not to be adversely affected by poorly compacted backfill at the test pit location.

**Hand Auger Drilling:** A borehole of 50mm to 100mm diameter is advanced by manually operated equipment. Refusal of the hand auger can occur on a variety of materials such as obstructions within any fill, tree roots, hard clay, gravel or ironstone, cobbles and boulders, and does not necessarily indicate rock level.

**Continuous Spiral Flight Augers:** The borehole is advanced using 75mm to 115mm diameter continuous spiral flight augers, which are withdrawn at intervals to allow sampling and insitu testing. This is a relatively economical means of drilling in clays and in sands above the water table. Samples are returned to the surface by the flights or may be collected after withdrawal of the auger flights, but they can be very disturbed and layers may become mixed. Information from the auger sampling (as distinct from specific sampling by SPTs or undisturbed samples) is of limited reliability due to mixing or softening of samples by groundwater, or uncertainties as to the original depth of the samples. Augering below the groundwater table is of even lesser reliability than augering above the water table.

**Rock Augering:** Use can be made of a Tungsten Carbide (TC) bit for auger drilling into rock to indicate rock quality and continuity by variation in drilling resistance and from examination of recovered rock cuttings. This method of investigation is quick and relatively inexpensive but provides only an indication of the likely rock strength and predicted values may be in error by a strength order. Where rock strengths may have a significant impact on construction feasibility or costs, then further investigation by means of cored boreholes may be warranted.

**Wash Boring:** The borehole is usually advanced by a rotary bit, with water being pumped down the drill rods and returned up the annulus, carrying the drill cuttings. Only major changes in stratification can be assessed from the cuttings, together with some information from "feel" and rate of penetration.

**Mud Stabilised Drilling:** Either Wash Boring or Continuous Core Drilling can use drilling mud as a circulating fluid to stabilise the borehole. The term 'mud' encompasses a range of products ranging from bentonite to polymers. The mud tends to mask the cuttings and reliable identification is only possible from intermittent intact sampling (eg. from SPT and U50 samples) or from rock coring, etc.

**Continuous Core Drilling:** A continuous core sample is obtained using a diamond tipped core barrel. Provided full core recovery is achieved (which is not always possible in very low strength rocks and granular soils), this technique provides a very reliable (but relatively expensive) method of investigation. In rocks, NMLC or HQ triple tube core barrels, which give a core of about 50mm and 61mm diameter, respectively, is usually used with water flush. The length of core recovered is compared to the length drilled and any length not recovered is shown as NO CORE. The location of NO CORE recovery is determined on site by the supervising engineer; where the location is uncertain, the loss is placed at the bottom of the drill run.

**Standard Penetration Tests:** Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) are used mainly in non-cohesive soils, but can also be used in cohesive soils, as a means of indicating density or strength and also of obtaining a relatively undisturbed sample. The test procedure is described in Australian Standard 1289.6.3.1–2004 (R2016) *'Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes, Soil Strength and Consolidation Tests – Determination of the Penetration Resistance of a Soil – Standard Penetration Test (SPT)'*.

The test is carried out in a borehole by driving a 50mm diameter split sample tube with a tapered shoe, under the impact of a 63.5kg hammer with a free fall of 760mm. It is normal for the tube to be driven in three successive 150mm increments and the 'N' value is taken as the number of blows for the last 300mm. In dense sands, very hard clays or weak rock, the full 450mm penetration may not be practicable and the test is discontinued.

The test results are reported in the following form:

- In the case where full penetration is obtained with successive blow counts for each 150mm of, say, 4, 6 and 7 blows, as

N = 13  
4, 6, 7

- In a case where the test is discontinued short of full penetration, say after 15 blows for the first 150mm and 30 blows for the next 40mm, as

N > 30  
15, 30/40mm

The results of the test can be related empirically to the engineering properties of the soil.

A modification to the SPT is where the same driving system is used with a solid 60° tipped steel cone of the same diameter as the SPT hollow sampler. The solid cone can be continuously driven for some distance in soft clays or loose sands, or may be used where damage would otherwise occur to the SPT. The results of this Solid Cone Penetration Test (SCPT) are shown as 'N<sub>c</sub>' on the borehole logs, together with the number of blows per 150mm penetration.

### **Cone Penetrometer Testing (CPT) and Interpretation:**

The cone penetrometer is sometimes referred to as a Dutch Cone. The test is described in Australian Standard 1289.6.5.1–1999 (R2013) *'Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes, Soil Strength and Consolidation Tests – Determination of the Static Cone Penetration Resistance of a Soil – Field Test using a Mechanical and Electrical Cone or Friction-Cone Penetrometer'*.

In the tests, a 35mm or 44mm diameter rod with a conical tip is pushed continuously into the soil, the reaction being provided by a specially designed truck or rig which is fitted with a hydraulic ram system. Measurements are made of the end bearing resistance on the cone and the frictional resistance on a separate 134mm or 165mm long sleeve, immediately behind the cone. Transducers in the tip of the assembly are electrically connected by wires passing through the centre of the push rods to an amplifier and recorder unit mounted on the control truck. The CPT does not provide soil sample recovery.

As penetration occurs (at a rate of approximately 20mm per second), the information is output as incremental digital records every 10mm. The results given in this report have been plotted from the digital data.

The information provided on the charts comprise:

- Cone resistance – the actual end bearing force divided by the cross sectional area of the cone – expressed in MPa. There are two scales presented for the cone resistance. The lower scale has a range of 0 to 5MPa and the main scale has a range of 0 to 50MPa. For cone resistance values less than 5MPa, the plot will appear on both scales.
- Sleeve friction – the frictional force on the sleeve divided by the surface area – expressed in kPa.
- Friction ratio – the ratio of sleeve friction to cone resistance, expressed as a percentage.

The ratios of the sleeve resistance to cone resistance will vary with the type of soil encountered, with higher relative friction in clays than in sands. Friction ratios of 1% to 2% are commonly encountered in sands and occasionally very soft clays, rising to 4% to 10% in stiff clays and peats. Soil descriptions based on cone resistance and friction ratios are only inferred and must not be considered as exact.

Correlations between CPT and SPT values can be developed for both sands and clays but may be site specific.

Interpretation of CPT values can be made to empirically derive modulus or compressibility values to allow calculation of foundation settlements.

Stratification can be inferred from the cone and friction traces and from experience and information from nearby boreholes etc. Where shown, this information is presented for general guidance, but must be regarded as interpretive. The test method provides a continuous profile of engineering properties but, where precise information on soil classification is required, direct drilling and sampling may be preferable.

There are limitations when using the CPT in that it may not penetrate obstructions within any fill, thick layers of hard clay and very dense sand, gravel and weathered bedrock. Normally a 'dummy' cone is pushed through fill to protect the equipment. No information is recorded by the 'dummy' probe.

**Flat Dilatometer Test:** The flat dilatometer (DMT), also known as the Marchetti Dilometer comprises a stainless steel blade having a flat, circular steel membrane mounted flush on one side.

The blade is connected to a control unit at ground surface by a pneumatic-electrical tube running through the insertion rods. A gas tank, connected to the control unit by a pneumatic cable, supplies the gas pressure required to expand the membrane. The control unit is equipped with a pressure regulator, pressure gauges, an audio-visual signal and vent valves.

The blade is advanced into the ground using our CPT rig or one of our drilling rigs, and can be driven into the ground using an SPT hammer. As soon as the blade is in place, the membrane is inflated, and the pressure required to lift the membrane (approximately 0.1mm) is recorded. The pressure then required to lift the centre of the membrane by an additional 1mm is recorded. The membrane is then deflated before pushing to the next depth increment, usually 200mm down. The pressure readings are corrected for membrane stiffness.

The DMT is used to measure material index ( $I_b$ ), horizontal stress index ( $K_0$ ), and dilatometer modulus ( $E_D$ ). Using established correlations, the DMT results can also be used to assess the 'at rest' earth pressure coefficient ( $K_0$ ), over-consolidation ratio (OCR), undrained shear strength ( $C_u$ ), friction angle ( $\phi$ ), coefficient of consolidation ( $C_h$ ), coefficient of permeability ( $K_h$ ), unit weight ( $\gamma$ ), and vertical drained constrained modulus ( $M$ ).

The seismic dilatometer (SDMT) is the combination of the DMT with an add-on seismic module for the measurement of shear wave velocity ( $V_s$ ). Using established correlations, the SDMT results can also be used to assess the small strain modulus ( $G_0$ ).

**Portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometers:** Portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) tests are carried out by driving a 16mm diameter rod with a 20mm diameter cone end with a 9kg hammer dropping 510mm. The test is described in Australian Standard 1289.6.3.2–1997 (R2013) *'Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes, Soil Strength and Consolidation Tests – Determination of the Penetration Resistance of a Soil – 9kg Dynamic Cone Penetrometer Test'*.

The results are used to assess the relative compaction of fill, the relative density of granular soils, and the strength of cohesive soils. Using established correlations, the DCP test results can also be used to assess California Bearing Ratio (CBR).

Refusal of the DCP can occur on a variety of materials such as obstructions within any fill, tree roots, hard clay, gravel or ironstone, cobbles and boulders, and does not necessarily indicate rock level.

**Vane Shear Test:** The vane shear test is used to measure the undrained shear strength ( $C_u$ ) of typically very soft to firm fine grained cohesive soils. The vane shear is normally performed in the bottom of a borehole, but can be completed from surface level, the bottom and sides of test pits, and on recovered undisturbed tube samples (when using a hand vane).

The vane comprises four rectangular blades arranged in the form of a cross on the end of a thin rod, which is coupled to the bottom of a drill rod string when used in a borehole. The size of the vane is dependent on the strength of the fine grained cohesive soils; that is, larger vanes are normally used for very low strength soils. For borehole testing, the size of the vane can be limited by the size of the casing that is used.

For testing inside a borehole, a device is used at the top of the casing, which suspends the vane and rods so that they do not sink under self-weight into the 'soft' soils beyond the depth at which the test is to be carried out. A calibrated torque head is used to rotate the rods and vane and to measure the resistance of the vane to rotation.

With the vane in position, torque is applied to cause rotation of the vane at a constant rate. A rate of  $6^\circ$  per minute is the common rotation rate. Rotation is continued until the soil is sheared and the maximum torque has been recorded. This value is then used to calculate the undrained shear strength. The vane is then rotated rapidly a number of times and the operation repeated until a constant torque reading is obtained. This torque value is used to calculate the remoulded shear strength. Where appropriate, friction on the vane rods is measured and taken into account in the shear strength calculation.

## LOGS

The borehole or test pit logs presented herein are an engineering and/or geological interpretation of the subsurface conditions, and their reliability will depend to some extent on the frequency of sampling and the method of drilling or excavation. Ideally, continuous undisturbed sampling or core drilling will enable the most reliable assessment, but is not always practicable or possible to justify on economic grounds. In any case, the boreholes or test pits represent only a very small sample of the total subsurface conditions.

The terms and symbols used in preparation of the logs are defined in the following pages.

Interpretation of the information shown on the logs, and its application to design and construction, should therefore take into account the spacing of boreholes or test pits, the method of drilling or excavation, the frequency of sampling and testing and the possibility of other than 'straight line' variations between the boreholes or test pits. Subsurface conditions between boreholes or test pits may vary significantly from conditions encountered at the borehole or test pit locations.

## GROUNDWATER

Where groundwater levels are measured in boreholes, there are several potential problems:

- Although groundwater may be present, in low permeability soils it may enter the hole slowly or perhaps not at all during the time it is left open.
- A localised perched water table may lead to an erroneous indication of the true water table.
- Water table levels will vary from time to time with seasons or recent weather changes and may not be the same at the time of construction.
- The use of water or mud as a drilling fluid will mask any groundwater inflow. Water has to be blown out of the hole and drilling mud must be washed out of the hole or 'reverted' chemically if reliable water observations are to be made.

More reliable measurements can be made by installing standpipes which are read after the groundwater level has stabilised at intervals ranging from several days to perhaps weeks for low permeability soils. Piezometers, sealed in a particular stratum, may be advisable in low permeability soils or where there may be interference from perched water tables or surface water.

## FILL

The presence of fill materials can often be determined only by the inclusion of foreign objects (eg. bricks, steel, etc) or by distinctly unusual colour, texture or fabric. Identification of the extent of fill materials will also depend on investigation methods and frequency. Where natural soils similar to those at the site are used for fill, it may be difficult with limited testing and sampling to reliably assess the extent of the fill.

The presence of fill materials is usually regarded with caution as the possible variation in density, strength and material type is much greater than with natural soil deposits. Consequently, there is an increased risk of adverse engineering characteristics or behaviour. If the volume and quality of fill is of importance to a project, then frequent test pit excavations are preferable to boreholes.

## LABORATORY TESTING

Laboratory testing is normally carried out in accordance with Australian Standard 1289 *'Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes'* or appropriate NSW Government Roads & Maritime Services (RMS) test methods. Details of the test procedure used are given on the individual report forms.

## ENGINEERING REPORTS

Engineering reports are prepared by qualified personnel and are based on the information obtained and on current engineering standards of interpretation and analysis. Where the report has been prepared for a specific design proposal (eg. a three storey building) the information and interpretation may not be relevant if the design proposal is changed (eg. to a twenty storey building). If this happens, the Company will be pleased to review the report and the sufficiency of the investigation work.

Reasonable care is taken with the report as it relates to interpretation of subsurface conditions, discussion of geotechnical aspects and recommendations or suggestions for design and construction. However, the Company cannot always anticipate or assume responsibility for:

- Unexpected variations in ground conditions – the potential for this will be partially dependent on borehole spacing and sampling frequency as well as investigation technique.
- Changes in policy or interpretation of policy by statutory authorities.
- The actions of persons or contractors responding to commercial pressures.
- Details of the development that the Company could not reasonably be expected to anticipate.

If these occur, the Company will be pleased to assist with investigation or advice to resolve any problems occurring.

#### **SITE ANOMALIES**

In the event that conditions encountered on site during construction appear to vary from those which were expected from the information contained in the report, the Company requests that it immediately be notified. Most problems are much more readily resolved when conditions are exposed rather than at some later stage, well after the event.

#### **REPRODUCTION OF INFORMATION FOR CONTRACTUAL PURPOSES**

Where information obtained from this investigation is provided for tendering purposes, it is recommended that all information, including the written report and discussion, be made available. In circumstances where the discussion or comments section is not relevant to the contractual situation, it may be appropriate to prepare a specially edited document. The Company would

be pleased to assist in this regard and/or to make additional report copies available for contract purposes at a nominal charge.

Copyright in all documents (such as drawings, borehole or test pit logs, reports and specifications) provided by the Company shall remain the property of Jeffery and Katauskas Pty Ltd. Subject to the payment of all fees due, the Client alone shall have a licence to use the documents provided for the sole purpose of completing the project to which they relate. Licence to use the documents may be revoked without notice if the Client is in breach of any obligation to make a payment to us.

#### **REVIEW OF DESIGN**

Where major civil or structural developments are proposed or where only a limited investigation has been completed or where the geotechnical conditions/constraints are quite complex, it is prudent to have a joint design review which involves an experienced geotechnical engineer/engineering geologist.

#### **SITE INSPECTION**

The Company will always be pleased to provide engineering inspection services for geotechnical aspects of work to which this report is related.

Requirements could range from:

- i) a site visit to confirm that conditions exposed are no worse than those interpreted, to
- ii) a visit to assist the contractor or other site personnel in identifying various soil/rock types and appropriate footing or pile founding depths, or
- iii) full time engineering presence on site.

## SYMBOL LEGENDS

### SOIL



FILL



TOPSOIL



CLAY (CL, CI, CH)



SILT (ML, MH)



SAND (SP, SW)



GRAVEL (GP, GW)



SANDY CLAY (CL, CI, CH)



SILTY CLAY (CL, CI, CH)



CLAYEY SAND (SC)



SILTY SAND (SM)



GRAVELLY CLAY (CL, CI, CH)



CLAYEY GRAVEL (GC)



SANDY SILT (ML, MH)



PEAT AND HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS (Pt)

### ROCK



CONGLOMERATE



SANDSTONE



SHALE/MUDSTONE



SILTSTONE



CLAYSTONE



COAL



LAMINITE



LIMESTONE



PHYLLITE, SCHIST



TUFF



GRANITE, GABBRO



DOLERITE, DIORITE



BASALT, ANDESITE



QUARTZITE

### OTHER MATERIALS



BRICKS OR PAVERS



CONCRETE



ASPHALTIC CONCRETE

## CLASSIFICATION OF COARSE AND FINE GRAINED SOILS

Major Divisions		Group Symbol	Typical Names	Field Classification of Sand and Gravel	Laboratory Classification	
Coarse grained soil (more than 68% of soil excluding oversize fraction is greater than 0.075mm)	GRAVEL (more than half of coarse fraction is larger than 2.36mm)	GW	Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines	Wide range in grain size and substantial amounts of all intermediate sizes, not enough fines to bind coarse grains, no dry strength	≤ 5% fines	$C_u > 4$ $1 < C_c < 3$
		GP	Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines, uniform gravels	Predominantly one size or range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing, not enough fines to bind coarse grains, no dry strength	≤ 5% fines	Fails to comply with above
		GM	Gravel-silt mixtures and gravel-sand-silt mixtures	'Dirty' materials with excess of non-plastic fines, zero to medium dry strength	≥ 12% fines, fines are silty	Fines behave as silt
		GC	Gravel-clay mixtures and gravel-sand-clay mixtures	'Dirty' materials with excess of plastic fines, medium to high dry strength	≥ 12% fines, fines are clayey	Fines behave as clay
	SAND (more than half of coarse fraction is smaller than 2.36mm)	SW	Sand and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines	Wide range in grain size and substantial amounts of all intermediate sizes, not enough fines to bind coarse grains, no dry strength	≤ 5% fines	$C_u > 6$ $1 < C_c < 3$
		SP	Sand and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines	Predominantly one size or range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing, not enough fines to bind coarse grains, no dry strength	≤ 5% fines	Fails to comply with above
		SM	Sand-silt mixtures	'Dirty' materials with excess of non-plastic fines, zero to medium dry strength	≥ 12% fines, fines are silty	N/A
		SC	Sand-clay mixtures	'Dirty' materials with excess of plastic fines, medium to high dry strength	≥ 12% fines, fines are clayey	

**Laboratory Classification Criteria**


A well graded coarse grained soil is one for which the coefficient of uniformity  $C_u > 4$  and the coefficient of curvature  $1 < C_c < 3$ . Otherwise, the soil is poorly graded. These coefficients are given by:

$$C_u = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} \quad \text{and} \quad C_c = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} D_{60}}$$

Where  $D_{10}$ ,  $D_{30}$  and  $D_{60}$  are those grain sizes for which 10%, 30% and 60% of the soil grains, respectively, are smaller.

- NOTES:**
- For a coarse grained soil with a fines content between 5% and 12%, the soil is given a dual classification comprising the two group symbols separated by a dash; for example, for a poorly graded gravel with between 5% and 12% silt fines, the classification is GP-GM.
  - Where the grading is determined from laboratory tests, it is defined by coefficients of curvature ( $C_c$ ) and uniformity ( $C_u$ ) derived from the particle size distribution curve.
  - Clay soils with liquid limits  $> 35\%$  and  $\leq 50\%$  may be classified as being of medium plasticity.
  - The U line on the Modified Casagrande Chart is an approximate upper bound for most natural soils.

Major Divisions		Group Symbol	Typical Names	Field Classification of Silt and Clay			Laboratory Classification
				Dry Strength	Dilatancy	Toughness	
fine grained soils (more than 35% of soil excluding oversize fraction is less than 0.075mm)	SILT and CLAY (low to medium plasticity)	ML	Inorganic silt and very fine sand, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sand or silt with low plasticity	None to low	Slow to rapid	Low	Below A line
		CL, CI	Inorganic clay of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clay, sandy clay	Medium to high	None to slow	Medium	Above A line
		OL	Organic silt	Low to medium	Slow	Low	Below A line
	SILT and CLAY (high plasticity)	MH	Inorganic silt	Low to medium	None to slow	Low to medium	Below A line
		CH	Inorganic clay of high plasticity	High to very high	None	High	Above A line
		OH	Organic clay of medium to high plasticity, organic silt	Medium to high	None to very slow	Low to medium	Below A line
	Highly organic soil	Pt	Peat, highly organic soil	–	–	–	–



## LOG SYMBOLS

Log Column	Symbol	Definition		
Groundwater Record	▼	Standing water level. Time delay following completion of drilling/excavation may be shown.		
	C	Extent of borehole/test pit collapse shortly after drilling/excavation.		
	▶	Groundwater seepage into borehole or test pit noted during drilling or excavation.		
Samples	ES	Sample taken over depth indicated, for environmental analysis.		
	U50	Undisturbed 50mm diameter tube sample taken over depth indicated.		
	DB	Bulk disturbed sample taken over depth indicated.		
	DS	Small disturbed bag sample taken over depth indicated.		
	ASB	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for asbestos analysis.		
	ASS	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for acid sulfate soil analysis.		
	SAL	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for salinity analysis.		
Field Tests	N = 17 4, 7, 10	Standard Penetration Test (SPT) performed between depths indicated by lines. Individual figures show blows per 150mm penetration. 'Refusal' refers to apparent hammer refusal within the corresponding 150mm depth increment.		
	N <sub>c</sub> =	5	Solid Cone Penetration Test (SCPT) performed between depths indicated by lines. Individual figures show blows per 150mm penetration for 60° solid cone driven by SPT hammer. 'R' refers to apparent hammer refusal within the corresponding 150mm depth increment.	
		7		
		3R		
VNS = 25 PID = 100	Vane shear reading in kPa of undrained shear strength. Photoionisation detector reading in ppm (soil sample headspace test).			
Moisture Condition (Fine Grained Soils)	w > PL	Moisture content estimated to be greater than plastic limit.		
	w ≈ PL	Moisture content estimated to be approximately equal to plastic limit.		
(Coarse Grained Soils)	w < PL	Moisture content estimated to be less than plastic limit.		
	w ≈ LL	Moisture content estimated to be near liquid limit.		
	w > LL	Moisture content estimated to be wet of liquid limit.		
	D	DRY – runs freely through fingers.		
	M	MOIST – does not run freely but no free water visible on soil surface.		
	W	WET – free water visible on soil surface.		
Strength (Consistency) Cohesive Soils	VS	VERY SOFT – unconfined compressive strength ≤ 25kPa.		
	S	SOFT – unconfined compressive strength > 25kPa and ≤ 50kPa.		
	F	FIRM – unconfined compressive strength > 50kPa and ≤ 100kPa.		
	St	STIFF – unconfined compressive strength > 100kPa and ≤ 200kPa.		
	VSt	VERY STIFF – unconfined compressive strength > 200kPa and ≤ 400kPa.		
	Hd	HARD – unconfined compressive strength > 400kPa.		
	Fr	FRIABLE – strength not attainable, soil crumbles.		
	( )	Bracketed symbol indicates estimated consistency based on tactile examination or other assessment.		
Density Index/ Relative Density (Cohesionless Soils)		<b>Density Index (I<sub>D</sub>) Range (%)</b>		
	VL	VERY LOOSE	<b>SPT 'N' Value Range (Blows/300mm)</b>	
	L	LOOSE	≤ 15	0 – 4
	MD	MEDIUM DENSE	> 15 and ≤ 35	4 – 10
	D	DENSE	> 35 and ≤ 65	10 – 30
	VD	VERY DENSE	> 65 and ≤ 85	30 – 50
	( )		> 85	> 50
		Bracketed symbol indicates estimated density based on ease of drilling or other assessment.		
Hand Penetrometer Readings	300	Measures reading in kPa of unconfined compressive strength. Numbers indicate individual test results on representative undisturbed material unless noted otherwise.		
	250			

Log Column	Symbol	Definition	
Remarks	'V' bit	Hardened steel 'V' shaped bit.	
	'TC' bit	Twin pronged tungsten carbide bit.	
	T <sub>60</sub>	Penetration of auger string in mm under static load of rig applied by drill head hydraulics without rotation of augers.	
	Soil Origin	The geological origin of the soil can generally be described as:	
		RESIDUAL	– soil formed directly from insitu weathering of the underlying rock. No visible structure or fabric of the parent rock.
		EXTREMELY WEATHERED	– soil formed directly from insitu weathering of the underlying rock. Material is of soil strength but retains the structure and/or fabric of the parent rock.
		ALLUVIAL	– soil deposited by creeks and rivers.
		ESTUARINE	– soil deposited in coastal estuaries, including sediments caused by inflowing creeks and rivers, and tidal currents.
MARINE		– soil deposited in a marine environment.	
AEOLIAN		– soil carried and deposited by wind.	
COLLUVIAL	– soil and rock debris transported downslope by gravity, with or without the assistance of flowing water. Colluvium is usually a thick deposit formed from a landslide. The description 'slopewash' is used for thinner surficial deposits.		
	LITTORAL	– beach deposited soil.	

## Classification of Material Weathering

Term	Abbreviation	Definition
Residual Soil	RS	Material is weathered to such an extent that it has soil properties. Mass structure and material texture and fabric of original rock are no longer visible, but the soil has not been significantly transported.
Extremely Weathered	XW	Material is weathered to such an extent that it has soil properties. Mass structure and material texture and fabric of original rock are still visible.
Highly Weathered	HW	The whole of the rock material is discoloured, usually by iron staining or bleaching to the extent that the colour of the original rock is not recognisable. Rock strength is significantly changed by weathering. Some primary minerals have weathered to clay minerals. Porosity may be increased by leaching, or may be decreased due to deposition of weathering products in pores.
Moderately Weathered	MW	
Distinctly Weathered (Note 1)		
Slightly Weathered	SW	Rock is partially discoloured with staining or bleaching along joints but shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock.
Fresh	FR	Rock shows no sign of decomposition of individual minerals or colour changes.

**NOTE 1:** The term 'Distinctly Weathered' is used where it is not practicable to distinguish between 'Highly Weathered' and 'Moderately Weathered' rock. 'Distinctly Weathered' is defined as follows: 'Rock strength usually changed by weathering. The rock may be highly discoloured, usually by iron staining. Porosity may be increased by leaching, or may be decreased due to deposition of weathering products in pores'. There is some change in rock strength.

## Rock Material Strength Classification

Term	Abbreviation	Uniaxial Compressive Strength (MPa)	Guide to Strength	
			Point Load Strength Index $Is_{(50)}$ (MPa)	Field Assessment
Very Low Strength	VL	0.6 to 2	0.03 to 0.1	Material crumbles under firm blows with sharp end of pick; can be peeled with knife; too hard to cut a triaxial sample by hand. Pieces up to 30mm thick can be broken by finger pressure.
Low Strength	L	2 to 6	0.1 to 0.3	Easily scored with a knife; indentations 1mm to 3mm show in the specimen with firm blows of the pick point; has dull sound under hammer. A piece of core 150mm long by 50mm diameter may be broken by hand. Sharp edges of core may be friable and break during handling.
Medium Strength	M	6 to 20	0.3 to 1	Scored with a knife; a piece of core 150mm long by 50mm diameter can be broken by hand with difficulty.
High Strength	H	20 to 60	1 to 3	A piece of core 150mm long by 50mm diameter cannot be broken by hand but can be broken by a pick with a single firm blow; rock rings under hammer.
Very High Strength	VH	60 to 200	3 to 10	Hand specimen breaks with pick after more than one blow; rock rings under hammer.
Extremely High Strength	EH	> 200	> 10	Specimen requires many blows with geological pick to break through intact material; rock rings under hammer.

## Abbreviations Used in Defect Description

Cored Borehole Log Column	Symbol Abbreviation	Description	
Point Load Strength Index	• 0.6	Axial point load strength index test result (MPa)	
	x 0.6	Diametral point load strength index test result (MPa)	
Defect Details	– Type	Be	Parting – bedding or cleavage
		CS	Clay seam
		Cr	Crushed/sheared seam or zone
		J	Joint
		Jh	Healed joint
		Ji	Incipient joint
		XWS	Extremely weathered seam
	– Orientation	Degrees	Defect orientation is measured relative to normal to the core axis (ie. relative to the horizontal for a vertical borehole)
	– Shape	P	Planar
		C	Curved
		Un	Undulating
		St	Stepped
		Ir	Irregular
	– Roughness	Vr	Very rough
		R	Rough
		S	Smooth
		Po	Polished
		Sl	Slickensided
	– Infill Material	Ca	Calcite
		Cb	Carbonaceous
		Clay	Clay
		Fe	Iron
		Qz	Quartz
		Py	Pyrite
	– Coatings	Cn	Clean
		Sn	Stained – no visible coating, surface is discoloured
		Vn	Veneer – visible, too thin to measure, may be patchy
		Ct	Coating ≤ 1mm thick
		Filled	Coating > 1mm thick
	– Thickness	mm.t	Defect thickness measured in millimetres