Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd



Geotechnical Assessment: 9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW





WATER



WASTEWATER







PROJECT MANAGEMENT



P1806622JR02V03 March 2022

Copyright Statement

Martens & Associates Pty Ltd (Publisher) is the owner of the copyright subsisting in this publication. Other than as permitted by the Copyright Act and as outlined in the Terms of Engagement, no part of this report may be reprinted or reproduced or used in any form, copied or transmitted, by any electronic, mechanical, or by other means, now known or hereafter invented (including microcopying, photocopying, recording, recording tape or through electronic information storage and retrieval systems or otherwise), without the prior written permission of Martens & Associates Pty Ltd. Legal action will be taken against any breach of its copyright. This report is available only as book form unless specifically distributed by Martens & Associates in electronic form. No part of it is authorised to be copied, sold, distributed or offered in any other form.

The document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited. Martens & Associates Pty Ltd assumes no responsibility where the document is used for purposes other than those for which it was commissioned.

Limitations Statement

The sole purpose of this report and the associated services performed by Martens & Associates Pty Ltd is to complete a geotechnical assessment in accordance with the scope of services set out by Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd (hereafter known as the Client). That scope of works and services were defined by the requests of the Client, by the time and budgetary constraints imposed by the Client, and by the availability of access to the site.

Martens & Associates Pty Ltd derived the data in this report primarily from a number of sources including site inspections, correspondence regarding the proposal, examination of records in the public domain, interviews with individuals with information about the site or the project, and field explorations conducted on the dates indicated. The passage of time, manifestation of latent conditions or impacts of future events may require further examination / exploration of the site and subsequent data analyses, together with a re-evaluation of the findings, observations and conclusions expressed in this report.

In preparing this report, Martens & Associates Pty Ltd may have relied upon and presumed accurate certain information (or absence thereof) relative to the site. Except as otherwise stated in the report, Martens & Associates Pty Ltd has not attempted to verify the accuracy of completeness of any such information (including for example survey data supplied by others).

The findings, observations and conclusions expressed by Martens & Associates Pty Ltd in this report are not, and should not be considered an opinion concerning the completeness and accuracy of information supplied by others. No warranty or guarantee, whether express or implied, is made with respect to the data reported or to the findings, observations and conclusions expressed in this report. Further, such data, findings and conclusions are based solely upon site conditions, information and drawings supplied by the Client etc. in existence at the time of the investigation.

This report has been prepared on behalf of and for the exclusive use of the Client, and is subject to and issued in connection with the provisions of the agreement between Martens & Associates Pty Ltd and the Client. Martens & Associates Pty Ltd accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for or in respect of any use of or reliance upon this report by any third party.



@ March 2022Copyright Martens & Associates Pty Ltd All Rights Reserved

Head Office

Suite 201, 20 George Street Hornsby, NSW 2077, Australia ACN 070 240 890 ABN 85 070 240**Phone: +61-2-9476-9999** Fax: +61-2-9476-8767

Email: mail@martens.com.au Web: www.martens.com.au

	Document and Distribution Status											
Autho	r(s)	Reviewer(s)		Project Manager/ Di	rector	Sign	ature					
Aksh	naya Ghimire	Surendran K	(arasu	Gray Taylor		wy ryh.						
					Documen	Location						
Revision No.	Description	Status	Release Date	File Copy	Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd							
1	Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment	Final	19.05.2021	1H, 1P, 1E	1P							
2	Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment	Final	13.08.2021	1H, 1P, 1E	1P							
3	Geotechnical Assessment	Final	23.03.2022	1H, 1P, 1E	1P							

Distribution Types: F = Fax, H = Hard copy, P = PDF document, E = Other electronic format. Digits indicate number of document copies.

All enquiries regarding this project are to be directed to the Project Manager.



Contents

1	DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTIGATION SCOPE	5
2	GENERAL SITE DETAILS AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	7
3	GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	8
3.1	Geotechnical Landslip Risk Assessment	8
3.2	Acid Sulfate Soils	8
3.3	Preliminary Soil and Rock Strength Properties	9
4	RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE WORKS	10
5	PROPOSED ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT	12
5.1	Works Prior to Construction Certificate	12
5.2	Construction Monitoring and Inspections	12
6	REFERENCES	13
7	ATTACHMENT A – FIGURES	14
8	ATTACHMENT B - BOREHOLE LOGS	18
9	ATTACHMENT C - DCP 'N' COUNTS	23
10	ATTACHMENT D - GEOTECHNICAL RISK CALCULATION SHEET	25
11	ATTACHMENT E - HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES (AGS, 2007)	27
12	ATTACHMENT F - GENERAL GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS	30
	ATTACHMENT G – GEOTECHNICAL RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR PI – FORMS 1 AND 1A	
14	ATTACHMENT H - NOTES ABOUT THIS REPORT	36



1 Development and Investigation Scope

The proposed development details and investigation scope are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of proposed development and investigation scope.

Item	Details
Property Address	9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW ('the site')
Lot / DP	Lot 9, DP 18612
LGA	Northern Beaches Council (NBC) – previously Pittwater Council
Site Area	575.4 m² (BL, 2006)
Proposed development	 The proposal plans (BKH, 2021) indicate that the development will include Demolition of existing structures (i.e. driveway, carport and retaining walls) in the eastern portion of the site. Demolition of existing gazebo in the western portion, above boatshed and construction of a new pavilion structure. Construction of a new additional 3-storey studio, with an upper-level carport with roof, staircase leading to ground floor laundry / rumpus rooms. These will likely require bulk excavations up to approximately 3.0 m below ground level (mBGL). Addition of inclinator along the southern boundary.
Council Mapped Hazard Risks	The site is mapped by the Pittwater Council's Local Environmental Plan (LEP, 2014) as containing the following hazard risks: o 'Class 5' Acid Sulphate Soils (ASS). o 'Geotechnical Hazard H1'.
Assessment Purpose	This geotechnical investigation has been prepared to address NBC requirements for a Development Application (DA).
Previous Site Assessment	A previous risk analysis and management report for the site was conducted by Jack Hodgson Consultants (JHC, 2007) for a proposed garage and guest house along the eastern property boundary. The report identified the following two hazards associated with the proposed development:
	 Tilting of the top flight of stairs cutting across the slope. Failure of the cut batter for the proposed carport before construction of permanent support.
	JHC (2007) concluded 'an acceptable risk' for both hazards, subject to following recommendations provided within the report.
	We note that these hazards will be removed as part of the new development.
Investigation scope of work	A preliminary geotechnical assessment was previously undertaken by Martens and Associates Pty Ltd to support a development application (DA) on March 2019. The investigation primarily involved drilling of four boreholes (BH101-BH104 using hand auger up to 1.7 mbgl and four dynamic penetration tests (DCP101-DCP104) up to 2.05 mbgl. The findings and recommendations are



Item	Details
	presented in MA's report referenced P1806622JR01V02, dated March 2019. Results of the assessments have been reproduced in this report.
	MA's engineer performed the site investigation on 5 May 2021. From the site investigation, it is observed that the site seems to be in similar condition as when previous geotechnical investigation was completed in 2018. The previous scope of geotechnical investigations are considered relevant for the site including recommendations since changes to the proposed development are minor.
	Investigation locations are shown in Figure 1, Attachment A.



2 General Site Details and Subsurface Conditions

General site details and investigation findings of subsurface conditions are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of general site details based on desktop review, site walkover and site investigations.

Comment
Within highly undulating terrain, approximately at the base of a southwest facing slope.
South westerly aspect with grades up to approximately 30%. Site elevation ranges between approximately 1.5 mAHD (western site boundary) and 16.5 mAHD (south eastern site corner along Thyra Road).
The existing development include: Single storey fibro, timber and stone residence with associated timber decking, corrugated roof. In-ground swimming pool, timber boat house and jetty, Carport, retaining / garden walls and concrete pathway and steps in good working condition.
Grass, landscaped gardens, shrubs and trees. Eastern portion of the site is heavily vegetated with small shrubs.
Via overland flow into Careel Bay, located along the western site border.
Narrabeen Group comprising interbedded sandstone, siltstone and shale (Sydney 1:100 000 Geological Sheet 9130, 1^{st} edition).
 Unit A: Topsoil comprising very soft and soft sandy silt / clayey silt up to approximately 0.3 mBGL. Unit B: Colluvium (possible fill from upslope road cuts) comprising silty clay with consistencies generally between very soft and soft, and firm up to approximately 0.55 mBGL. Unit C: Residual clay, silty clay and sandy clay, generally firm grading to very stiff to hard near the transition into rock and hand auger refusal depths of up to 1.7 mBGL. Unit D: Weathered and inferred very low to low strength sandstone / siltstone / shale below DCP refusal between 1.25 mBGL (DCP103) and investigation termination depth of 2.05 mBGL (DCP104). For the purpose of this report, rock below DCP refusal depths is assumed to be of very low to low strength, with possible lower and / or higher strength bands, which should be confirmed / revised by further assessment, as necessary. Top of weathered rock is expected to step down towards the south west across the site.
Groundwater inflow was not encountered during drilling of the boreholes up to 1.7 mBGL. However, ephemeral perched groundwater may be encountered in the soil profile or at the soil / rock interface originating from infiltration of surface water within and upslope of the site during prolonged or intense rainfall events. Should further information on permanent site groundwater levels be required, additional investigation would need to be carried out (i.e. installation of groundwater monitoring wells).



3 Geotechnical Assessment

3.1 Geotechnical Landslip Risk Assessment

No evidence of extensive subsidence or recent large-scale slope instability was observed on site during site investigation, or by JHC (2007) in 2007. However, evidence of possible shallow soil movement, including retaining wall deflection / cracking, was observed.

A geotechnical hazard risk assessment for the proposed works has been completed in accordance with the qualitative risk matrices provided in Section 7 of the Australian Geomechanics Society's Landslide Risk Management Guidelines (2007). We have considered four main geotechnical hazards and have assumed inclusion of treatment measures recommended in this report. These and associated risks are described in Attachment D.

The proposed development is considered to constitute an acceptable risk to life and a low risk to property, resulting from assessed geotechnical hazards, provided that the slope treatment measures presented in Attachment D and recommendations presented in this report are adhered to, where applicable. Areas likely to be impacted by slope instability risks have been highlighted on the geological cross section (Figure 2, Attachment A). A description of good hillslope engineering practices is provided as Attachment E. Geotechnical Risk Management Poilcy for Pittwater Forms 1 and 1a are provided as Attachment G

3.2 Acid Sulfate Soils

According to the NBC LEP (2014) Acid Sulfate Soils Map (Sheet ASS_015), the subject site is categorised as having Class 5 ASS risk. Site location relating to ASS risk is presented in Figure 3 (Attachment A).

Based on Table 2.1 of the ASSMAC (1998) guidelines, the following works on Class 5 land requires development consent:

- Works within 500 metres of adjacent Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land that is below 5 mAHD.
- Works by which the water table is likely to be lowered below 1 mAHD on adjacent Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land.

Considering site conditions, topography and likely foundation systems, it is expected that foundation excavation will not extend below 5 mAHD or adversely impact the water table at the site or on adjacent Class 1, 2,



Page 8

3 or 4 land. The site is considered to be suitable for the proposed development and the development is not expected to be affected by ASS risk or affect surrounding land.

3.3 Preliminary Soil and Rock Strength Properties

Preliminary soil and rock strength properties, estimated from field test results in conjunction with borehole derived soil / rock profile data as well as engineering assumptions, are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Preliminary estimated soil and rock properties.

Layer ¹	Y _{in-situ} ² (kN/m³)	UCS ³ (MPa)	Cu ⁴ (kPa)	Φ' ⁵ (deg)	E' ⁶ (MPa)	Ks ⁷ (MPa/m)
Uncontrolled FILL / TOPSOIL / COLLUVIUM / RESIDUAL SOIL (very soft to soft, firm)	17	NA ⁸	NA ⁸	NA ⁸	NA ⁸	NA ⁸
RESIDUAL SOIL: CLAY / Silty CLAY / Sandy CLAY (at least stiff)	18	0.1	75	NA 8	10	10
WEATHERED ROCK: SANDSTONE / SILTSTONE / SHALE (at least very low strength)	22	0.5-1.0	NA 8	28	100	75

Notes:

- Refer to borehole logs in Attachment B for material description details.
- 2 Inferred average In-situ unit weight for layer, based on visual assessment only (±2 kN/m³).
- 3 Average unconfined compressive strength of intact material (typical range provided for rock).
- 4 Average undrained shear strength (± 5 kPa) estimate assuming normally consolidated clay.
- 5 Average effective internal friction angle (\pm 2 $^{\circ}$) estimate assuming drained conditions; may be dependent on rock defect conditions.
- 6 Effective elastic modulus estimate (±10 %).
- 7 Modulus of subgrade reaction (vertical).
- 8 Not applicable.



4 Recommendations and Future Works

The following geotechnical recommendations are provided for the proposed development. Further general geotechnical recommendations are presented in Attachment F.

- Excavation and support: Excavations in soils and weathered rock must be temporarily and permanently supported / retained to maintain excavation stability and limit potential adverse impacts on neighbouring properties or other infrastructure. Medium and / or higher strength rock, where encountered, may remain unsupported subject to confirmation on site by a geotechnical engineer. Appropriate support and / or excavation methodologies should be adopted by the excavation contractor and design engineer and approved by a geotechnical engineer.
- 2. <u>Vibration</u>: If medium or higher strength rock is to be excavated using a rock hammer, vibration management will be required.
- 3. <u>Earth Pressure Coefficients</u>: Retaining wall design may adopt preliminary active, at rest and passive earth pressure coefficients of 0.39, 0.56 and 2.56, respectively, assuming retained ground is level.
- 4. Rock Support: Steeply dipping joints and other rock defects may have an adverse effect on unsupported rock face stability and construction safety. Geotechnical mapping of the excavation should be conducted in 1.5 m height increments to identify such features and allow early mitigation of risks of rock movement, such as by installation of rock bolts.

The possible presence of weakly cemented (extremely weathered) seams within the rock may require shotcreting and rock bolting.

Rock support should be specified in terms of performance requirements and installed / placed by contractors experienced in ground anchor technology and on advisement by an experienced geotechnical engineer. Rock support should not extend beyond property boundaries unless approval has been granted by relevant property owners or stakeholders. The actual amount of stabilisation which will be required cannot be quantified at this stage and can only be determined at the time of construction. Martens and Associates can complete the necessary mapping and provide advice on support requirements.



Page 10

5. Footings and Foundations: Foundation loading associated with all new structures should be transmitted to the underlying rock using pad footings or piers, depending on foundation level. This is to limit differential movements across the building footprints and limit slope instability risk. Shallow footings may be designed adopting allowable end bearing capacities of 400 kPa for very low to low strength sandstone. Estimates of safe end bearing capacity and shaft friction for piers founding in very low to low strength rock are 1000 kPa and 150 kPa, respectively. For uplift resistance, we recommend reducing allowable shaft friction by 50% and checking against 'piston' and 'cone' pull-out mechanisms in accordance with AS2159 (2009). Further testing is required for higher bearing pressures.

Provided bearing capacities assume an at least 1 m foundation base offset from excavation edge and an embedment of at least 0.3 m into the design unit. Embedment depth into rock may need to be increased subject to the following:

- Footing offsets from excavation edge are inadequate or to be reduced.
- Further assessment results of exposed rock conditions in the vicinity of footings.
- Further advice by a geotechnical engineer during construction.
- 6. <u>Drainage requirements</u>: Appropriate drainage measures should be provided upslope of the development and behind the retaining walls to divert overland flows and ephemeral perched water away from structures and discharge into approved onsite stormwater systems. Groundwater inflow, if encountered during rock excavation, is expected to be limited and can be managed by sump and pump methods.
- 7. <u>Site Classification</u>: The site is classified as a "M" site in accordance with AS 2870 (2011), subject to the removal of all possible fill materials. A reclassification to 'A' may be considered where footings are founded on rock. These classifications are subject to the recommendations presented in this report and the design of footings in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards and foundation maintenance in accordance with CSIRO (2003).



5 Proposed Additional Assessment

5.1 Works Prior to Construction Certificate

We recommend the following additional geotechnical assessments are carried out to develop the final design and prior to construction:

- 1. Assessment of bedrock conditions if higher end bearing pressures are required. This should include rock coring and point load testing of collected rock samples to assess rock strength.
- 2. Review of the final design by a senior geotechnical engineer to confirm adequate consideration of the geotechnical risks and adoption of the recommendations provided in this report.

5.2 Construction Monitoring and Inspections

We recommend the following is inspected and monitored during construction of the project (Table 4).

Table 4: Recommended inspection / monitoring requirements during site works.

Scope of Works	Frequency/Duration	Who to Complete
Inspect excavation retention (shoring, retaining wall, rock bolt) installations and batters and monitor associated performance to assess need for additional support requirements.	Daily / As required ²	Builder / MA ¹
Monitor groundwater seepage from excavation faces, if encountered, to assess stability of exposed materials, suitability of proposed drainage and additional drainage requirements.	When encountered	Builder / MA ¹
Monitor excavation-induced vibrations, if required.	Daily at on-set of excavation and as agreed thereafter ²	MA ¹
Monitor settlement and lateral deflection of retaining structures to identify potential excavation impacts on neighbouring properties.	Daily at on-set of excavation and as agreed thereafter	Builder / MA ¹
Inspect exposed material at foundation / subgrade level to verify suitability as foundation / lateral support / subgrade.	Prior to reinforcement set-up and concrete placement	MA ¹
Monitor sedimentation downslope of excavated areas.	During and after rainfall events	Builder
Monitor sediment and erosion control structures to assess adequacy and for removal of built up spoil.	After rainfall events	Builder

Notes:

² MA inspection frequency to be determined based on initial inspection findings in line with construction program.



¹ MA = Martens and Associates engineer


6 References

- Ahern C. R., Stone, Y. and Blunden B. (1998) Acid Sulfate Soils Assessment Guidelines, Acid Sulfate Soil Management Advisory Committee (ASSMAC), Wollongbar, NSW, Australia.
- Australian Geomechanics Society (2007) Practice Note Guidelines For Landslide Risk Management 2007, Journal and News of the Australian Geomechanics Society Volume 42 No 1 March 2007.
- Bee & Lethbridge Pty Ltd (2006) Survey Plan, Ref No: 13281, Drawing No: 13281C-01, dated 21 June 2006 (BL, 2006).
- Burley Katon Halliday (2021) McKinnon Residence Development Application, Project No: 3454, Drawing No: DA0.03-D, DA1.01-D, DA2.01-D, A.2.02-D, dated 20 May 2021 (BKH, 2021).
- CSIRO BTF 18 (2003) Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A homeowner's Guide, (CSIRO, 2003).
- Herbert C. (1983) Sydney 1:100 000 Geological Sheet 9130, 1st edition, Geological Survey of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Land and Property Information (2018) SIX Maps Viewer, https://maps.six.nsw.gov.au, visited June 2018.
- Martens and Associates (2019) Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Reference No: P1906622JR01V01, dated March 2019.
- Pittwater Local Environmental Plan (2014), Acid Sulfate Soils Map, Sheet ASS 015, File No. 6370 COM ASS 015 010 20140217.
- Pittwater Local Environmental Plan (2014), Geotechnical Hazard Map, Sheet GTH_015, File No. 6370_COM_GTH_015_010_20140217.
- Standards Australia Limited (1997) AS 1289.6.3.2:1997, Determination of the penetration resistance of a soil 9kg dynamic cone penetrometer test, SAI Global Limited.
- Standards Australia Limited (2017) AS 1726:2017, Geotechnical site investigations, SAI Global Limited.



7 Attachment A – Figures






Key:


0

Approximate borehole and DCP test location


Geological cross section (Figure 3)

Martens & Associates Pty Ltd ABN 8	5 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management						
Drawn:	AG		Drawing:					
Approved:	SK	EXISTING SITE SURVEY AND GEOTECHNICAL TESTING PLAN	FIGURE 1					
Date:	13.08.2021	9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW						
Scale:	NA	Source: BL, 2006	Job No: P1806622JR02V02					





Martens & Associates Pty Ltd ABN 85 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management						
Drawn: AG		Drawing:					
Approved: SK	SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO ASS RISK MAP	FIGURE 3					
Date: 06.05.2021	9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW						
Scale: NA	Source: Pittwater Council LEP, 2014	Job No: P1806622JR02V01					



Mariens & Associates Fly Lia ABN 85	0/0 240 890	Environment water wastewater Geolectrinical Civil Management						
Drawn:	AG		Drawing:					
Approved:	SK	INFERRED GEOLOGICAL CROSS SECTION SHOWING POSSIBLE INSTABILITY RISKS	FIGURE 2					
Date:	13.08.2021	9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW						
Scale:	NA	Source: Modified from BKH, 2021	Job No: P1806622JR02V02					

8 Attachment B – Borehole Logs



CLI	ENT	Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd				COMMENCED	COMMENCED 20/06/2018 COMPLETED 20/06/2018					REF BH101		
PR	DJEC	TF	relimina	ary Geo	technical Assessment			LOGGED	AM/DI	CHECKED	RE			
SITE 9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW							GEOLOGY	Narrabeen Group	VEGETATION	Shru	ubs		Sheet 1 OF 1 PROJECT NO. P1806622	
EQUIPMENT Hand Auger E							EASTING		RL SURFACE	12.4	l m		DATUM AHD	
EXCAVATION DIMENSIONS Ø75 mm x 1.45 m depth						NORTHING		ASPECT	Sou	thwe	st	SLOPE <5%		
			ling		Sampling				F	ield Material D	_	·	_	
METHOD	PENETRATION RESISTANCE	WATER	DEPTH (metres)	<i>DEPTH</i> RL	SAMPLE OR FIELD TEST	RECOVERED GRAPHIC LOG	USCS / ASCS CLASSIFICATION	SOIL/RC	OCK MATERIAL DESC	CRIPTION		MOISTURE	CONSISTENCY DENSITY	
			_	0.05 12.35		X	ML 1		ILT; low plasticity; brown, nd sandstone gravels. ticity; brown, dark brown, nd sandstone gravels.		е	M (=PL	VS - S	TOPSOIL COLLUVIUM 0.05: Possible fill to 0.5 m
НА		Not Encountered	0.5 —	<i>0.50</i> 11.90	_	X	X X CI (CLAY; medium plas	ticity; yellow, red, orange	, grey; trace roots	-			RESIDUAL SOIL -
	М	Not	1.0 —								,	M (<pl< td=""><td>F)</td><td>- -</td></pl<>	F)	- -
	м-н		_	1.20 11.20			-	Frace subrounded s					St	
			1.5 —				F	Hole Terminated at	1.45 m					1.45: Hand auger refusal due to high penetration resistance. —
			2.0		EXCAVATION LOG TO	D BE REA	AD IN CO				TES A	AND	ABB	REVIATIONS
)				6 "		ASSOCIATES PTY LTD				Fn	aineerina Loa -

MARTENS & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD Suite 201, 20 George St. Hornsby, NSW 2077 Australia Phone: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767 mail@martens.com.au WEB: http://www.martens.com.au

CL	ENT	В	urley Ka	aton Ha	ılliday Pty Ltd				COMMENCED	20/06/2018	COMPLETED	20/0	06/20	18		REF	BH102
PR	OJEC	тР	relimina	ary Geo	technical Assessment	:			LOGGED	AM/DI	CHECKED	RE					
SIT	E	9	Thyra F	Road, P	Palm Beach, NSW				GEOLOGY	Narrabeen Group	VEGETATION	Shru	Shrubs			Sheet PROJECT	1 OF 1 NO. P1806622
EQUIPMENT Hand Auger E											RL SURFACE	13.7	7 m			DATUM	AHD
EXC	CAVAC	ION E	IMENSI	ONS .	Ø75 mm x 1.70 m depth				NORTHING		ASPECT	Sou	thwe	st		SLOPE	20%
		Dril	ling		Sampling			T		ı	Field Material D		Ė				
METHOD	PENETRATION RESISTANCE	WATER	DEPTH (metres)	<i>DEPTH</i> RL	SAMPLE OR FIELD TEST	RECOVERED	GRAPHIC LOG	USCS / ASCS CLASSIFICATION		OCK MATERIAL DES			MOISTURE CONDITION	CONSISTENCY DENSITY	TODGG	STRUCTURE AND ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS	
METH HA	PENE RESIL	Not Encountered WATE	1.0 — 1.5 — 2.5 — 2.5 — -	0.05 13.65 13.15 13.15		RECK		CI	oots and gravels Sitty CLAY; low plas sand; trace subangi oots.		n, orange-brown; w distone gravels and	J´ ⁄ith	SIOW M (= PL)	VS - S	TOPSC COLLU 0.05: Pi	OIL VIUM OSSIBLE FILL TO	0.55 m.
			-														
					EXCAVATION LOG T) BE	REA	D IN C	ONJUCTION WI	TH ACCOMPANYING	G REPORT NO	ES A	AND	ABB	REVIAT	TONS	
	/		24		_			Suite		ASSOCIATES PTY LT				Ξn	ain	eerin	g Log -

MARTENS & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD Suite 201, 20 George St. Hornsby, NSW 2077 Australia Phone: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767 mail@martens.com.au WEB: http://www.martens.com.au

CLI	ENT	E	Burley K	aton Ha	alliday Pty Ltd				COMMENCED	20/06/2018	COMPLETED	20/06	201	8		KEF	BH103	
PR	OJEC	CT F	Prelimina	ary Geo	technical Assessment				LOGGED	AM/DI	CHECKED	RE						
SIT	E	9	9 Thyra	Road, F	Palm Beach, NSW				GEOLOGY	Narrabeen Group	VEGETATION	Shrub	s		- 1	Sheet PROJECT	1 OF 1 NO. P1806622	
EQI	JIPME	NT			Hand Auger				EASTING		RL SURFACE	10.23	m			DATUM	AHD	
EXC	AVA	TION I	DIMENSI	ONS .	Ø75 mm x 1.20 m depth				NORTHING		ASPECT	South	west	t		SLOPE	20%	
			lling		Sampling					Fi	ield Material D		$\overline{}$					
METHOD	PENETRATION RESISTANCE	WATER	DEPTH (metres)	DEPTH RL	SAMPLE OR FIELD TEST	RECOVERED	GRAPHIC LOG	USCS / ASCS CLASSIFICATION	SOIL/RC	OCK MATERIAL DESC	CRIPTION	MOISTURE	CONDITION	CONSISTENCY DENSITY	STRUCTURE AND ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS		DITIONAL	
				0.05 10.18			<u>X</u>	- -	TOPSOIL: Clayey S roots.	ILT; low plasticity; brown,	dark brown; trace				TOPSOI			
HA	M-H	Not Encountered	1.5 —	0.05 10.18 0.55 9.68	6622/BH103/0.8/S/1 D 0.30 m 6622/BH103/0.8/S/1 D 0.80 m			CI CI	cots. Sity CLAY; low plas	ticity; dark grey-brown; wi	ith sand.	(<		VS S	RESIDU	AL SOIL	efusal on inferred very sandstone.	
			-	1														
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	 Excavation log to) B	L E REA	D IN C	ONJUCTION WI	TH ACCOMPANYING	REPORT NOT	TES AN	ND <i>F</i>	ABB	REVIATI	ONS		
										ASSOCIATES DTV I TD							_	

MARTENS & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD Suite 201, 20 George St. Hornsby, NSW 2077 Australia Phone: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767 mail@martens.com.au WEB: http://www.martens.com.au

CLI	ENT		Burley K	aton Ha	alliday Pty Ltd			COMMENCED	20/06/2018	COMPLETED	TED 20/06/201		18		KEF	BH104	
PRO	OJEC	т	Prelimin	ary Geo	technical Assessment			LOGGED	AM/DI	CHECKED	RE						
SIT	E		9 Thyra	Road, F	Palm Beach, NSW			GEOLOGY	Narrabeen Group	VEGETATION	Shru	bs			Sheet PROJECT	1 OF 1 NO. P1806622	
EQL	JIPME	NT			Hand Auger			EASTING		RL SURFACE	14.2	m			DATUM	AHD	
EXC	AVAT	ION	DIMENS	ONS	Ø75 mm x 1.20 m depth			NORTHING		ASPECT	Sout	hwes	st		SLOPE	15%	
		Dr	illing		Sampling			•	F	ield Material D		_	_				
METHOD	PENETRATION RESISTANCE	WATER	DEPTH (metres)	<i>DEPTH</i> RL	SAMPLE OR FIELD TEST	RECOVERED		SOIL/RC	IL/ROCK MATERIAL DESCRIPTION		CONDITION	CONSISTENCY DENSITY		STRUCTURE AND ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS			
ME HA HE	L-M	Not Encountered WA	-	0.30 13.90		~ 1	ML TO	ots.	LT; low plasticity; dark brotein ticity; grey, red, yellow-brotein ticity; grey and the second secon		— –	OO M <pl)< td=""><td>s </td><td>RESIDU</td><td>DAL SOIL</td><td>efusal due to high</td><td></td></pl)<>	s 	RESIDU	DAL SOIL	efusal due to high	
					EXCAVATION LOG TO	В	E READ IN CO	NJUCTION WI	TH ACCOMPANYING	REPORT NOT	ES A	ND	ABB	REVIAT	IONS		
			_					MADTENCO	ASSOCIATES DTV I TO	, - T							

MARTENS & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD Suite 201, 20 George St. Hornsby, NSW 2077 Australia Phone: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767 mail@martens.com.au WEB: http://www.martens.com.au

9 Attachment C - DCP 'N' Counts



Dynamic Cone Penetrometer Test Log Summary



Suite 201, 20 George Street, Hornsby, NSW 2077 Ph: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767, mail@martens.com.au, www.martens.com.au

Site	9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW	DCP Group Reference	P1806622JS01V01			
Client	Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd	Log Date	20.06.2018			
Logged by	DI / AM					
Checked by	RE					
Comments DCP commenced at 50 mm BGL.						

TEST DATA

Depth Interval (m)	DCP101	DCP102	DCP103	DCP104							
0.15	0	0	0	1							
0.30	1	2	0	1							
0.45	2	1	1	2							
0.60	3	2	3	3							
0.75	2	2	3	3							
0.90	2	2	3	3							
1.05	3	3	3	3							
1.20	3	3	7	4							
1.35	5	2	Bounce at 1.25	6							
1.50	5	5	mBGL.	28							
1.65	Bounce at 1.55	4		12							
1.80	mBGL.	4		23							
1.95		2/75 mm		29							
2.10		Bounce at 1.925		14/50 mm							
2.25 2.40		mBGL.		Bounce at 2.05	-						
				mBGL.							
2.55 2.70											
2.85											
3.00											
3.15											
3.30											
3.45											
3.60											
3.75											
3.90											
4.05											
4.20											
4.35											
4.50											
4.65											
4.80											
4.95											
5.10											
5.25											
5.40											
5.55											
5.70											
5.85											
6.00											
0.00											
		_		_							
		-									
	<u> </u>			<u> </u>							

10 **Attachment D – Geotechnical Risk Calculation Sheet**



Slope Instability Risk - Summary Assessment

Method based on Walker et al. in AGS Vol 42 No. 1 March 2007

Method ST-38 Revised 08.07.09



Suite 201, George Street, Hornsby, NSW 2007, Ph: (02) 9476 9999 Fax: (02) 9476 8767, mail@martens.com.au, www.martens.com.au

PROJECT DETAILS

Project 9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW AM Reviewed

Ref. No. Date Created P1806622JS02V01 29.06.2018

RISK ASSESSMEENT

									Risk to	Life 1	Risk to P	roperty ¹
Risk	Identify Hazard						Description	Likelihood 1	Probability	Assessment	Consequence	Assessment
Α	Shallow rotational slide	•	Unlikely	•	Minor	•	Shallow rotational slide	Unlikely	7.90E-07	Lr-A	Minor	L
В	Deep seated rotational slide	•	Unlikely	•	Minor	•	Deep seated rotational slide	Unlikely	2.63E-07	Lr-A	Minor	L
С	Shallow rock slide	•	Unlikely	•	Medium	•	Shallow rock slide	Unlikely	8.14E-07	Lr-A	Medium	L
D	Deep rock slide	•	Rare	•	Major	•	Deep rock slide	Rare	9.60E-07	Lr-A	Major	L
		•		•		•						

1. Assumes tretment measures are adopted.

Definitions

- 1. Risk to Life Assessment Lr-A: Acceptable risk for loss of life for the person(s). Risk level suitable for new developments.
- 2. Risk to Life Assessment Lr-T: Tolerable risk for loss of life for the person(s). Risk level suitable for existing structures > 10 years old. Risk level unsuitable for new developments.
- 3. Risk to Life Assessment Lr-U: Unacceptable risk for loss of life for the person(s). Risk level unsuitable for new or existing (>10 years old) developments.

Risk Level Implications

- 1. VH Very High Risk Unacceptable without treatment. Extensive detailed investigation and research, planning and implementation of treatment options essential to reduce to Low. Cost could be prohibitive.
- 2. H High Risk Unacceptable without treatment. Detailed investigation, planning and implementation of treatment options required to reduce risk to Low. Treatment will be costly.
- 3. M Moderate Risk May be tolerated in certain circumstances but requires investigation, planning and implementation to reduce risk to Low. Treatment options are practical.
- 4. L Low Risk Usually acceptable to regulators. Where treatment has been requir3ed to reduce the risk to this level, ongoing maintenance is required.
- 5. VL Very Low Risk Acceptable. Manage by normal slope maintenance procedures.

Treatment Measures

Ensure good hill slope engineering practice is adopted (examples are provided in Attachment E). Maintain vegetation cover. Do not oversteepen existing grades without suitable shoring support. Do not place excessive load onto reaining walls or existing and final sloping surfaces unless designed for. Ensure appropriate foundation and footing design. Ensure placement of all new footings on rock. Provide / maintain appropriate surface and subsurface drainage. Refer report text for further recommendations.

11 Attachment E – Hillside Construction Guidelines (AGS, 2007)



PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

APPENDIX G - SOME GUIDELINES FOR HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION


GOOD ENGINEERING PRACTICE

ADVICE


POOR ENGINEERING PRACTICE

GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	Obtain advice from a qualified, experienced geotechnical practitioner at early stage of planning and before site works.	Prepare detailed plan and start site works before geotechnical advice.
PLANNING	, while or primarily made of the control of the con	8
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.
DESIGN AND CON	STRUCTION	
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.	Indiscriminatory 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	Minimise height. Strip vegetation and topsoil and key into natural slopes prior to filling. Use clean fill materials and compact to engineering standards. Batter to appropriate slope or support with engineered retaining wall. Provide surface drainage and appropriate subsurface drainage.	Loose or poorly compacted fill, which if it fails, may flow a considerable distance including onto property 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 rock 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 rock 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	Provide at tops of cut and fill slopes. Discharge to street drainage or natural water courses. Provide general falls to prevent blockage by siltation and incorporate silt traps. Line to minimise infiltration and make flexible where possible. Special structures to dissipate energy at changes of slope and/or direction.	Discharge at top of fills and cuts. Allow water to pond on bench areas.
Subsurface	Provide filter around subsurface drain. Provide drain behind retaining walls. Use flexible pipelines with access for maintenance. Prevent inflow of surface water.	Discharge roof runoff 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 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.
	ITE VISITS DURING CONSTRUCTION	
DRAWINGS	Building Application drawings should be viewed by geotechnical consultant	
SITE VISITS	Site Visits by consultant may be appropriate during construction/	
	MAINTENANCE BY OWNER	
OWNER'S RESPONSIBILITY	Clean drainage systems; repair broken joints in drains and leaks in supply pipes.	
	Where structural distress is evident see advice. If seepage observed, determine causes or seek advice on consequences.	

EXAMPLES OF GOOD HILLSIDE PRACTICE



EXAMPLES OF POOR HILLSIDE PRACTICE



12	Attachment F – General Geotechnical Recommendations



Geotechnical Recommendations

Important Recommendations About Your Site (1 of 2)

These general geotechnical recommendations have been prepared by Martens to help you deliver a safe work site, to comply with your obligations, and to deliver your project. Not all are necessarily relevant to this report but are included as general reference. Any specific recommendations made in the report will override these recommendations.

Batter Slopes

Excavations in soil and extremely low to very low strength rock exceeding $0.75\,\mathrm{m}$ depth should be battered back at grades of no greater than 1 Vertical (V): 2 Horizontal (H) for temporary slopes (unsupported for less than 1 month) and 1 V: 3 H for longer term unsupported slopes.

Vertical excavation may be carried out in medium or higher strength rock, where encountered, subject to inspection and confirmation by a geotechnical engineer. Long term and short term unsupported batters should be protected against erosion and rock weathering due to, for example, stormwater run-off.

Batter angles may need to be revised depending on the presence of bedding partings or adversely oriented joints in the exposed rock, and are subject to on-site inspection and confirmation by a geotechnical engineer. Unsupported excavations deeper than 1.0 m should be assessed by a geotechnical engineer for slope instability risk.

Any excavated rock faces should be inspected during construction by a geotechnical engineer to determine whether any additional support, such as rock bolts or shotcrete, is required.

Earthworks

Earthworks should be carried out following removal of any unsuitable materials and in accordance with AS3798 (2007). A qualified geotechnical engineer should inspect the condition of prepared surfaces to assess suitability as foundation for future fill placement or load application.

Earthworks inspections and compliance testing should be carried out in accordance with Sections 5 and 8 of AS3798 (2007), with testing to be carried out by a National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) accredited testing laboratory.

Excavations

All excavation work should be completed with reference to the Work Health and Safety (Excavation Work) Code of Practice (2015), by Safe Work Australia. Excavations into rock may be undertaken as follows:

- 1. Extremely low to low strength rock conventional hydraulic earthmoving equipment.
- 2. <u>Medium strength or stronger rock</u> hydraulic earthmoving equipment with rock hammer or ripping tyne attachment.

Exposed rock faces and loose boulders should be monitored to assess risk of block / boulder movement, particularly as a result of excavation vibrations.

Fill

Subject to any specific recommendations provided in this report, any fill imported to site is to comprise approved material with maximum particle size of two thirds the final layer thickness. Fill should be placed in horizontal layers of not more than 300 mm loose thickness, however, the layer thickness should be appropriate for the adopted compaction plant.

Foundations

All exposed foundations should be inspected by a geotechnical engineer prior to footing construction to confirm encountered conditions satisfy design assumptions and that the base of all excavations is free from loose or softened material and water. Water that has ponded in the base of excavations and any resultant softened material is to be removed prior to footing construction.

Footings should be constructed with minimal delay following excavation. If a delay in construction is anticipated, we recommend placing a concrete blinding layer of at least 50 mm thickness in shallow footings or mass concrete in piers / piles to protect exposed foundations.

A geotechnical engineer should confirm any design bearing capacity values, by further assessment during construction, as necessary.

Shoring - Anchors

Where there is a requirement for either soil or rock anchors, or soil nailing, and these structures penetrate past a property boundary, appropriate permission from the adjoining land owner must be obtained prior to the installation of these structures.

Shoring - Permanent

Permanent shoring techniques may be used as an alternative to temporary shoring. The design of such structures should be in accordance with the findings of this report and any further testing recommended by this report. Permanent shoring may include [but not be limited to] reinforced block work walls, contiguous and semi contiguous pile walls, secant pile walls and soldier pile walls with or without reinforced shotcrete infill panels. The choice of shoring system will depend on the type of structure, project budget and site specific geotechnical conditions.

Permanent shoring systems are to be engineer designed and backfilled with suitable granular

Important Recommendations About Your Site (2 of 2)

material and free-draining drainage material. Backfill should be placed in maximum 100 mm thick layers compacted using a hand operated compactor. Care should be taken to ensure excessive compaction stresses are not transferred to retaining walls.

Shoring design should consider any surcharge loading from sloping / raised ground behind shoring structures, live loads, new structures, construction equipment, backfill compaction and static water pressures. All shoring systems shall be provided with adequate foundation designs.

Suitable drainage measures, such as geotextile enclosed 100 mm agricultural pipes embedded in free-draining gravel, should be included to redirect water that may collect behind the shoring structure to a suitable discharge point.

Shoring - Temporary

In the absence of providing acceptable excavation batters, excavations should be supported by suitably designed and installed temporary shoring / retaining structures to limit lateral deflection of excavation faces and associated ground surface settlements.

Soil Erosion Control

Removal of any soil overburden should be performed in a manner that reduces the risk of sedimentation occurring in any formal stormwater drainage system, on neighbouring land and in receiving waters. Where possible, this may be achieved by one or more of the following means:

- 1. Maintain vegetation where possible
- 2. Disturb minimal areas during excavation
- 3. Revegetate disturbed areas if possible

All spoil on site should be properly controlled by erosion control measures to prevent transportation of sediments off-site. Appropriate soil erosion control methods in accordance with Landcom (2004) shall be required.

Trafficability and Access

Consideration should be given to the impact of the proposed works and site subsurface conditions on trafficability within the site e.g. wet clay soils will lead to poor trafficability by tyred plant or vehicles.

Where site access is likely to be affected by any site works, construction staging should be organised such that any impacts on adequate access are minimised as best as possible.

Vibration Management

Where excavation is to be extended into medium or higher strength rock, care will be required when using a rock hammer to limit potential structural distress from excavation-induced vibrations where nearby structures may be affected by the works.

To limit vibrations, we recommend limiting rock hammer size and set frequency, and setting the hammer parallel to bedding planes and along defect planes, where possible, or as advised by a geotechnical engineer. We recommend limiting vibration peak particle velocities (PPV) caused by construction equipment or resulting from excavation at the site to 5 mm/s (AS 2187.2, 2006, Appendix J).

Waste – Spoil and Water

Soil to be disposed off-site should be classified in accordance with the relevant State Authority guidelines and requirements.

Any collected waste stormwater or groundwater should also be tested prior to discharge to ensure contaminant levels (where applicable) are appropriate for the nominated discharge location.

MA can complete the necessary classification and testing if required. Time allowance should be made for such testing in the construction program.

Water Management - Groundwater

If the proposed works are likely to intersect ephemeral or permanent groundwater levels, the management of any potential acid soil drainage should be considered. If groundwater tables are likely to be lowered, this should be further discussed with the relevant State Government Agency.

Water Management – Surface Water

All surface runoff should be diverted away from excavation areas during construction works and prevented from accumulating in areas surrounding any retaining structures, footings or the base of excavations.

Any collected surface water should be discharged into a suitable Council approved drainage system and not adversely impact downslope surface and subsurface conditions.

All site discharges should be passed through a filter material prior to release. Sump and pump methods will generally be suitable for collection and removal of accumulated surface water within any excavations.

Contingency Plan

In the event that proposed development works cause an adverse impact on geotechnical hazards, overall site stability or adjacent properties, the following actions are to be undertaken:

- 1. Works shall cease immediately.
- The nature of the impact shall be documented and the reason(s) for the adverse impact investigated.
- A qualified geotechnical engineer should be consulted to provide further advice in relation to the issue.



13 Attachment G – Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater – Forms 1 and 1a



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

	Development Appl	ication for Bur	ley Katon Halliday Pty	Ltd			
		9 Thyra Road	Palm Beach, NSW	ant			
Declaration geotechnic				astal engineer (where applicable) as p	part of a		
, Ralph	h Erni	on behalf of	Martens & Associates	•			
.,	(Insert Name)		(Trading or Company Name)				
on this th engineer organisation least \$2mi	as defined by the on/company to issue	Geotechnical Ris	k Management Policy for	geotechnical engineer or engineering Pittwater - 2009 and I am author n/company has a current professional in	ised by the above		
	ark appropriate box have prepared the d Landslide Risk Manaç	letailed Geotechnic gement Guidelines	al Report referenced below (AGS 2007) and the Geotechr	in accordance with the Australia Geo nical Risk Management Policy for Pittwa	mechanics Society's ter - 2009		
	am willing to technica Australian Geomecha Policy for Pittwater - 2	anics Society's Land	etailed Geotechnical Report r Islide Risk Management Guid	eferenced below has been prepared in elines (AGS 2007) and the Geotechnic	accordance with the al Risk Management		
	Section 6.0 of the Ge the proposed develop	otechnical Risk Ma pment are in comp	nagement Policy for Pittwater	d have carried out a risk assessment - 2009. I confirm that the results of the Risk Management Policy for Pittwater	risk assessment for		
	have examined the site and the proposed development/alteration in detail and I 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 Report is in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 requirements.						
	have examined the si and does not require Risk Management Po	a Geotechnical Re	port or Risk Assessment and	eparate from and is not affected by a 0 d hence my Report is in accordance w	Geotechnical Hazard ith the Geotechnical		
	have provided the coa	istal process and co	astal forces analysis for inclu	sion in the Geotechnical Report			
Geotechn	ical Report Details:						
	Report Title: Geot	technical Asse	ssment Report referen	ce P1806622JR02V03			
	Report Date: 2	3 March 2022					
-	∷ Author: Д	Akshaya Ghimi	re				
	Author's Company/C		lartens & Associates				
Documen	tation which relate to	o or are relied upo	n in report preparation:				
	Bee & Lethbridg	je Pty Ltd, Sur	vey reference 13281				
	Burley Katon Ha	alliday Pty Ltd a	architectural drawings	for reference project no. 3454	,		
I am awar Application the propos taken as a	n for this site and will t sed development have at least 100 years un to remove foreseeable	otechnical Report, be relied on by Pittw e been adequately a nless otherwise state e risk.	rater Council as the basis for or addressed to achieve an "Acc	oned site is to be submitted in suppo ensuring that the Geotechnical Risk Mar eptable Risk Management" level for the rt and that reasonable and practical n	nagement aspects of life of the structure		
	N	Ralph	Erni				
			nal Status CPEng NE 2061149	R			
	N	•					
	C	_{Company} Ma	rtens & Associates				

P21 DCP Appendix 5 Page 21

Adopted: 15 December 2014 In Force From: 20 December 2014

GEOTECHNICAL RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR PITTWATER

FORM NO. 1(a) - Checklist of Requirements For Geotechnical Risk Management Report for Development
Application

	Development Application for Burley Katon Halliday Pty Ltd
	Name of Applicant Address of site9 Thyra Road, Palm Beach, NSW
	wing checklist covers the minimum requirements to be addressed in a Geotechnical Risk Management Geotechnical Report. This is to accompany the Geotechnical Report and its certification (Form No. 1).
Geotech	nical Report Details:
	Report Title: Geotechnical Assessment Report reference P1806622JR02V03
	Report Date: 23 March 2022
	Author: Akshaya Ghimire
	Author's Company/Organisation: Martens & Associates
Please m	Comprehensive site mapping conducted 20 June 2018
	(uale)
x	Mapping details presented on contoured site plan with geomorphic mapping to a minimum scale of 1:200 (as appropriate) Subsurface investigation required
~	Substitace investigation required No Justification
	✓ Yes Date conducted
X	Geotechnical model developed and reported as an inferred subsurface type-section Geotechnical hazards identified
	Above the site ∴
	☑ On the site
	☑ Below the site
X	⊠ Beside the site Geotechnical hazards described and reported
\mathbf{x}	Risk assessment conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
	 ☑ Consequence analysis ☑ Frequency analysis
X	Risk calculation
X	Risk assessment for property conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
X	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
X	Opinion has been provided that the design can achieve the "Acceptable Risk Management" criteria provided that the specified conditions are achieved.
X	Design Life Adopted:
-	specify
X	Geotechnical Conditions to be applied to all four phases as described in the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 have been specified
X	Additional action to remove risk where reasonable and practical have been identified and included in the report. Risk assessment within Bushfire Asset Protection Zone.
geotechn for the life	are that Pittwater Council will rely on the Geotechnical Report, to which this checklist applies, as the basis for ensuring that the ical risk management aspects of the proposal have been adequately addressed to achieve an "Acceptable Risk Management" level to fithe structure, taken as at least 100 years unless otherwise stated, and justified in the Report and that reasonable and practical is have been identified to remove foreseeable risk.
	Signature
	Name Ralph Erni
	Chartered Professional Status. CPEng NER
	Membership No
	Sompany

P21 DCP Appendix 5 Page 22

Adopted: 15 December 2014 In Force From: 20 December 2014

Document Set ID: 5273966 Version: 1, Version Date: 26/11/2015 14 Attachment H – Notes About This Report





Important Information About Your Report (1 of 2)

These notes have been prepared by Martens to help you interpret and understand the limitations of your report. Not all are necessarily relevant to all reports but are included as general reference.

Engineering Reports - Limitations

Engineering reports are based on information that may be gained from limited subsurface site testing and sampling, supplemented by knowledge of local geology and experience. For this reason, they must be regarded as interpretative rather than factual documents, limited to some extent by the scope of information on which they rely.

Engineering Reports - Project Specific Criteria

Engineering reports are prepared by qualified personnel. They are based on information obtained, on current engineering standards of interpretation and analysis, and on the basis of your unique project specific requirements as understood by Martens. Project criteria typically include the general nature of the project; its size and configuration; the location of any structures on the site; other site improvements; the presence of underground utilities; and the additional risk imposed by scope-of-service limitations imposed by the Client.

Where the report has been prepared for a specific design proposal (e.g. a three storey building), the information and interpretation may not be relevant if the design proposal is changed (e.g. to a twenty storey building). Your report should not be relied upon, if there are changes to the project, without first asking Martens to assess how factors, which changed subsequent to the date of the report, affect the report's recommendations. Martens will not accept responsibility for problems that may occur due to design changes, if not consulted.

Engineering Reports - Recommendations

Your report is based on the assumption that site conditions, as may be revealed through selective point sampling, are indicative of actual conditions throughout an area. This assumption often cannot be substantiated until project implementation has commenced. Therefore your site investigation report recommendations should only be regarded as preliminary.

Only Martens, who prepared the report, are fully familiar with the background information needed to assess whether or not the report's recommendations are valid and whether or not changes should be considered as the project develops. If another party undertakes the implementation of the recommendations of this report, there is a risk that the report will be misinterpreted and Martens cannot be held responsible for such misinterpretation.

Engineering Reports - Use for Tendering Purposes

Where information obtained from investigations is provided for tendering purposes, Martens recommend 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.

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

Engineering Reports - Data

The report as a whole presents the findings of a site assessment and should not be copied in part or altered in any way.

Logs, figures, drawings etc are customarily included in a Martens report and are developed by scientists, engineers or geologists based on their interpretation of field logs (assembled by field personnel), desktop studies and laboratory evaluation of field samples. These data should not under any circumstances be redrawn for inclusion in other documents or separated from the report in any way.

Engineering Reports - Other Projects

To avoid misuse of the information contained in your report it is recommended that you confer with Martens before passing your report on to another party who may not be familiar with the background and purpose of the report. Your report should not be applied to any project other than that originally specified at the time the report was issued.

Subsurface Conditions - General

Every care is taken with the report in relation to interpretation of subsurface conditions, discussion of geotechnical aspects, relevant standards 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 will depend partly on test point (eg. excavation or borehole) spacing and sampling frequency, which are often limited by project imposed budgetary constraints.
- Changes in guidelines, standards and policy or interpretation of guidelines, standards and policy by statutory authorities.



- The actions of contractors responding to commercial pressures.
- Actual conditions differing somewhat from those inferred to exist, because no professional, no matter how qualified, can reveal precisely what is hidden by earth, rock and time.

The actual interface between logged materials may be far more gradual or abrupt than assumed based on the facts obtained. Nothing can be done to change the actual site conditions which exist, but steps can be taken to reduce the impact of unexpected conditions.

If these conditions occur, Martens will be pleased to assist with investigation or providing advice to resolve the matter.

Subsurface Conditions - Changes

Natural processes and the activity of man create subsurface conditions. For example, water levels can vary with time, fill may be placed on a site and pollutants may migrate with time. Reports are based on conditions which existed at the time of the subsurface exploration / assessment.

Decisions should not be based on a report whose adequacy may have been affected by time. If an extended period of time has elapsed since the report was prepared, consult Martens to be advised how time may have impacted on the project.

Subsurface Conditions - Site Anomalies

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

Report Use by Other Design Professionals

To avoid potentially costly misinterpretations when other design professionals develop their plans based on a Martens report, retain Martens to work with other project professionals affected by the report. This may involve Martens explaining the report design implications and then reviewing plans and specifications produced to see how they have incorporated the report findings.

Subsurface Conditions - Geo-environmental Issues

Your report generally does not relate to any findings, conclusions, or recommendations about the potential for hazardous or contaminated materials existing at the site unless specifically required to do so as part of Martens' proposal for works.

Specific sampling guidelines and specialist equipment, techniques and personnel are typically used to perform geo-environmental or site contamination assessments. Contamination can create major health, safety and environmental risks. If you have no information about the potential for your site to be contaminated or create an environmental hazard, you are advised to contact Martens for information relating to such matters.

Responsibility

Geo-environmental reporting relies on interpretation of factual information based on professional judgment and opinion and has an inherent level of uncertainty attached to it and is typically far less exact than the design disciplines. This has often resulted in claims being lodged against consultants, which are unfounded.

To help prevent this problem, a number of clauses have been developed for use in contracts, reports and other documents. Responsibility clauses do not transfer appropriate liabilities from Martens to other parties but are included to identify where Martens' responsibilities begin and end. Their use is intended to help all parties involved to recognise their individual responsibilities. Read all documents from Martens closely and do not hesitate to ask any questions you may have.

Site Inspections

Martens will always be pleased to provide engineering inspection services for aspects of work to which this report relates. This could range from a site visit to confirm that conditions exposed are as expected, to full time engineering presence on site. Martens is familiar with a variety of techniques and approaches that can be used to help reduce risks for all parties to a project, from design to construction.



martens consulting enginee

Definitions

In engineering terms, soil includes every type of uncemented or partially cemented inorganic or organic material found in the ground. In practice, if the material does not exhibit any visible rock properties and can be remoulded or disintegrated by hand in its field condition or in water it is described as a soil. Other materials are described using rock description terms.

The methods of description and classification of soils and rocks used in this report are typically based on Australian Standard 1726 and the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) – refer Soil Data Explanation of Terms (2 of 3). In general, descriptions cover the following properties - strength or density, colour, structure, soil or rock type and inclusions.


Particle Size

Soil types are described according to the predominating particle size, qualified by the grading of other particles present (e.g. sandy CLAY). Unless otherwise stated, particle size is described in accordance with the following table.

Division	Subdivision	Size (mm)		
BOULDERS		>200		
COBBLES		63 to 200		
	Coarse	20 to 63		
GRAVEL	Medium	6 to 20		
	Fine	2.36 to 6		
	Coarse	0.6 to 2.36		
SAND	Medium	0.2 to 0.6		
	Fine	0.075 to 0.2		
SILT		0.002 to 0.075		
CLAY		< 0.002		

Plasticity Properties

Plasticity properties of cohesive soils can be assessed in the field by tactile properties or by laboratory procedures.



Moisture Condition

Dry Looks and feels dry. Cohesive and cemented soils are hard, friable or powdery. Uncemented granular soils run freely through hands.

Moist Soil feels cool and damp and is darkened in colour. Cohesive soils can be moulded. Granular soils tend to cohere.

Wet As for moist but with free water forming on hands when handled.

Explanation of Terms (1 of 3)

Consistency of Cohesive Soils

Cohesive soils refer to predominantly clay materials.

Term	C _u (kPa)	Approx. SPT "N"	Field Guide
Very Soft	<12	2	A finger can be pushed well into the soil with little effort. Sample extrudes between fingers when squeezed in fist.
Soft	12 - 25	2 – 4	A finger can be pushed into the soil to about 25mm depth. Easily moulded in fingers.
Firm	25 - 50	4 – 8	The soil can be indented about 5mm with the thumb, but not penetrated. Can be moulded by strong pressure in the figures.
Stiff	50 - 100	8 – 15	The surface of the soil can be indented with the thumb, but not penetrated. Cannot be moulded by fingers.
Very Stiff	100 - 200	15 – 30	The surface of the soil can be marked, but not indented with thumb pressure. Difficult to cut with a knife. Thumbnail can readily indent.
Hard	> 200	> 30	The surface of the soil can be marked only with the thumbnail. Brittle. Tends to break into fragments.
Friable	-	-	Crumbles or powders when scraped by thumbnail.

Density of Granular Soils

Non-cohesive soils are classified on the basis of relative density, generally from standard penetration test (SPT) or Dutch cone penetrometer test (CPT) results as below:

Relative Density	%	SPT 'N' Value* (blows/300mm)	CPT Cone Value (q _c MPa)	
Very loose	< 15	< 5	< 2	
Loose	15 - 35	5 - 10	2 - 5	
Medium dense	35 - 65	10 - 30	5 - 15	
Dense	65 - 85	30 - 50	15 - 25	
Very dense	> 85	> 50	> 25	

^{*} Values may be subject to corrections for overburden pressures and equipment type.

Minor Components

Minor components in soils may be present and readily detectable, but have little bearing on general geotechnical classification. Terms include:

Term	Assessment	Proportion of Minor component In:
Trace of	Presence just detectable by feel or eye. Soil properties little or no different to general properties of primary component.	Coarse grained soils: < 5 % Fine grained soils: < 15 %
With some	Presence easily detectable by feel or eye. Soil properties little different to general properties of primary component.	Coarse grained soils: 5 - 12 % Fine grained soils: 15 - 30 %



Explanation of Terms (2 of 3)

Symbols for Soils and Other

SOILS

0 7

COBBLES/BOULDERS

GRAVEL (GP OR GW)



SILT (ML OR MH)

ORGANIC SILT (OH)

CLAY (CL, CI OR CH)



OTHER

FILL



TALUS



ASPHALT



CONCRETE

1803g

SILTY GRAVEL (GM)

CLAYEY GRAVEL (GC)

SILTY SAND (SM)

CLAYEY SAND (SC)



SAND (SP OR SW)



SILTY CLAY

SANDY CLAY



PEAT



TOPSOIL

Unified Soil Classification Scheme (USCS)

	FIELD IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES (Excluding particles larger than 63 mm and basing fractions on estimated mass)								
than		rse mm.	irse) mm.	CLEAN GRAVELS [Little or no fines)	W	ide range in grain siz	e and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes.	GW	Gravel
is larger		VELS alf of coe r than 2.0	CLEAN GRAVELS (Little or no fines)		Predominantly one	size or a range of sizes with more intermediate sizes missing	GP	Gravel	
OILS 63 mm i	(e)	GRAVELS More than half of coarse fraction is larger than 2.0 mm.	VELS FINES ciable int of ss)		Non-plastic fine	es (for identification procedures see ML below)	GM	Silty Gravel	
AINED So	aked ey	Mor	GRAVELS WITH FINES (Appreciable amount of fines)		Plastic fines	(for identification procedures see CL below)	GC	Clayey Gravel	
COARSE GRAINED SOILS More than 50 % of material less than 63 mm is larger than 0.075 mm	0.075 mm particle is about the smallest particle visible to the naked eye)	irse 0 mm	AN IDS or no		Wide range in grain	sizes and substantial amounts of intermediate sizes missing.	SW	Sand	
COA % of ma	visible	IDS alf of coa er than 2.	CLEAN SANDS (Little or no fines)		Predominantly one size or a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing			Sand	
than 50	particle	SANDS More than half of coarse fraction is smaller than 2.0 mm	IDS FINES ciable int of es)		Non-plastic fine	es (for identification procedures see ML below)	SM	Silty Sand	
More	mallest	Mor	SANDS WITH FINES (Appreciable amount of fines)		Plastic fines	SC	Clayey Sand		
	thes		IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES ON FRACTIONS < 0.2 MM					1	
3 mm is	s about	DRY STRENG (Crushing Characteristi	DILATANC	Υ	TOUGHNESS	DESCRIPTION	USCS	Primary Name	
LS s than 6 nm	article i	None to Low Quick to Slow)	None	Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands with slight plasticity	ML	Silt	
IED SOI erial less 0.075 r	d ww	Medium to High	Medium to High None Low to Slow to Very Medium Slow		Medium	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity ¹ , gravely clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays	CL ²	Clay	
FINE GRAINED SOILS 50 % of material less tha smaller than 0.075 mm	(A 0.075				Low	Organic slits and organic slity clays of low plasticity	OL	Organic Silt	
FINE GRAINED SOILS More than 50 % of material less than 63 mm is smaller than 0.075 mm	0	Low to Medium			Low to Medium	Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts	МН	Silt	
ore tha		High	None	None		Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays	СН	Clay	
Ē		Medium to High	o None		Low to Medium	Organic clays of medium to high plasticity	ОН	Organic Silt	
HIGHLY ORGANI SOILS Notes:		Rea	idily identified by	y col	lour, odour, spong	gy feel and frequently by fibrous texture	Pt	Peat	

Notes:

- 1. Low Plasticity Liquid Limit $W_L < 35\%$ Medium Plasticity Liquid limit $W_L 35$ to 60% High Plasticity Liquid limit $W_L > 60\%$.
- CI may be adopted for clay of medium plasticity to distinguish from clay of low plasticity.



Explanation of Terms (3 of 3)

Soil Agricultural Classification Scheme

In some situations, such as where soils are to be used for effluent disposal purposes, soils are often more appropriately classified in terms of traditional agricultural classification schemes. Where a Martens report provides agricultural classifications, these are undertaken in accordance with descriptions by Northcote, K.H. (1979) The factual key for the recognition of Australian Soils, Rellim Technical Publications, NSW, p 26 - 28.

Symbol	Field Texture Grade	Behaviour of moist bolus	Ribbon length	Clay content (%)
S	Sand	Coherence nil to very slight; cannot be moulded; single grains adhere to fingers	0 mm	< 5
LS	Loamy sand	Slight coherence; discolours fingers with dark organic stain	6.35 mm	5
CLS	Clayey sand	Slight coherence; sticky when wet; many sand grains stick to fingers; discolours fingers with clay stain	6.35mm - 1.3cm	5 - 10
SL	Sandy loam	Bolus just coherent but very sandy to touch; dominant sand grains are of medium size and are readily visible	1.3 - 2.5	10 - 15
FSL	Fine sandy loam	Bolus coherent; fine sand can be felt and heard	1.3 - 2.5	10 - 20
SCL-	Light sandy clay loam	Bolus strongly coherent but sandy to touch, sand grains dominantly medium size and easily visible	2.0	15 - 20
L	Loam	Bolus coherent and rather spongy; smooth feel when manipulated but no obvious sandiness or silkiness; may be somewhat greasy to the touch if much organic matter present	2.5	25
Lfsy	Loam, fine sandy	Bolus coherent and slightly spongy; fine sand can be felt and heard when manipulated	2.5	25
SiL	Silt loam	Coherent bolus, very smooth to silky when manipulated	2.5	25 + > 25 silt
SCL	Sandy clay loam	Strongly coherent bolus sandy to touch; medium size sand grains visible in a finer matrix	2.5 - 3.8	20 - 30
CL	Clay loam	Coherent plastic bolus; smooth to manipulate	3.8 - 5.0	30 - 35
SiCL	Silty clay loam	Coherent smooth bolus; plastic and silky to touch	3.8 - 5.0	30- 35 + > 25 silt
FSCL	Fine sandy clay loam	Coherent bolus; fine sand can be felt and heard	3.8 - 5.0	30 - 35
SC	Sandy clay	Plastic bolus; fine to medium sized sands can be seen, felt or heard in a clayey matrix	5.0 - 7.5	35 - 40
SiC	Silty clay	Plastic bolus; smooth and silky	5.0 - 7.5	35 - 40 + > 25 silt
LC	Light clay	Plastic bolus; smooth to touch; slight resistance to shearing	5.0 - 7.5	35 - 40
LMC	Light medium clay	Plastic bolus; smooth to touch, slightly greater resistance to shearing than LC	7.5	40 - 45
MC	Medium clay	Smooth plastic bolus, handles like plasticine and can be moulded into rods without fracture, some resistance to shearing	> 7.5	45 - 55
НС	Heavy clay	Smooth plastic bolus; handles like stiff plasticine; can be moulded into rods without fracture; firm resistance to shearing	> 7.5	> 50



Explanation of Terms (1 of 2)

GNEISS

METAMORPHIC ROCK

Symbols for Rock

SEDIMENTARY ROCK



CONGLOMERATIC SANDSTONE

COAL



IGNEOUS ROCK

LITHIC TUFF

LIMESTONE

METASANDSTONE

SLATE, PHYLLITE, SCHIST

METASILTSTONE



METAMUDSTONE



SANDSTONE/QUARTZITE

SILTSTONE

SHALE



MUDSTONE/CLAYSTONE



GRANITE



DOLERITE/BASALT

Definitions

Descriptive terms used for Rock by Martens are based on AS1726 and encompass rock substance, defects and mass.

Rock Substance

In geotechnical engineering terms, rock substance is any naturally occurring aggregate of minerals and organic matter which cannot be disintegrated or remoulded by hand in air or water. Other material is described using soil descriptive terms. Rock substance is effectively homogeneous and may be isotropic or anisotropic.

Rock Defect

Discontinuity or break in the continuity of a substance or substances.

Rock Mass

Any body of material which is not effectively homogeneous. It can consist of two or more substances without defects, or

one or more substances with one or more defects.

Degree of Weathering

Rock weathering is defined as the degree of decline in rock structure and grain property and can be determined in the field.

Term	Symbol	Definition				
Residual soil ¹	Residual soil ¹ Rs Soil derived from the weathering of rock. The mass structure and substance fabric are no longer evic is a large change in volume but the soil has not been significantly transported.					
Extremely weathered ¹	EW	Rock substance affected by weathering to the extent that the rock exhibits soil properties - i.e. it can be remoulded and can be classified according to the Unified Classification System, but the texture of the original rock is still evident.				
Highly weathered ²	HW	Rock substance affected by weathering to the extent that limonite staining or bleaching affects the whole of the rock substance and other signs of chemical or physical decomposition are evident. Porosity and strength may be increased or decrease compared to the fresh rock usually as a result of iron leaching or deposition. The colour and strength of the original rock substance is no longer recognisable.				
Moderately weathered ²	MW	Rock substance affected by weathering to the extent that staining extends throughout the whole of the rock substance and the original colour of the fresh rock is no longer recognisable.				
Slightly weathered	SW	Rock substance affected by weathering to the extent that partial staining or discolouration of the rock substance usually by limonite has taken place. The colour and texture of the fresh rock is recognisable.				
Fresh	FR	Rock substance unaffected by weathering				

- 1 The term "Distinctly Weathered" (DW) may be used to cover the range of substance weathering between EW and SW.
- 2 Rs and EW material is described using soil descriptive terms

Rock strength is defined by the Point Load Strength Index (Is 50) and refers to the strength of the rock substance in the direction normal to the loading. The test procedure is described by the International Society of Rock Mechanics.

Term	Is (50) MPa	Field Guide	Symbol
Very low	>0.03 ≤0.1	May be crumbled in the hand. Sandstone is 'sugary' and friable.	VL
Low	>0.1 ≤0.3	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm diameter may be broken by hand and easily scored with a knife. Sharp edges of core may be friable and break during handling.	L
Medium	>0.3 ≤1.0	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm diameter can be broken by hand with considerable difficulty. Readily scored with a knife.	М
High	>1 ≤3	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm diameter cannot be broken by unaided hands, can be slightly scratched or scored with a knife.	Н
Very high	>3 ≤10	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm diameter may be broken readily with hand held hammer. Cannot be scratched with pen knife.	VH
Extremely high	>10	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm diameter is difficult to break with hand held hammer. Rings when struck with a hammer.	EH





Explanation of Terms (2 of 2)

Degree of Fracturing

This classification applies to diamond drill cores and refers to the spacing of all types of natural fractures along which the core is discontinuous. These include bedding plane partings, joints and other rock defects, but exclude fractures such as drilling breaks (DB) or handling breaks (HB).

Term	Description
Fragmented	The core is comprised primarily of fragments of length less than 20 mm, and mostly of width less than core diameter.
Highly fractured	Core lengths are generally less than 20 mm to 40 mm with occasional fragments.
Fractured	Core lengths are mainly 30 mm to 100 mm with occasional shorter and longer sections.
Slightly fractured	Core lengths are generally 300 mm to 1000 mm, with occasional longer sections and sections of 100 mm to 300 mm.
Unbroken	The core does not contain any fractures.

Rock Core Recovery

TCR = Total Core Recovery

SCR = Solid Core Recovery

RQD = Rock Quality Designation

 $= \frac{\text{Length of core recovered}}{\text{Length of core run}} \times 100\%$

 $= \frac{\Sigma Length \, of \, cylindrical \, core \, recovered}{Length \, of \, core \, run} \times 100\%$

 $= \frac{\sum Axial \, lengths \, of \, core > 100 \, mm \, long}{Length \, of \, core \, run} \times 100\%$

Rock Strength Tests

- ▼ Point load strength Index (Is50) axial test (MPa)
- ▶ Point load strength Index (Is50) diametral test (MPa)
- Unconfined compressive strength (UCS) (MPa)

Defect Type Abbreviations and Descriptions

Defect Type (with inclination given)		Planarity		Roughness		
BP	Bedding plane parting	PI	Planar	Pol	Polished	
FL	Foliation	Cu	Curved	SI	Slickensided	
CL	Cleavage	Un	Undulating	Sm	Smooth	
JT	Joint	St	Stepped	Ro	Rough	
FC	Fracture	Ir	Irregular	VR	Very rough	
SZ/SS	Sheared zone/ seam (Fault)	Dis	Discontinuous			
CZ/CS	CZ/CS Crushed zone/ seam		s	Coating or Filling		
DZ/DS FZ IS VN CO HB DB	Decomposed zone/ seam Fractured Zone Infilled seam Vein Contact Handling break Drilling break	Thickness Zone > 100 mm Seam > 2 mm < 100 mm Plane < 2 mm		Cn Sn Ct Vnr Fe X Qz MU	Clean Stain Coating Veneer Iron Oxide Carbonaceous Quartzite Unidentified mineral	
		Inclination Inclination of defect is measured from perpendicular to and down the core axis. Direction of defect is measured clockwise (looking down core) from magnetic north.				

Test, Drill and Excavation Methods Explanation of Terms (1 of 3)

Sampling

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

Disturbed samples taken during drilling or excavation provide information on colour, type, inclusions and, depending upon the degree of disturbance, some information on strength and structure.

Undisturbed samples may be taken by pushing a thin-walled sampling tube, e.g. U_{50} (50 mm internal diameter thin walled tube), into soils and withdrawing a soil sample in a relatively undisturbed state. Such samples yield information on structure and strength and are necessary for laboratory determination of shear strength and compressibility. Undisturbed sampling is generally effective only in cohesive soils. Other sampling methods may be used. Details of the type and method of sampling are given in the report.

Drilling / Excavation Methods

The following is a brief summary of drilling and excavation methods currently adopted by the Company and some comments on their use and application.

<u>Hand Excavation</u> - in some situations, excavation using hand tools, such as mattock and spade, may be required due to limited site access or shallow soil profiles.

<u>Hand Auger</u> - the hole is advanced by pushing and rotating either a sand or clay auger, generally 75-100 mm in diameter, into the ground. The penetration depth is usually limited to the length of the auger pole; however extender pieces can be added to lengthen this.

<u>Test Pits</u> - these are excavated with a backhoe or a tracked excavator, allowing close examination of the insitu soils and, if it is safe to descend into the pit, collection of bulk disturbed samples. The depth of penetration is limited to about 3 m for a backhoe and up to 6 m for an excavator. A potential disadvantage is the disturbance caused by the excavation.

Large Diameter Auger (e.g. Pengo) - the hole is advanced by a rotating plate or short spiral auger, generally 300 mm or larger in diameter. The cuttings are returned to the surface at intervals (generally of not more than 0.5 m) and are disturbed but usually unchanged in moisture content. Identification of soil strata is generally much more reliable than with continuous spiral flight augers, and is usually supplemented by occasional undisturbed tube sampling.

<u>Continuous Sample Drilling (Push Tube)</u> - the hole is advanced by pushing a 50 - 100 mm diameter socket into the ground and withdrawing it at intervals to extrude the sample. This is the most reliable method of drilling in soils, since moisture content is unchanged and soil structure, strength etc. is only marginally affected.

Continuous Spiral Flight Augers - the hole is advanced using 90 - 115 mm diameter continuous spiral flight augers, which are withdrawn at intervals to allow sampling or 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 or, or may be collected after withdrawal of the auger flights, but they are very disturbed and may be contaminated. Information from the drilling (as distinct from specific sampling by SPTs or undisturbed samples) is of relatively lower reliability, due to remoulding, contamination or softening of samples by ground water.

Non-core Rotary Drilling - the hole is 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 determined from the cuttings, together with some information from 'feel' and rate of penetration.

Rotary Mud Drilling - similar to rotary drilling, but using drilling mud as a circulating fluid. The mud tends to mask the cuttings and reliable identification is again only possible from separate intact sampling (eg. from SPT).

<u>Continuous Core Drilling</u> - a continuous core sample is obtained using a diamond tipped core barrel of usually 50 mm internal diameter. Provided full core recovery is achieved (not always possible in very weak or fractured rocks and granular soils), this technique provides a very reliable (but relatively expensive) method of investigation.

In-situ Testing and Interpretation

Cone Penetrometer Testing (CPT)

Cone penetrometer testing (sometimes referred to as Dutch Cone) described in this report has been carried out using an electrical friction cone penetrometer.

The test is described in AS 1289.6.5.1-1999 (R2013). In the test, a 35 mm diameter rod with a cone tipped end is pushed continuously into the soil, the reaction being provided by a specially designed truck or rig which is fitted with an hydraulic ram system.

Measurements are made of the end bearing resistance on the cone and the friction resistance on a separate 130 mm long sleeve, immediately behind the cone. Transducers in the tip of the assembly are connected by electrical wires passing through the push rod centre to an amplifier and recorder unit mounted on the control truck. As penetration occurs (at a rate of approximately 20 mm per second) the information is output on continuous chart recorders. The plotted results given in this report have been traced from the original records. The information provided on the charts comprises:

- (i) Cone resistance (qc) the actual end bearing force divided by the cross sectional area of the cone, expressed in MPa.
- (ii) Sleeve friction (q₁) the frictional force of the sleeve divided by the surface area, expressed in kPa.
- (iii) Friction ratio the ratio of sleeve friction to cone resistance, expressed in percent.

There are two scales available for measurement of cone resistance. The lower (A) scale (0 - 5 MPa) is used in very soft soils where increased sensitivity is required and is shown in the graphs as a dotted line. The main (B) scale (0 - 50 MPa) is less sensitive and is shown as a full line.

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 % - 2 % are commonly encountered in sands and very soft clays rising to 4 % - 10 % in stiff clays.

In sands, the relationship between cone resistance and SPT value is commonly in the range:

 $q_c \text{ (MPa)} = (0.4 \text{ to } 0.6) \text{ N (blows/300 mm)}$

In clays, the relationship between undrained shear strength and cone resistance is commonly in the range:

 $q_c = (12 \text{ to } 18) C_u$

Test, Drill and Excavation Methods Explanation of Terms (2 of 3) Sequence of the estimate unconfined compressive to the field of the

estimation of modulus or compressibility values to allow calculation of foundation settlements.

Inferred stratification as shown on the attached reports is assessed from the cone and friction traces and from experience and information from nearby boreholes etc. This information is presented for general guidance, but must be regarded as being to some extent interpretive. The test method provides a continuous profile of engineering properties, and where precise information on soil classification is required, direct drilling and sampling may be preferable.

Standard Penetration Testing (SPT)

Standard penetration tests are used mainly in noncohesive soils, but occasionally also in cohesive soils as a means of determining density or strength and also of obtaining a relatively undisturbed sample.

The test procedure is described in AS 1289.6.3.1-2004. The test is carried out in a borehole by driving a 50 mm diameter split sample tube under the impact of a 63 kg hammer with a free fall of 760 mm. It is normal for the tube to be driven in three successive 150 mm penetration depth increments and the 'N' value is taken as the number of blows for the last two 150 mm depth increments (300 mm total penetration). In dense sands, very hard clays or weak rock, the full 450 mm penetration may not be practicable and the test is discontinued. The test results are reported in the following form:

Where full 450 mm penetration is obtained with successive blow counts for each 150 mm of say 4, 6 and 7 blows:

as 4, 6, 7 N = 13

(ii) 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 15, 30/40 mm.

The results of the tests can be related empirically to the engineering properties of the soil. Occasionally, the test method is used to obtain samples in 50 mm diameter thin walled sample tubes in clays. In such circumstances, the test results are shown on the borehole logs in brackets.

Dynamic Cone (Hand) Penetrometers

Hand penetrometer tests are carried out by driving a rod into the ground with a falling weight hammer and measuring the blows for successive 150mm increments of penetration. Normally, there is a depth limitation of 1.2m but this may be extended in certain conditions by the use of extension rods. Two relatively similar tests are used.

Perth sand penetrometer (PSP) - a 16 mm diameter flat ended rod is driven with a 9 kg hammer, dropping 600 mm. The test, described in AS 1289.6.3.3-1997 (R2013), was developed for testing the density of sands (originating in Perth) and is mainly used in granular soils and filling

Cone penetrometer (DCP) - sometimes known as the Scala Penetrometer, a 16 mm rod with a 20 mm diameter cone end is driven with a 9 kg hammer dropping 510 mm. The test, described in AS 1289.6.3.2-1997 (R2013), was developed initially for pavement sub-grade investigations, with correlations of the test results with California Bearing Ratio published by various Road Authorities.

Pocket Penetrometers

The pocket (hand) penetrometer (PP) is typically a light weight spring hand operated device with a stainless steel

strength, qu, (UCS in kPa) of a fine grained soil in field conditions. In use, the free end of the piston is pressed into the soil at a uniform penetration rate until a line, engraved near the piston tip, reaches the soil surface level. The reading is taken from a gradation scale, which is attached to the piston via a built-in spring mechanism and calibrated to kilograms per square centimetre (kPa) UCS. The UCS measurements are used to evaluate consistency of the soil in the field moisture condition. The results may be used to assess the undrained shear strength, Cu, of fine grained soil using the approximate relationship:

 $q_u = 2 \times C_u$.

It should be noted that accuracy of the results may be influenced by condition variations at selected test surfaces. Also, the readings obtained from the PP test are based on a small area of penetration and could give misleading results. They should not replace laboratory test results. The use of the results from this test is typically limited to an assessment of consistency of the soil in the field and not used directly for design of foundations.

Test Pit / Borehole Logs

Test pit / borehole log(s) presented herein are an engineering and / or geological interpretation of the subsurface conditions. Their reliability will depend to some extent on frequency of sampling and methods of excavation / drilling. Ideally, continuous undisturbed sampling or excavation / core drilling will provide the most reliable assessment but this is not always practicable, or possible to justify on economic grounds. In any case, the test pit / borehole logs represent only a very small sample of the total subsurface profile.

Interpretation of the information and its application to design and construction should therefore take into account the spacing of test pits / boreholes, the frequency of sampling and the possibility of other than 'straight line' variation between the test pits / boreholes.

Laboratory Testing

Laboratory testing is carried out in accordance with AS 1289 Methods of Testing Soil for Engineering Purposes. Details of the test procedure used are given on the individual report forms.

Ground Water

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

- In low permeability soils, ground water although present, 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 prior weather changes. They may not be the same at the time of construction as are indicated in the report.
- The use of water or mud as a drilling fluid will mask any ground water inflow. Water has to be blown out of the hole and drilling mud must first be washed out of the hole if water observations are to be made.

More reliable measurements can be made by installing standpipes, which are read at intervals over several days, or 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 a perched water table.

Test, Drill and Excavation Methods

Explanation of Terms (3 of 3)

DRILLING / EXCAVATION METHOD

НА	Hand Auger	RD	Rotary Blade or Drag Bit	NQ	Diamond Core - 47 mm
AD/V	Auger Drilling with V-bit	RT	Rotary Tricone bit	NMLC	Diamond Core - 51.9 mm
AD/T	Auger Drilling with TC-Bit	RAB	Rotary Air Blast	HQ	Diamond Core - 63.5 mm
AS	Auger Screwing	RC	Reverse Circulation	HMLC	Diamond Core - 63.5 mm
HSA	Hollow Stem Auger	CT	Cable Tool Rig	DT	Diatube Coring
S	Excavated by Hand Spade	PT	Push Tube	NDD	Non-destructive digging
BH	Tractor Mounted Backhoe	PC	Percussion	PQ	Diamond Core - 83 mm
JET	Jetting	E	Tracked Hydraulic Excavator	Χ	Existing Excavation

SUPPORT

Nil	No support	S	Shotcrete	RB	Rock Bolt
С	Casing	Sh	Shoring	SN	Soil Nail
WB	Wash bore with Blade or Bailer	WR	Wash bore with Roller	T	Timbering

WATER

✓ Water level at date shown✓ Partial water loss✓ Water inflow✓ Complete water loss

GROUNDWATER NOT OBSERVED (NO)

The observation of groundwater, whether present or not, was not possible due to drilling water, surface seepage or cave in of the borehole/test pit.

GROUNDWATER NOT ENCOUNTERED (NX)

The borehole/test pit was dry soon after excavation. However, groundwater could be present in less permeable strata. Inflow may have been observed had the borehole/test pit been left open for a longer period.

PENETRATION / EXCAVATION RESISTANCE

- L Low resistance: Rapid penetration possible with little effort from the equipment used.
- M Medium resistance: Excavation possible at an acceptable rate with moderate effort from the equipment used.
- H High resistance: Further penetration possible at slow rate & requires significant effort equipment.
- Refusal/ Practical Refusal. No further progress possible without risk of damage/ unacceptable wear to digging implement / machine.

These assessments are subjective and dependent on many factors, including equipment power, weight, condition of excavation or drilling tools, and operator experience.

SAMPLING

D	Small disturbed sample	W	Water Sample	С	Core sample
В	Bulk disturbed sample	G	Gas Sample	CONC	Concrete Core

U63 Thin walled tube sample - number indicates nominal undisturbed sample diameter in millimetres

TESTING

SPT	Standard Penetration Test to AS1289.6.3.1-2004	CPT	Static cone penetration test
4,7,11	4,7,11 = Blows per 150mm.	CPTu	CPT with pore pressure (u) measurement
N=18	'N' = Recorded blows per 300mm penetration following 150mm seating	PP	Pocket penetrometer test expressed as instrument reading (kPa)
DCP	Dynamic Cone Penetration test to AS1289.6.3.2-1997. 'n' = Recorded blows per 150mm penetration	FP	Field permeability test over section noted
Notes:		VS	Field vane shear test expressed as uncorrected shear strength (sv = peak value, sr = residual
RW	Penetration occurred under the rod weight only		value)
HW	Penetration occurred under the hammer and rod weight only	PM	Pressuremeter test over section noted
HB 30/80mm	Hammer double bouncing on anvil after 80 mm penetration	PID	Photoionisation Detector reading in ppm
N=18	Where practical refusal occurs, report blows and	WPT	Water pressure tests

SOIL DESCRIPTION

ROCK DESCRIPTION

Dens	sity	Cons	sistency	Moist	ure	Stren	gth	Weat	hering
VL	Very loose	VS	Very soft	D	Dry	VL	Very low	EW	Extremely weathered
L	Loose	S	Soft	M	Moist	L	Low	HW	Highly weathered
MD	Medium dense	F	Firm	W	Wet	М	Medium	MW	Moderately weathered
D	Dense	St	Stiff	Wp	Plastic limit	Н	High	SW	Slightly weathered
VD	Very dense	VSt	Very stiff	WI	Liquid limit	VH	Very high	FR	Fresh
		Н	Hard			EH	Extremely high		