



Geotechnical Assessment


Project: Seniors Housing Development
49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest, NSW.

Prepared for:
Jalal Ziaolhagh
C/o – Scott Walsh
Walsh² Architects
Canberra ACT 2624

REF: AG 19088
28th May, 2019

Geotechnical Assessment

For Seniors Housing Development at
49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest, NSW

Document Status			Approved for Issue	
Version	Author	Reviewer	Signature	Date
0	Ben Morgan	Karen Allan		28/05/2019
Document Distribution				
Version	Copies	Format	To	Date
0	1	PDF	Jalal Ziaolhagh	28/05/2019
0	1	PDF	Scott Walsh – Walsh ² Architects	28/05/2019

Limitations

This report has been prepared for Jalal Ziaolhagh C/o – Scott Walsh – Walsh² Architects in accordance with Ascent Geotechnical Consulting's (Ascent) Fee Proposal dated 16th May, 2019.

The report is provided for the exclusive use of the property owners, Walsh² Architects and their nominated agents for the specific development and purpose as described in the report. This report must not be used for purposes other than those outlined in the report or applied to any other projects.

The information contained within this report is considered accurate at the time of issue with regard to the current conditions onsite as identified by Ascent and the documentation provided by others.

The report should be read in its entirety and should not be separated from its attachments or supporting notes. It should not have sections removed or included in other documents without the express approval of Ascent.

Contents

1 Overview.....	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Proposed Development	3
1.3 Relevant Instruments	3
2 Site Description.....	4
2.1 Summary	4
2.2 Geology and Geological Interpretation	5
2.3 Fieldwork	5
3 Geotechnical Assessment.....	6
3.1 Site Classification	6
3.2 Ground Water	6
3.3 Surface Water	7
3.4 Slope Instability	7
3.5 Geotechnical hazards and Risk Analysis	8
3.6 Recommendations	8
4 References.....	12

5 Appendices

Appendix A:	Site Plan/Ground Test Locations & Geological Cross Section
Appendix B:	Engineering logs
Appendix C:	General Notes
	CSIRO Sheet BTF-18 “Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Homeowners Guide”
	Australian Geoguide LR8 – Examples of Good/Bad Hillside Construction Practice
	Australian Geomechanics Guidelines 2007 Appendix C

1 Overview

1.1 Background

This report presents the findings of a geotechnical assessment carried out at 49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest (the “Site”), by Ascent Geotechnical Consulting (Ascent). This assessment has been prepared to meet Northern Beaches Council lodgement requirements for Development Application (DA).

1.2 Proposed Development

Details of the proposed development are outlined in a series of architectural plans prepared by Walsh² Architects, Drawings DA000, DA005, DA010, DA020, DA100-DA104, DA200, DA201, DA400, DA401, DA451, DA500, DA502, DA503, DA550 and DA900, Revision 1, dated 17th May, 2019: -

The proposed works comprise the following:

- Demolition of existing structures, vegetation clearing and site preparation,
- Construction of new two-storey, four unit, seniors dwelling, with basement level parking, internal lift and exterior ramp access,
- Various landscaping details, including construction of new retaining walls,
- The proposed development will take place on an approximately 923.0m² residential block being Lot 1A in D.P. 382200.

1.3 Relevant Instruments

This geotechnical assessment has been prepared in accordance with the following relevant guidelines and standards:

- Northern Beaches Council – Warringah Local Environment Plan (WLEP) 2011 & Warringah Development Control Plan (WDCP) 2011.
- Australian Geomechanics Society’s Landslide Risk Management Guidelines (AGS 2007).
- Australian Standard 1726:2017 Geotechnical Site Investigations.
- Australian Standard 2870:2011 Residential Slabs and Footings.
- Australian Standard 1289.6.3.2:1997 Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes.
- Australian Standard 3798:2007 Guidelines on earthworks for commercial and residential developments.

2 Site Description

2.1 Summary

A summary of site conditions identified at the time of our Assessment is provided in the table below (Table 1.).

Table 1: Summary of site conditions.

Parameter	Description
Site Visit	Morgan Spreadbury-Key - Ascent Geotechnical – 24/05/2019
Site Address	49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest, NSW – Lot 1A, D.P. 382200.
Site Area m ² (approx.)	923.0m ² (by Calc).
Existing development	Two-storey brick and weatherboard residence, tile roof.
Aspect	South-west
Average gradient	~10 degrees
Vegetation	Large lawn areas with small garden beds, shrubs, and medium to large trees.
Retaining Structures	Low, small sandstone stack rock garden beds. Small, low concrete wall displaying significant cracking along driveway.
Neighbouring environment	Residentially developed to the south and east. Adams Street to the north. Forest Way to the west.




Image 1: Site location – 49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest – Red Pin (©Google Maps)

2.2 Geology and Geological Interpretation

The Sydney 1:100,000 Geological Sheet 9130 (NSW Dept. Mineral Resources, 1983) indicates that the site is underlain by Middle Triassic Hawkesbury Sandstones of the Wianamatta Group (Rh). The Hawkesbury rocks are comprised of medium to coarse-grained quartz sandstones, minor shale and laminite lenses.

The soil profile consists of sandy/silty top soils (O & A Horizons) overlying sandy clays (B Horizon) and weathered bedrock (C Horizon). Based on our observations and the results of testing onsite, we would expect competent weathered bedrock to be found within 300-800mm from current surface levels across the site.

NOTE: The local geology is comprised predominantly of sandstones with minor shale interbeds in some areas. Sandstone floaters or large detached joint blocks are often present in the soil profile. The Hawkesbury bedrock is often found in benched terraces, subsequently ground conditions on site may alter significantly across short distances. This variability should be anticipated and accounted for in the design and construction of any new foundations.

2.3 Fieldwork

A site investigation was undertaken on the 24th May, 2019, which included a geotechnically focused visual assessment of the property and its surrounds, geotechnical mapping, photographic record and preliminary subsurface investigation.

Six Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) tests were carried out to determine the relative density of the shallow soil profile, and the depth to weathered rock (if encountered). These tests were conducted to the Australian Standard for ground testing: AS 1289.6.3.2 – 1997. Possible locations of testing were constrained by existing structures, hard surfaces and the presence of utilities. The location of these tests is shown on the site plan provided and summary of the test results is presented below, with full details in the engineering logs presented in the appendix section of this report:

Table 2: Summary DCP test results.

TEST	DCP 1	DCP 2	DCP 3	DCP 4	DCP 5	DCP 6
SUMMARY	End of test at @ 0.3m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified	End of test at @ 0.7m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified	End of test at @ 0.8m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified	End of test at @ 0.6m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified	End of test at @ 0.8m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified	End of test at @ 0.5m in inferred weathered bedrock. No seepage identified

Hand Auger Testing

One Hand Auger borehole (BH1) test was drilled at the approximate location shown on the site plan to visually identify the subsurface material. An engineering log of the hand auger borehole is presented in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Hand Auger test results.

BH1 - Depth	Material description
0.00 to 0.10m	SILTY SAND. Medium grained, brown, loose. Grass roots, dry.
0.10 to 0.30m	SANDY CLAY. Fine to medium grained, orange/brown/red, firm, moderate plasticity, moist.
0.30 to 0.35m	SANDY CLAY. Fine to medium grained, orange/brown/red, firm, moderate plasticity, moist, indurated sandstone gravel.
	Borehole terminated at 0.35m due to grinding on weathered bedrock. No standing water table encountered. Backfilled on completion.

NOTE: The equipment chosen to undertake ground investigations provides the most cost-effective method for understanding the subsurface conditions. Our interpretation of the subsurface conditions is limited to the results of testing undertaken and the known geology in the area. While every care is taken to accurately identify the subsurface conditions on-site, variation between the interpreted model presented herein, and the actual conditions onsite may occur. Should actual ground conditions vary from those anticipated, we would recommend the geotechnical engineer be informed as soon as possible to advise if modifications to our recommendations are required.

3 Geotechnical Assessment

3.1 Site Classification

All footings taken to the underlying weathered bedrock, a classification of “A” in accordance with AS 2870:2011 is considered appropriate.

3.2 Ground Water

Normal ground water seepage is expected to move downslope through the soil profile along the interface with underling bedrock, or any impervious horizons in the profile such as clays.

Due to the position of the block relative to the slope and the underlying geology, no significant standing water table is expected to influence the site.


3.3 Surface Water

No significant overland or surface flows entering the site from adjoining areas were identified at the time of our inspection, however normal overland runoff could enter the site from above during heavy or extended rainfall.

3.4 Slope Instability

A landslide hazard assessment of the existing slope has been undertaken in accordance with the Australian Geomechanics Society Landslide Risk Management Concepts and Guidelines, 2007.

- No evidence of significant soil creep, tension cracks were identified at the time of our inspection.
- The damage to the dilapidated concrete wall that extends along the driveway can be attributed to inadequate footings, and poor construction, rather than land instability.
- The property is classified as **Area A & B** with reference to Northern Beaches Council WLEP Landslip Risk Map Sheet LSR_007 (WLEP Landslip Risk Map **Image 2** below).



3.5 Geotechnical Hazards and Risk Analysis

No significant geotechnical hazards were identified above, beside or below the subject site.

The slope across the subject site has an average gradient of ~10 degrees. The soil profile is interpreted to be comprised of sandy/silty top soils and sandy clays overlying weathered bedrock at relatively shallow depth over the block. The likelihood of the slope failing is assessed as '**UNLIKELY**', the consequences of such a failure are assessed as '**MINOR**'. The risk to property is '**LOW**'. The existing conditions and proposed development are considered to constitute an '**ACCEPTABLE**' risk to life and a '**LOW**' risk to property provided that the recommendations outlined in **Section 3.6** are adhered to.

3.6 Recommendations

The proposed development is considered to be suitable for the site. No significant geotechnical hazards should result from the completion of the proposed development provided the recommendations presented in Table 4 are adhered to.

Table 4: Geotechnical Recommendations.

Recommendation	Description
Dilapidation Reporting	We would recommend that detailed dilapidation reporting, undertaken by others, be prepared for all adjacent structures, including services, before the demolition and excavations commence onsite.
Soil Excavation	<p>Soil excavation will be required for the construction of the basement and ground floor levels, as well as to establish pad levels and footings across the site. It is anticipated that these excavations will encounter sandy/silty top soil and sandy clays before weathered sandstone bedrock is encountered.</p> <p>Provided the residual soils overlying weathered rock is battered back to a minimum of 45 degrees, they should remain stable without support for a short period until permanent support is in place.</p> <p>If permanent batters are proposed, the unsupported batter must not be steeper in gradient than 35 degrees, and should be supported by geotextile fabric, pinned to the slope and planted with soil binding vegetation.</p>
Rock Excavation	All excavation recommendations as outlined below should be read in conjunction with Safe Work Australia's ' <i>Excavation Work – Code of Practice</i> ', published March, 2015.

	<p>The excavations required for the construction of the proposed basement and ground levels, will require excavation to approximate maximum depths of ~ 4.0m from current surface levels. The excavations are expected to encounter sandy/silty topsoil and sandy clays, with weathered sandstone bedrock expected between ~ <0.3 – 0.8m across the site.</p> <p>It is essential that any excavation through rock that cannot be readily achieved with a bucket excavator or ripper should be carried out initially using a rock saw or grinder to minimise the vibration impact and disturbance on the adjoining properties. Any rock breaking must be carried out only after the rock has been sawed and in short bursts (2-5 seconds) to prevent the vibration amplifying. The break in the rock from the saw must be between the rock to be broken and the closest adjoining structure.</p> <p>All excavated material is to be removed from the site in accordance with current Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) regulations.</p>
Vibrations	<p>The Australian Standard AS2670.2-1990 “Evaluation of human exposure to whole-body vibrations – continuous and shock induced vibrations in buildings (1-80 Hz)” suggests a day time limit of 5 mm/s component PPV for human comfort is acceptable.</p> <p>Where rock hammers are adopted for bulk rock excavation there is an inherent risk that the vibrations may result in damage to adjacent structures. In order to mitigate such risk, we recommend vibration monitoring be carried out by specialist vibration engineers.</p> <p>We would suggest allowable vibration limits be set at 5mm/s PPV. It is expected that rock hammers with an approximate weight of 600-800kg will be adequate to operate within these tolerances. These assumptions should be confirmed with the plant manufacturer. It may be necessary to move to smaller rock hammers or to rotary grinders or rock saws if vibrations limits cannot be met.</p> <p>The propagation of vibrations can be mitigated by pulsing the use of rock hammers, i.e. short bursts, utilising line sawing along boundaries.</p>
Excavation Support	<p>Vertical or sub-vertical excavation through weathered bedrock should stand unsupported until permanent supporting structures are installed. Provided the appropriate batter angles, mentioned above, are achieved, and any exposed soil batter is covered with plastic sheering to prevent excessive infiltration or evaporation of moisture, no significant excavation support is anticipated.</p> <p>Due to the possibility of joints/fractures or other undiagnosed geological defects in the bedrock, we would recommend that hold points at 2.0m depth intervals be implemented to allow visual assessment of the</p>

	<p>excavation face, and advise on the need for temporary excavation support, or stabilisation work, before continuing with the excavation. Such hold points and visual assessments will allow prompt identification and treatment of unstable blocks of rock before excavation has reached full depth.</p> <p>Any permanent vertical or sub-vertical cuts are to be supported by adequately designed and constructed retaining structures.</p> <p>The assumptions made in this report are based on our limited ground testing and the known geology of the area. For more accurate information of rock strength and quality, additional ground testing may be required, this may involve mechanical vertical boring taken to below the depth of the proposed excavation. If drilling is required, we would recommend this be carried out after the demolition of existing site structures to allow full access for drilling plant.</p>
Sediment and Erosion Control	<p>Appropriate design and construction methods shall be required during site works to minimise erosion and provide sediment control. In particular, any stockpiled soil will require erosion control measures, such as siltation fencing and barriers, to be designed by others.</p>
Footings	<p>Visual assessment and the results of our testing, as well as the known geological conditions of the area, suggested the presence of sandy/silty top soils and sandy clays overlying weathered sandstone bedrock. All pad, strip or piered footings should be founded on and socketed a minimum of 200mm into the underlying weathered sandstone rock. For fully cleaned footings, the allowable bearable pressure is 1000 kPa.</p> <p>End bearing pressure at the full depth of excavation may be significantly higher than 1000 kPa.</p> <p>It is essential that the foundation materials of all footing excavations be inspected and approved before steel reinforcement and concrete is placed.</p>
Retaining Structures	<p>Permanent retaining walls, to be designed by others, should adhere to the following Geotechnical design parameters;</p> <p>Earth Pressure Coefficients: For low strength sandstone (Class V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At rest – K_0 0.45 • Active – K_a 0.27 • Passive – K_p 3.5

	Any retaining structures to be constructed as part of the site works are to be backfilled with suitable free-draining materials wrapped in a non-woven geotextile fabric (i.e Bidim A34 or similar), to prevent the clogging of the drainage with sediment.
Fills	<p>Any fill that may be required is to be comprised of local sand, clay and weathered rock. Existing organic topsoil is to be cleared in preparation for the introduction of fill.</p> <p>Any new fill material is to be placed in layers not more than 250 mm thick and compacted to not less than 95% of Standard Optimum Dry Density at plus or minus 2% of Standard Optimum Moisture Content.</p> <p>All new fill placement is to be carried out in accordance with AS 3798 – 2007 – Guidelines on earthworks for commercial and residential developments.</p>
Stormwater Disposal	All stormwater collected from hard surfaces is to be collected and piped to the council stormwater network through any storage tanks or on-site detention that may be required by the regulating authorities, and in accordance with all relevant Australian Standards, and the detailed stormwater management plan by others.
Inspections	<p>We would recommend that Ascent be engaged for a site meeting with the project manager and excavation contractor to discuss and approve proposed excavation methodology and equipment before bulk excavations commence.</p> <p>We would recommend that Ascent inspect the excavation face at hold points of 2.0m drops to ensure the competency of the rock strata and advise if any temporary or permanent support is required.</p> <p>It is essential that the foundation materials of all footing excavations be inspected and approved by Ascent before steel reinforcement and concrete is placed.</p>

Should you have any queries regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact the author of this report, undersigned.

For and on behalf of, **Ascent Geotechnical Consulting Pty Ltd,**



Ben Morgan BSc Geol.
Engineering Geologist



Karen Allan CPEng MIEAust
Senior Geotechnical Engineer

4 References

NSW Department of Mineral Resources (1983), Sydney Australia 1: 100,000 Geological Series Sheet 9130.

Australian Geomechanics Society (March 2007), *Landslide Risk Management*, Australian Geomechanics 42 (1).

Australian Standard 1726:2017 Geotechnical Site Investigations.

Australian Standard 2870:2011 Residential Slabs and Footings.

Australian Standard 1289.6.3.2:1997 Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes.

Australian Standard 3798:2007 Guidelines for earthworks for commercial and residential developments.

Excavation Work – *Code of Practice*. March, 2015 – Safe Work Australia

Australian Standard AS2670.2:1990 Evaluation of Human Exposure to Whole-Body Vibrations – Continuous and Shock Induced Vibrations in Buildings (1-80 Hz).




LEGEND



DCP LOCATIONS

BOREHOLE LOCATION



SITE PLAN/GROUND TEST LOCATIONS

SCALE NTS

A	28.05.19	PRELIMINARY ISSUE		AF	BM
REV	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION		REV BY	CHKD



ABN: 71621428402
MIE Aust. CP Eng. NER
Ben: 0448 255 537
Ben@ascentgeo.com.au
PO BOX 37
Manly NSW 1655

CLIENT:

JALAL ZIAOLHAGH

COPYRIGHT:

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF ASCENT GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING. COPYING OF THIS MATERIAL IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF ASCENT GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING CONSTITUTES AN INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT LAWS.

SITE PLAN/GROUND TEST LOCATIONS

AT 49 FOREST WAY,
FRENCHS FOREST NSW

DATE:

28/05/2019

SCALE:

AS SHOWN @ A3


DRAWING TITLE:

SITE PLAN

DRAWING NO:

AG 19088- S1


INTERPRETED SUBSURFACE SECTION ONLY.
ACTUAL GROUND CONDITIONS MAY VARY.




INFERRED GEOLOGICAL SECTION

SCALE NTS

INFERRED GEOLOGICAL TYPE SECTION

 SILTY SANDS

 SANDY CLAYS

 HAWKESBURY SANDSTONE BEDROCK

A	28.05.19	PRELIMINARY ISSUE		AF	BM
REV	DATE		REVISION DESCRIPTION	REV BY	CHECK



ABN: 71621428402
MIE Aust. CP Eng. NER
Ben: 0448 255 537
Ben@ascentgeo.com.au
PO BOX 37
Manly NSW 1655

CLIENT: JALAL ZIAOLHAGH

COPYRIGHT: [REDACTED]

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF ASCENT GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING. COPYING OF THIS MATERIAL IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF ASCENT GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING CONSTITUTES AN INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT LAWS

INFERRED GEOLOGICAL SECTION
AT 49 FOREST WAY,
FRENCHS FOREST NSW

DATE: 28/05/2019

SCALE: AS SHOWN @ A3

DRAWING TITLE: **ELEVATION**

DRAWING NO: AG 19088- S2

Dynamic Cone Penetration Test Report

1 of 2

Client:		Jalal Ziaolhagh				Job No:		AG 19088	
Project:		Seniors Housing Development				Date:		24/5/19	
Location:		49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest				Operator:		MSK	
Test Procedure:		AS 1289.6.3.2 – 1997							
Test Data									
Test No: DCP 1		Test No: DCP 2		Test No: DCP 3		Test No: DCP 4		Test No: DCP 5	
Test Location: Refer to Site Plan		Test Location: Refer to Site Plan		Test Location: Refer to Site Plan		Test Location: Refer to Site Plan		Test Location: Refer to Site Plan	
RL: ~ 151.3		RL: ~ 151.1		RL: ~ 151.5		RL: ~ 149.4		RL: ~ 149.3	
Soil Classification: A		Soil Classification: A		Soil Classification: A		Soil Classification: A		Soil Classification: A	
Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows
0.0 - 0.3	20 Rs	0.0 - 0.3	10	0.0 - 0.3	25	0.0 - 0.3	27	0.0 - 0.3	23
0.3 - 0.6		0.3 - 0.6	18	0.3 - 0.6	26	0.3 - 0.6	28	0.3 - 0.6	28
0.6 - 0.9		0.6 - 0.9	27 Rs	0.6 - 0.9	45	0.6 - 0.9	6 Rs	0.6 - 0.9	30 Rs
0.9 - 1.2		0.9 - 1.2		0.9 - 1.2	0.9 - 1.2				
1.2 - 1.5		1.2 - 1.5		1.2 - 1.5	1.2 - 1.5				
1.5 - 1.8		1.5 - 1.8		1.5 - 1.8	1.5 - 1.8				
1.8 - 2.1		1.8 - 2.1		1.8 - 2.1	1.8 - 2.1				
2.1 - 2.4		2.1 - 2.4		2.1 - 2.4	2.1 - 2.4				
2.4 - 2.7		2.4 - 2.7		2.4 - 2.7	2.4 - 2.7				
2.7 - 3.0		2.7 - 3.0		2.7 - 3.0	2.7 - 3.0				
3.0 - 3.3		3.0 - 3.3		3.0 - 3.3	3.0 - 3.3				
3.3 - 3.6		3.3 - 3.6		3.3 - 3.6	3.3 - 3.6				
3.6 - 3.9		3.6 - 3.9		3.6 - 3.9	3.6 - 3.9				
3.9 - 4.2		3.9 - 4.2		3.9 - 4.2	3.9 - 4.2				
4.2 - 4.5		4.2 - 4.5		4.2 - 4.5	4.2 - 4.5				
4.5 - 4.8		4.5 - 4.8		4.5 - 4.8	4.5 - 4.8				
DCP 1: Refusal @ 0.3m Bouncing on inferred sandstone bedrock. Fine red/orange clay on dry tip.		DCP 2: Refusal @ 0.7m Bouncing on inferred sandstone bedrock. Fine to medium red/orange material on dry tip.		DCP 3: End of test @ 0.8m in inferred weathered sandstone bedrock. Fine to medium red/orange/ brown material on dry tip.		DCP 4: Refusal @ 0.6m Bouncing on inferred sandstone bedrock. Fine red/orange/brown material on dry tip.		DCP 5: Refusal @ 0.5m Bouncing on inferred sandstone bedrock. Fine red/orange/brown material on dry tip.	
Remarks:						Weight: 9 kg			
Available test locations limited due to existing structures, hard surfaces and utility locations. No groundwater encountered.						Drop: 510 mm			
						Rod Diameter: 16 mm			

Rs = Solid ring/Hammer bouncing

Dynamic Cone Penetration Test Report

2 of 2

Client:		Jalal Ziaolhagh		Job No:		AG 19088	
Project:		Seniors Housing Development		Date:		24/5/19	
Location:		49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest		Operator:		MSK	
Test Procedure:		AS 1289.6.3.2 – 1997					
Test Data							
Test No: DCP 1		Test No:		Test No:		Test No:	
Test Location: Refer to Site Plan		Test Location:		Test Location:		Test Location:	
RL: ~ 149.3		RL:		RL:		RL:	
Soil Classification: A		Soil Classification:		Soil Classification:		Soil Classification:	
Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows
0.0 - 0.3	13						
0.3 - 0.6	7 Rs						
0.6 - 0.9							
0.9 - 1.2							
1.2 - 1.5							
1.5 - 1.8							
1.8 - 2.1							
2.1 - 2.4							
2.4 - 2.7							
2.7 - 3.0							
3.0 - 3.3							
3.3 - 3.6							
3.6 - 3.9							
3.9 - 4.2							
4.2 - 4.5							
4.5 - 4.8							
DCP 6: Refusal @ 0.5m Bouncing on inferred sandstone bedrock. Fine red/orange/brown material on dry tip.							
Remarks:				Weight:			
Available test locations limited due to existing structures, hard surfaces and utility locations. No groundwater encountered.				Drop:			
				Rod Diameter:			
				9 kg			
				510 mm			
				16 mm			

Rs = Solid ring/Hammer bouncing

GEOTECHNICAL LOG - BORE HOLE







Client: Jalal Ziaolhagh		Job No: AG 19088		BOREHOLE NO.: BH 1		
Project: Seniors Housing Development		Date: 24/5/19				
Location: 49 Forest Way, Frenchs Forest, NSW		Operator: MSK		Sheet 1 of 1		

W A T E R	S A M P L E S	DEPTH (m)	DESCRIPTION OF DRILLED PRODUCT (Soil type, colour, grain size, plasticity, minor components, observations)	S Y M B O L	CONSISTENCY (cohesive soils) or RELATIVE DENSITY (sands and gravels)	M O I S T U R E	
		0	TOPSOIL. SILTY SAND. Brown, medium grained, grass roots.	ML	LOOSE	D	
		0.1	SANDY CLAY. Residual, orange/brown/red, fine to medium grained, moderate plasticity.	SC	FIRM	D	
		0.3	SANDY CLAY. Residual, orange/brown/red, fine to medium grained, moderate plasticity, indurated sandstone gravel.	SC	FIRM	D	
			Borehole terminated at 0.35m due to difficulty penetrating through weathered bedrock. No standing water table encountered. Backfilled upon completion.				
		2.0					
		2.5					

NOTE: D - disturbed sample U - undisturbed tube sample B - bulk sample WT - level of water table or free water N - Standard Penetration Test (SPT)				Contractor: N/A Equipment: Hand Auger Hole width (mm): Angle from Vertical (°):		
See explanation sheets for meaning of all descriptive terms and symbols						

GUIDE TO NOTES, DESCRIPTIONS AND TERMS USED ON ENGINEERING LOGS


Graphic Symbols Used - Soil Main Component Only

SAND		SILTY SAND	
GRAVEL		SILTY CLAY	
CLAY		FILL	

Soil Description - Refer to AS1726 (2017) for full details.

Main Components	Particle Size	USCS Symbol	Typical Names
COARSE GRAINED SOILS (more than 65% of material less than 63 mm is larger than 0.075 mm)	BOULDERS		
	COBBLES 200		
	63	GW	Well graded gravel and sand mixtures, little or no fines
	19	GP	Poorly graded gravel and sand mixtures, little or no fines
	6.7	GM	Silty gravels, gravel sand and silt mixes
	2.36	GC	Clayey gravels, gravel sand and clay mixes
	0.6	SW	Sand and gravel Sand mixes, little or no fines
	0.21	SP	Sand and gravel Sand mixes, little or not fines, poorly graded
		SM	Sand and silt mixes
	0.075	SC	Sand and clay mixes
FINE GRAINED SOILS (more than 35% of material less than 63 mm in size is less than 0.075mm)	SILTS & CLAYS (low to medium plasticity)	ML	Inorganic silts, very fine sand, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sand, clayey silts with slight plasticity
		CL and CI	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays and lean clays
		OL	Organic silt
	SILTS & CLAYS (high plasticity)	MH	Inorganic Silt
		CH	Inorganic clays of high plasticity
		OH	Organic silts and clays of medium to high plasticity; organic silt
	ORGANIC SOILS	PT	Peat and other highly organic soils

Laboratory Classification - Refer to AS1726 (2017) for full details.

	% Passing 0.075 mm	Plasticity of fine fraction	$C_u =$ D_{60}/D_{10}	$C_c = D_{30}^2 / D_{10}$ D_{60}	NOTES
GW	0-5		> 4	Between 1 and 3	(1) and (2)
GP	0-5		Fails to comply with above		
GM	> 12%	Below "A" line or $PI < 4$	Fines are silty		
GC	> 12%	Above "A" line or $PI > 7$	Fines are clayey		
SW	0-5		> 6	Between 1 and 3	
SP	0-5		Fails to comply with above		
SM	> 12%	Below "A" line or $PI < 4$	Fines are silty		
SC	> 12%	Above "A" line or $PI > 7$	Fines are clayey		
ML	<div></div> <p>NOTE: The U line is an approximate upper bound for most natural soils. Data which plot above the U line may represent unusual/problem soil behaviour, or unreliable data and should be considered carefully.</p> <p>FIGURE 5 MODIFIED CASAGRANDE CHART FOR CLASSIFYING SILTS AND CLAYS ACCORDING TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR</p> <p>© AS2870-2017</p>				
CL and CI					
OL					
MH					
CH					
OH					
PT					

NOTES

(1) Identify fines by method for fine grained soils

(2) Borderline classificaiton occur when percentage of fines is greater than 5% and less than 12% and require the use of SP-SM, GW-GC etc.

Soil Colour is described in its moist condition using black, white, grey, red, brown, orange, yellow, green or blue. Combinations can be used for borderline cases with the stronger colour preceding the weaker colour. Pale, dark or mottled may be used where necessary. For further details refer to AS1726 (2017) Section 6.1.5

Soil Moisture Condition is based on the appearance and feel of the soil as per AS1726 (2017) Section 6.1.7.

Dry (D) - non-cohesive and free-running

Moist (M) - Soil feels cool, darkened in colour, tends to stick together

Wet (W) - Soil feels cool, darkened in colour, tends to stick together and free water

Material Density and Consistency

Consistency - Cohesive Soils					
Term	Field Assessment	Symbol	SPT "N" Value	Undrained Shear Strength, su (kPa)	Unconfined Compressive Strength qu, (kPa)
Very Soft	Oozes between fingers when squeezed	VS	0 - 2	< 12	< 25
Soft	Easily moulded with fingers	S	2 - 4	12 - 25	25 - 50
Firm	Can be moulded by strong pressure of	F	4 - 8	25 - 50	50 - 100
Stiff	Not possible to mould with fingers	St	8 - 15	50 - 100	100 - 200
Very Stiff		VSt	15 - 30	100 - 200	200 - 400
Hard	Can be indented with difficulty by thumb nail	H	> 30	> 200	> 400

Consistency - Non-Cohesive Soils				
Term	Symbol	SPT N Value	Field Guide	Density Index (%)
Very Loose	VL	0 - 4	Foot imprints readily	0 - 15
Loose	L	4 - 10	Shovels easily	15 - 35
Medium Dense	MD	10 - 30	Shovelling difficult	35 - 65
Dense	D	30 - 50	Pick required	65 - 85
Very Dense	VD	> 50	Picking difficult	85 - 100

Rock Weathering Guide

Residual Soil	RS	Soil like material developed on extremely weathered rock, the mass structure and substance fabric are no longer evident, the material has not been significantly transported
Extremely Weathered	XW	Material is weathered to such an extent that it has "soil" like properties, but substance fabric and rock structure is still
Highly Weathered	D W	HW Rock is discoloured, and rock strength significantly changed by weathering.
Moderately Weathered		MW Rock is discoloured, original rock colour is not recognizable, but little or no change in strength from fresh rock.
Slightly Weathered	SW	Rock is slightly discoloured but shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock.
Fresh Rock	FR	Rock shows no signs of decomposition or staining.

*DW - Distinctly weathered - Some change in rock strength due to weathering and highly discoloured.

Rock Strength Condition (Intact Rock Strength)

Term	Symbol	Is(50)	Field Guide to Strength
Extremely Low	EL	< 0.03	Easily remoulded by hand to a material with soil like
Very Low	VL	0.03 - 0.1	Material crumbles under firm blows with the sharp end of a pick, can be peeled with a knife but too hard to cut into a triaxial sample by hand. Can break pieces up to 3 cm thick by hand
Low	L	0.1 - 0.3	Easily scored with a knife; indentations 1 mm to 3 mm shown after blows with a pick; has dull sound under hammer. A 50 mm diameter sample may be broken by hand.
Medium	H	0.3 - 1.0	Readily scored with a knife; a 50mm diameter core sample can be broken by hand with difficulty
High	H	1.0 - 3.0	A piece of 50mm diameter cores cannot be broken by hand; rock rings under hammer blow
Very High	VH	3.0 - 10	Hand specimen breaks with pick after more than one blow, rock rings under hammer.
Extremely High	EH	> 10	Specimen requires many blows with pick to break through intact rock; rock rings under hammer.



General Notes About This Report

Introduction

These supporting notes have been prepared by Ascent Geotechnical Consultants (AGC) to assist our clients interpret and understand the limitations of this report. Not all sections below are necessarily relevant to this report.

Limitations

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

This report has been prepared for this specific project's design proposal. This report should not be relied upon for any other project or if the design proposal of this project changes without the prior knowledge of AGC.

Subsurface Conditions

Subsurface conditions can change with time and can vary significantly between test locations and over very short distances. That actual interface between the materials may be far more gradual or abrupt than interpreted. Therefore, actual conditions in areas not tested may differ from those predicted since no subsurface investigation, no matter how comprehensive, can reveal all subsurface details and anomalies.

Groundwater

Groundwater levels indicated in our subsurface testing are recorded at specific times. The groundwater levels recorded will depend on ground permeability, seepage and environmental variations.

Site inspections

Ascent Geotechnical Consultants will always be please to provide engineering inspection services for aspects of work relating to this report. This may range from standard foundation material inspections for footings, to a full-time engineering presence on site or through one stage of the development. Ascent Geotechnical Consultants are 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.

Anomalies

If the ground or groundwater conditions onsite prove to differ from those described in this report we would recommend that Ascent Geotechnical Consulting be contacted as a matter of priority. It is far easier and less costly to address these issues if they are addressed early on in the project.

Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Homeowner's Guide



CSIRO

BTF 18
replaces
Information
Sheet 10/91

Buildings can and often do move. This movement can be up, down, lateral or rotational. The fundamental cause of movement in buildings can usually be related to one or more problems in the foundation soil. It is important for the homeowner to identify the soil type in order to ascertain the measures that should be put in place in order to ensure that problems in the foundation soil can be prevented, thus protecting against building movement.

This Building Technology File is designed to identify causes of soil-related building movement, and to suggest methods of prevention of resultant cracking in buildings.

Soil Types

The types of soils usually present under the topsoil in land zoned for residential buildings can be split into two approximate groups – granular and clay. Quite often, foundation soil is a mixture of both types. The general problems associated with soils having granular content are usually caused by erosion. Clay soils are subject to saturation and swell/shrink problems.

Classifications for a given area can generally be obtained by application to the local authority, but these are sometimes unreliable and if there is doubt, a geotechnical report should be commissioned. As most buildings suffering movement problems are founded on clay soils, there is an emphasis on classification of soils according to the amount of swell and shrinkage they experience with variations of water content. The table below is Table 2.1 from AS 2870, the Residential Slab and Footing Code.

Causes of Movement

Settlement due to construction

There are two types of settlement that occur as a result of construction:

- Immediate settlement occurs when a building is first placed on its foundation soil, as a result of compaction of the soil under the weight of the structure. The cohesive quality of clay soil mitigates against this, but granular (particularly sandy) soil is susceptible.
- Consolidation settlement is a feature of clay soil and may take place because of the expulsion of moisture from the soil or because of the soil's lack of resistance to local compressive or shear stresses. This will usually take place during the first few months after construction, but has been known to take many years in exceptional cases.

These problems are the province of the builder and should be taken into consideration as part of the preparation of the site for construction. Building Technology File 19 (BTF 19) deals with these problems.

Erosion

All soils are prone to erosion, but sandy soil is particularly susceptible to being washed away. Even clay with a sand component of say 10% or more can suffer from erosion.

Saturation

This is particularly a problem in clay soils. Saturation creates a bog-like suspension of the soil that causes it to lose virtually all of its bearing capacity. To a lesser degree, sand is affected by saturation because saturated sand may undergo a reduction in volume – particularly imported sand fill for bedding and blinding layers. However, this usually occurs as immediate settlement and should normally be the province of the builder.

Seasonal swelling and shrinkage of soil

All clays react to the presence of water by slowly absorbing it, making the soil increase in volume (see table below). The degree of increase varies considerably between different clays, as does the degree of decrease during the subsequent drying out caused by fair weather periods. Because of the low absorption and expulsion rate, this phenomenon will not usually be noticeable unless there are prolonged rainy or dry periods, usually of weeks or months, depending on the land and soil characteristics.

The swelling of soil creates an upward force on the footings of the building, and shrinkage creates subsidence that takes away the support needed by the footing to retain equilibrium.

Shear failure

This phenomenon occurs when the foundation soil does not have sufficient strength to support the weight of the footing. There are two major post-construction causes:

- Significant load increase.
- Reduction of lateral support of the soil under the footing due to erosion or excavation.
- In clay soil, shear failure can be caused by saturation of the soil adjacent to or under the footing.

GENERAL DEFINITIONS OF SITE CLASSES

Class	Foundation
A	Most sand and rock sites with little or no ground movement from moisture changes
S	Slightly reactive clay sites with only slight ground movement from moisture changes
M	Moderately reactive clay or silt sites, which can experience moderate ground movement from moisture changes
H	Highly reactive clay sites, which can experience high ground movement from moisture changes
E	Extremely reactive sites, which can experience extreme ground movement from moisture changes
A to P	Filled sites
P	Sites which include soft soils, such as soft clay or silt or loose sands; landslip; mine subsidence; collapsing soils; soils subject to erosion; reactive sites subject to abnormal moisture conditions or sites which cannot be classified otherwise

Tree root growth

Trees and shrubs that are allowed to grow in the vicinity of footings can cause foundation soil movement in two ways

- Roots that grow under footings may increase in cross-sectional size, exerting upward pressure on footings.
- Roots in the vicinity of footings will absorb much of the moisture in the foundation soil, causing shrinkage or subsidence.

Unevenness of Movement

The types of ground movement described above usually occur unevenly throughout the building's foundation soil. Settlement due to construction tends to be uneven because of:

- Differing compaction of foundation soil prior to construction.
- Differing moisture content of foundation soil prior to construction.

Movement due to non-construction causes is usually more uneven still. Erosion can undermine a footing that traverses the flow or can create the conditions for shear failure by eroding soil adjacent to a footing that runs in the same direction as the flow.

Saturation of clay foundation soil may occur where subfloor walls create a dam that makes water pond. It can also occur wherever there is a source of water near footings in clay soil. This leads to a severe reduction in the strength of the soil which may create local shear failure.

Seasonal swelling and shrinkage of clay soil affects the perimeter of the building first, then gradually spreads to the interior. The swelling process will usually begin at the uphill extreme of the building, or on the weather side where the land is flat. Swelling gradually reaches the interior soil as absorption continues. Shrinkage usually begins where the sun's heat is greatest.

Effects of Uneven Soil Movement on Structures

Erosion and saturation

Erosion removes the support from under footings, tending to create subsidence of the part of the structure under which it occurs. Brickwork walls will resist the stress created by this removal of support by bridging the gap or cantilevering until the bricks or the mortar bedding fail. Older masonry has little resistance. Evidence of failure varies according to circumstances and symptoms may include:

- Step cracking in the mortar beds in the body of the wall or above/below openings such as doors or windows.
- Vertical cracking in the bricks (usually but not necessarily in line with the vertical beds or perpend).

Isolated piers affected by erosion or saturation of foundations will eventually lose contact with the bearers they support and may tilt or fall over. The floors that have lost this support will become bouncy, sometimes rattling ornaments etc.

Seasonal swelling/shrinkage in clay

Swelling foundation soil due to rainy periods first lifts the most exposed extremities of the footing system, then the remainder of the perimeter footings while gradually permeating inside the building footprint to lift internal footings. This swelling first tends to create a dish effect, because the external footings are pushed higher than the internal ones.

The first noticeable symptom may be that the floor appears slightly dished. This is often accompanied by some doors binding on the floor or the door head, together with some cracking of cornice mitres. In buildings with timber flooring supported by bearers and joists, the floor can be bouncy. Externally there may be visible dishing of the hip or ridge lines.

As the moisture absorption process completes its journey to the innermost areas of the building, the internal footings will rise. If the spread of moisture is roughly even, it may be that the symptoms will temporarily disappear, but it is more likely that swelling will be uneven, creating a difference rather than a disappearance in symptoms. In buildings with timber flooring supported by bearers and joists, the isolated piers will rise more easily than the strip footings or piers under walls, creating noticeable doming of flooring.

Trees can cause shrinkage and damage



As the weather pattern changes and the soil begins to dry out, the external footings will be first affected, beginning with the locations where the sun's effect is strongest. This has the effect of lowering the external footings. The doming is accentuated and cracking reduces or disappears where it occurred because of dishing, but other cracks open up. The roof lines may become convex.

Doming and dishing are also affected by weather in other ways. In areas where warm, wet summers and cooler dry winters prevail, water migration tends to be toward the interior and doming will be accentuated, whereas where summers are dry and winters are cold and wet, migration tends to be toward the exterior and the underlying propensity is toward dishing.

Movement caused by tree roots

In general, growing roots will exert an upward pressure on footings, whereas soil subject to drying because of tree or shrub roots will tend to remove support from under footings by inducing shrinkage.

Complications caused by the structure itself

Most forces that the soil causes to be exerted on structures are vertical – i.e. either up or down. However, because these forces are seldom spread evenly around the footings, and because the building resists uneven movement because of its rigidity, forces are exerted from one part of the building to another. The net result of all these forces is usually rotational. This resultant force often complicates the diagnosis because the visible symptoms do not simply reflect the original cause. A common symptom is binding of doors on the vertical member of the frame.

Effects on full masonry structures

Brickwork will resist cracking where it can. It will attempt to span areas that lose support because of subsided foundations or raised points. It is therefore usual to see cracking at weak points, such as openings for windows or doors.

In the event of construction settlement, cracking will usually remain unchanged after the process of settlement has ceased.

With local shear or erosion, cracking will usually continue to develop until the original cause has been remedied, or until the subsidence has completely neutralised the affected portion of footing and the structure has stabilised on other footings that remain effective.

In the case of swell/shrink effects, the brickwork will in some cases return to its original position after completion of a cycle, however it is more likely that the rotational effect will not be exactly reversed, and it is also usual that brickwork will settle in its new position and will resist the forces trying to return it to its original position. This means that in a case where swelling takes place after construction and cracking occurs, the cracking is likely to at least partly remain after the shrink segment of the cycle is complete. Thus, each time the cycle is repeated, the likelihood is that the cracking will become wider until the sections of brickwork become virtually independent.

With repeated cycles, once the cracking is established, if there is no other complication, it is normal for the incidence of cracking to stabilise, as the building has the articulation it needs to cope with the problem. This is by no means always the case, however, and monitoring of cracks in walls and floors should always be treated seriously.

Upheaval caused by growth of tree roots under footings is not a simple vertical shear stress. There is a tendency for the root to also exert lateral forces that attempt to separate sections of brickwork after initial cracking has occurred.

The normal structural arrangement is that the inner leaf of brickwork in the external walls and at least some of the internal walls (depending on the roof type) comprise the load-bearing structure on which any upper floors, ceilings and the roof are supported. In these cases, it is internally visible cracking that should be the main focus of attention, however there are a few examples of dwellings whose external leaf of masonry plays some supporting role, so this should be checked if there is any doubt. In any case, externally visible cracking is important as a guide to stresses on the structure generally, and it should also be remembered that the external walls must be capable of supporting themselves.

Effects on framed structures

Timber or steel framed buildings are less likely to exhibit cracking due to swell/shrink than masonry buildings because of their flexibility. Also, the doming/dishing effects tend to be lower because of the lighter weight of walls. The main risks to framed buildings are encountered because of the isolated pier footings used under walls. Where erosion or saturation cause a footing to fall away this can double the span which a wall must bridge. This additional stress can create cracking in wall linings, particularly where there is a weak point in the structure caused by a door or window opening. It is, however, unlikely that framed structures will be so stressed as to suffer serious damage without first exhibiting some or all of the above symptoms for a considerable period. The same warning period should apply in the case of upheaval. It should be noted, however, that where framed buildings are supported by strip footings there is only one leaf of brickwork and therefore the externally visible walls are the supporting structure for the building. In this case, the subfloor masonry walls can be expected to behave as full brickwork walls.

Effects on brick veneer structures

Because the load-bearing structure of a brick veneer building is the frame that makes up the interior leaf of the external walls plus perhaps the internal walls, depending on the type of roof, the building can be expected to behave as a framed structure, except that the external masonry will behave in a similar way to the external leaf of a full masonry structure.

Water Service and Drainage

Where a water service pipe, a sewer or stormwater drainage pipe is in the vicinity of a building, a water leak can cause erosion, swelling or saturation of susceptible soil. Even a minuscule leak can be enough to saturate a clay foundation. A leaking tap near a building can have the same effect. In addition, trenches containing pipes can become watercourses even though backfilled, particularly where broken rubble is used as fill. Water that runs along these trenches can be responsible for serious erosion, interstrata seepage into subfloor areas and saturation.

Pipe leakage and trench water flows also encourage tree and shrub roots to the source of water, complicating and exacerbating the problem.

Poor roof plumbing can result in large volumes of rainwater being concentrated in a small area of soil:

- Incorrect falls in roof guttering may result in overflows, as may gutters blocked with leaves etc.

- Corroded guttering or downpipes can spill water to ground.
- Downpipes not positively connected to a proper stormwater collection system will direct a concentration of water to soil that is directly adjacent to footings, sometimes causing large-scale problems such as erosion, saturation and migration of water under the building.

Seriousness of Cracking

In general, most cracking found in masonry walls is a cosmetic nuisance only and can be kept in repair or even ignored. The table below is a reproduction of Table C1 of AS 2870.

AS 2870 also publishes figures relating to cracking in concrete floors, however because wall cracking will usually reach the critical point significantly earlier than cracking in slabs, this table is not reproduced here.

Prevention/Cure

Plumbing

Where building movement is caused by water service, roof plumbing, sewer or stormwater failure, the remedy is to repair the problem. It is prudent, however, to consider also rerouting pipes away from the building where possible, and relocating taps to positions where any leakage will not direct water to the building vicinity. Even where gully traps are present, there is sometimes sufficient spill to create erosion or saturation, particularly in modern installations using smaller diameter PVC fixtures. Indeed, some gully traps are not situated directly under the taps that are installed to charge them, with the result that water from the tap may enter the backfilled trench that houses the sewer piping. If the trench has been poorly backfilled, the water will either pond or flow along the bottom of the trench. As these trenches usually run alongside the footings and can be at a similar depth, it is not hard to see how any water that is thus directed into a trench can easily affect the foundation's ability to support footings or even gain entry to the subfloor area.

Ground drainage

In all soils there is the capacity for water to travel on the surface and below it. Surface water flows can be established by inspection during and after heavy or prolonged rain. If necessary, a graded drain system connected to the stormwater collection system is usually an easy solution.

It is, however, sometimes necessary when attempting to prevent water migration that testing be carried out to establish watertable height and subsoil water flows. This subject is referred to in BTF 19 and may properly be regarded as an area for an expert consultant.


Protection of the building perimeter

It is essential to remember that the soil that affects footings extends well beyond the actual building line. Watering of garden plants, shrubs and trees causes some of the most serious water problems.

For this reason, particularly where problems exist or are likely to occur, it is recommended that an apron of paving be installed around as much of the building perimeter as necessary. This paving

CLASSIFICATION OF DAMAGE WITH REFERENCE TO WALLS

Description of typical damage and required repair	Approximate crack width limit (see Note 3)	Damage category
Hairline cracks	<0.1 mm	0
Fine cracks which do not need repair	<1 mm	1
Cracks noticeable but easily filled. Doors and windows stick slightly	<5 mm	2
Cracks can be repaired and possibly a small amount of wall will need to be replaced. Doors and windows stick. Service pipes can fracture. Weathertightness often impaired	5–15 mm (or a number of cracks 3 mm or more in one group)	3
Extensive repair work involving breaking-out and replacing sections of walls, especially over doors and windows. Window and door frames distort. Walls lean or bulge noticeably, some loss of bearing in beams. Service pipes disrupted	15–25 mm but also depend on number of cracks	4



should extend outwards a minimum of 900 mm (more in highly reactive soil) and should have a minimum fall away from the building of 1:60. The finished paving should be no less than 100 mm below brick vent bases.

It is prudent to relocate drainage pipes away from this paving, if possible, to avoid complications from future leakage. If this is not practical, earthenware pipes should be replaced by PVC and backfilling should be of the same soil type as the surrounding soil and compacted to the same density.

Except in areas where freezing of water is an issue, it is wise to remove taps in the building area and relocate them well away from the building – preferably not uphill from it (see BTF 19).

It may be desirable to install a grated drain at the outside edge of the paving on the uphill side of the building. If subsoil drainage is needed this can be installed under the surface drain.

Condensation

In buildings with a subfloor void such as where bearers and joists support flooring, insufficient ventilation creates ideal conditions for condensation, particularly where there is little clearance between the floor and the ground. Condensation adds to the moisture already present in the subfloor and significantly slows the process of drying out. Installation of an adequate subfloor ventilation system, either natural or mechanical, is desirable.

Warning: Although this Building Technology File deals with cracking in buildings, it should be said that subfloor moisture can result in the development of other problems, notably:

- Water that is transmitted into masonry, metal or timber building elements causes damage and/or decay to those elements.
- High subfloor humidity and moisture content create an ideal environment for various pests, including termites and spiders.
- Where high moisture levels are transmitted to the flooring and walls, an increase in the dust mite count can ensue within the living areas. Dust mites, as well as dampness in general, can be a health hazard to inhabitants, particularly those who are abnormally susceptible to respiratory ailments.

The garden

The ideal vegetation layout is to have lawn or plants that require only light watering immediately adjacent to the drainage or paving edge, then more demanding plants, shrubs and trees spread out in that order.

Overwatering due to misuse of automatic watering systems is a common cause of saturation and water migration under footings. If it is necessary to use these systems, it is important to remove garden beds to a completely safe distance from buildings.

Existing trees

Where a tree is causing a problem of soil drying or there is the existence or threat of upheaval of footings, if the offending roots are subsidiary and their removal will not significantly damage the tree, they should be severed and a concrete or metal barrier placed vertically in the soil to prevent future root growth in the direction of the building. If it is not possible to remove the relevant roots without damage to the tree, an application to remove the tree should be made to the local authority. A prudent plan is to transplant likely offenders before they become a problem.

Information on trees, plants and shrubs

State departments overseeing agriculture can give information regarding root patterns, volume of water needed and safe distance from buildings of most species. Botanic gardens are also sources of information. For information on plant roots and drains, see Building Technology File 17.

Excavation

Excavation around footings must be properly engineered. Soil supporting footings can only be safely excavated at an angle that allows the soil under the footing to remain stable. This angle is called the angle of repose (or friction) and varies significantly between soil types and conditions. Removal of soil within the angle of repose will cause subsidence.

Remediation

Where erosion has occurred that has washed away soil adjacent to footings, soil of the same classification should be introduced and compacted to the same density. Where footings have been undermined, augmentation or other specialist work may be required. Remediation of footings and foundations is generally the realm of a specialist consultant.

Where isolated footings rise and fall because of swell/shrink effect, the homeowner may be tempted to alleviate floor bounce by filling the gap that has appeared between the bearer and the pier with blocking. The danger here is that when the next swell segment of the cycle occurs, the extra blocking will push the floor up into an accentuated dome and may also cause local shear failure in the soil. If it is necessary to use blocking, it should be by a pair of fine wedges and monitoring should be carried out fortnightly.

This BTF was prepared by John Lewer FAIB, MIAMA, Partner, Construction Diagnosis.

The information in this and other issues in the series was derived from various sources and was believed to be correct when published.

The information is advisory. It is provided in good faith and not claimed to be an exhaustive treatment of the relevant subject.

Further professional advice needs to be obtained before taking any action based on the information provided.

Distributed by


CSIRO PUBLISHING PO Box 1139, Collingwood 3066, Australia

Freecall 1800 645 051 Tel (03) 9662 7666 Fax (03) 9662 7555 www.publish.csiro.au


Email: publishing.sales@csiro.au

© CSIRO 2003. Unauthorised copying of this Building Technology file is prohibited

EXAMPLES OF **GOOD** HILLSIDE PRACTICE



EXAMPLES OF **POOR** HILLSIDE PRACTICE



PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007
APPENDIX C: LANDSLIDE RISK ASSESSMENT
QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD

Approximate Annual Probability		Implied Indicative Landslide Recurrence Interval	Description	Descriptor	Level
Indicative Value	Notional Boundary				
10 ⁻¹	5x10 ⁻²	10 years	The event is expected to occur over the design life.	ALMOST CERTAIN LIKELY	A
10 ⁻²	5x10 ⁻³	100 years	The event will probably occur under adverse conditions over the design life.		B
10 ⁻³	5x10 ⁻⁴	1000 years	The event could occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	POSSIBLE	C
10 ⁻⁴	5x10 ⁻⁵	10,000 years	The event might occur under very adverse circumstances over the design life.	UNLIKELY	D
10 ⁻⁵	5x10 ⁻⁶	100,000 years	The event is conceivable but only under exceptional circumstances over the design life.	RARE	E
10 ⁻⁶		1,000,000 years	The event is inconceivable or fanciful over the design life.	BARELY CREDIBLE	F

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

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY

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

- Notes:** (2) The Approximate Cost of Damage is expressed as a percentage of market value, being the cost of the improved value of the unaffected property which includes the land plus the unaffected structures.
- (3) The Approximate Cost is to be an estimate of the direct cost of the damage, such as the cost of reinstatement of the damaged portion of the property (land plus structures), stabilisation works required to render the site to tolerable risk level for the landslide which has occurred and professional design fees, and consequential costs such as legal fees, temporary accommodation. It does not include additional stabilisation works to address other landslides which may affect the property.
- (4) The table should be used from left to right; use Approximate Cost of Damage or Description to assign Descriptor, not *vice versa*

PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007
APPENDIX C: – QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY (CONTINUED)

QUALITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX – LEVEL OF RISK TO PROPERTY

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

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

RISK LEVEL IMPLICATIONS

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

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