



Geotechnical Assessment

Project: New Dwelling
71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW

Prepared for:
Jonathan & Virginia Younger

Ref: AG 25215
3 June 2025



WHAT TO DO WITH THIS REPORT

While your geotechnical assessment report may be a statutory requirement from council in support of your development application, it also contains information important to the structural design and construction methodology of your project. Therefore, it is critical that all relevant parties are provided with a copy of this report.

We suggest you give a copy of your geotechnical assessment report to:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your Architect/Building Designer | <input type="checkbox"/> Your Structural/Stormwater/Civil Engineer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your Certifier | <input type="checkbox"/> Your Project Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your Excavation Contractor | <input type="checkbox"/> Your Builder |

We would also suggest that if any of your project team have questions regarding the contents of this report, that we be contacted for clarification.

NEXT CRITICAL STAGES

Keep in mind that you will need AscentGeo again at different stages of your project. This may include:

- ☐ **Review or endorsement of structural plans/architectural plans for a Construction Certificate**
- ☐ **Foundation/Footing inspection during construction**
- ☐ **Excavation hold point inspection, usually at hold points not exceeding 1.5m drops**
- ☐ **Final inspection and certification for an Occupation Certificate upon completion of works**

GENERAL ADVICE

If after reading this report you have any questions, are unsure what to do next or when you need to get in touch, please reach out to us.

Given AscentGeo can't be on site the whole time, we recommend that you or/and your builder take a lot of progress photos, especially during excavation. Many of the potential problems that may pop up can be resolved if we have clear photos of the work that's been done.

A lot can change on site during a construction project: some of these changes are normal and innocuous, while others can be symptoms of larger or more serious issues. For this reason, it's important to contact us to discuss any changes you notice on site that you aren't sure about. This could include but not be limited to changes to ground or surface water, movement of structures, and settlement of paths or landscaping elements.



We're here to help.

The AscentGeo Team

Geotechnical Assessment

For New Dwelling at

71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW

Document Status			Approved for Issue	
Version	Author		Reviewer	Date
1	 Riley Turnbull BEnvSc&Mngt MAIG		 Ben Morgan BScGeol MAIG RPGeo	03.06.2025
Document Distribution				
Version	Copies	Format	To	Date
1	1	PDF	Action Plans	03.06.2025
1	1	PDF	Jonathan & Virginia Younger	03.06.2025

Limitations

This report has been prepared for Jonathan & Virginia Younger, c/- Action Plans, in accordance with AscentGeo's fee proposal dated 19 May 2025.

The report is provided for the exclusive use of the property owner 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 on site as identified by AscentGeo 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 AscentGeo.

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	Site Description	5
2.3	Geology and Geological Interpretation	5
2.4	Fieldwork	5
3	Geotechnical Assessment	7
3.1	Geological Model	7
3.2	Site Classification	8
3.3	Groundwater	9
3.4	Surface Water	9
3.4	Acid Sulfate Soils	9
3.5	Slope Instability	10
3.6	Geotechnical Hazards and Risk Analysis	10
3.7	Conclusion and Recommendations	11
4	References	15
5	Appendices	
Appendix A:	Site plan/ground test locations and geological cross section	
Appendix B:	Site photos	
Appendix C:	Engineering logs	
Appendix D:	General notes	
	CSIRO Publishing, 2012. 'Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Homeowners Guide', Sheet BTF-18.	
	Australian GeoGuide LR8, 2007. 'Examples of Good/Bad Hillside Construction Practice'.	
	Australian Geomechanics, 2007. 'Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Management', Appendix C: Qualitative Terminology.	
Appendix E:	Northern Beaches Council – Pittwater Geotechnical Forms 1 & 1A	

1 Overview

1.1 Background

This report presents the findings of a geotechnical assessment carried out at 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen (the 'Site'), by AscentGeo. This geotechnical assessment has been prepared to meet Northern Beaches Council lodgement requirements for a Development Application (DA), as well as informing detailed structural design and construction methodology.

1.2 Proposed Development

The proposed development will take place on Lot 18 in DP17768, being 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen as per plan by CMS Surveyors, dated 25 November 2024.

Details of the proposed development are outlined in a series of architectural drawings prepared by Action Plans, drawing numbers DA03 – DA19, dated 16 May 2025.

The works comprise the following:

- Demolition of existing structures, site preparation, excavation and footings preparation
- Construction of new two storey dwelling with attached two car garage and alfresco area
- Construction of new inground swimming pool and associated works
- Various soft and hard landscaping detail.

1.3 Relevant Instruments

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

- Northern Beaches Council – Pittwater Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2014 and Pittwater Development Control Plan (DCP) 2014
- Appendix 5 (to Pittwater P21) Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater – 2009
- 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 Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of site conditions

Parameter	Description
Site visit	Riley Turnbull, Engineering Geologist – 28/05/2025
Site address	71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen – Lot 18 in DP17768
Site area m ² (approx.)	613.4m ² (by calc.)
Existing development	Two storey brick dwelling, clad cabana, timber decking, spa, concrete hardstand driveway.
Slope Aspect	West
Average gradient	<5 degrees
Vegetation	Lawn areas, small to large shrubs, medium sized trees.
Retaining structures	Concrete seawall was observed to be in a dilapidated condition with bulging and cracking damage evident.
Neighbouring environment	Residentially developed to the north and south. Wimbledon Avenue to the east and Narrabeen Lagoon watercourse to the west.




Figure 1. Site location – 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW. (© SIX Maps NSW Gov)

2.2 Site Description

The subject site is situated in a residential area, has an irregular shape and is bounded by residential dwellings to the north and south. Wimbledon Avenue runs along the eastern (front) boundary of the site. The site is on a gently inclined slope with a gradient of <5 degrees, with easterly aspect (falling to its rear). A site plan is included in Appendix A.

The existing building at the site is a two-storey brick dwelling with a grassed front yard and larger grassed backyard areas. Neighbouring buildings are mostly single and double storey dwellings. Narrabeen Lagoon watercourse was observed to the west of the existing site and tidal fluctuations would be expected to influence the site.

The four photos presented in Appendix B show the general conditions of the site on the day of the site visit conducted by AscentGeo.

2.3 Geology and Geological Interpretation

The Geological Survey of New South Wales (GSNSW) Seamless Geology Project Version 2.5, May 2024, accessed via Minview, indicates that the site is underlain by Anthropocene anthropogenic deposits (Q_h). The Anthropocene anthropogenic deposits are comprised of deposits varying from large man-made clasts (concrete blocks to building demolition rubble) to quarried natural boulders, with interstitial sand-sized to clay matrix.

The soil profile consists of shallow uncontrolled silty fill and silty topsoil (O & A Horizons) and silty sand (B Horizon). Based on our observations and the results of testing on site, silty sands were observed to a depth of 3.6m (practical limit of test) and are expected to extend to unknown depths.

Note: The local geology is comprised predominantly of deep alluvial/estuarine sediments, with sandstone/shale bedrock at depths not determined. These sediments are of relatively low strength and will vary between low and medium density. This variability should be anticipated and accounted for in the design and construction of any new foundations.

2.4 Fieldwork

A site visit and investigation was undertaken on 28 May 2025, which included a geotechnically focused visual assessment of the property and its surrounds; geotechnical mapping; photographic documenting; and a limited subsurface investigation including hand auger borehole and dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP) testing.

Hand Auger Borehole Testing

Two hand auger boreholes (BH1 & BH2) tests were drilled at the approximate locations shown on the site plan (Appendix A) to visually identify the subsurface material. Engineering logs of the hand auger boreholes are presented in Appendix C.

Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) Testing

Five (5) DCP tests were carried out to assess the in situ relative density of the shallow soils and the depth to weathered rock (not encountered). These tests were carried out in accordance with the Australian Standard for ground testing: AS 1289.6.3.2–1997 'Methods of testing soils for engineering

purposes'. Test locations were constrained by existing structures, hard surfaces and the presence of utilities.

The location of these tests is shown on the site plan provided in Appendix A and a summary of the test results is presented below in Table 2, with the full details presented in the engineering logs in Appendix C.

Table 2. Summary of DCP test results

Test	Summary
DCP 1	End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.
DCP 2	End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.
DCP 3	End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.
DCP 4	End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.
DCP 5	End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.


Preliminary Acid Sulfate Soils Assessment

Acid sulfate soils is the common name given to naturally occurring soil and sediment containing iron sulfides. When these natural occurring sulfides are disturbed and exposed to air, oxidation occurs, and sulfuric acid is ultimately produced. For every tonne of sulfidic material that completely oxidises, 1.6 tonnes of pure sulfuric acid are produced. This sulfuric acid can drain into waterways and cause severe short- and long-term socioeconomic and environmental impacts.

With reference to the Northern Beaches Council (PLEP) Acid Sulfate Soils Map, the Site is classified as "Class 3" (Image 3).



Image 3. Pittwater Acid Sulfate Soils Map (NBC Maps):
71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen.



TEST: BH1		FIELD pH & PEROXIDE RESULTS			
Sample depth m	pH _F	30% Peroxide reaction	pH _{FOX}	pH _{FOX} - pH _F	SS=Shell J=Jarosite R=Roots
0.00	7.5	Moderate Fizz	7.2	- 0.3	R<5%, SS <5%
0.50	7.6	Weak Fizz	7.2	- 0.4	
1.00	7.9	No Reaction	7.5	- 0.4	SS <5%
1.50	7.9	Weak Fizz	8.1	0.2	
1.70	8.0	Weak Fizz	7.9	- 0.1	SS <5%
1.80	8.1	Weak Fizz	8.1	0.0	
TEST: BH2		FIELD pH & PEROXIDE RESULTS			
Sample depth m	pH _F	Sample depth m	pH _F	Sample depth m	pH _F
0.00	7.5	Moderate Fizz	7.4	- 0.1	R<5%, SS <5%
0.50	7.4	Weak Fizz	7.1	- 0.3	SS <5%
1.00	7.8	No Reaction	7.9	0.1	SS <5%
1.50	7.9	Weak Fizz	8.0	0.1	
1.70	8.0	Weak Fizz	7.9	- 0.1	
1.80	7.9	Weak Fizz	7.8	- 0.1	SS <5%

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

3 Geotechnical Assessment

3.1 Geological Model

Based on the results of our site assessment, ground testing, geological mapping and our experience in the area, the subsurface conditions encountered on site may be summarised as follows in Table 3.

Table 3. Interpreted geological model

Unit	Material	Comments
1	TOPSOIL / FILL	Sandy disturbed topsoil and uncontrolled, poorly compacted fill material.
2	Silty SAND	Fine grained, Silty Sand. Medium dense to dense in consistency, increasing density with depth.
3	Bedrock	Very low strength or greater bedrock expected to be found underlying deep sand deposits. Depth to rock unknown but is expected to be well below practical depth for footings.

3.2 Site Classification

Due to the depth of poorly compacted uncontrolled fill material the site is classified as “**P**” in accordance with AS 2870–2011.

Table 4. Site classification table for residential slabs and footings (AS2870-2011)

Site Classification	Soil description	Expected range of movement
A	Most sand and rock sites with little or no ground movement from moisture changes.	
S	Slight reactive clay sites, which may experience only slight ground movement from moisture changes.	0–20mm
M	Moderately reactive clay or silt sites, which may experience moderate ground movement from moisture changes.	20–40mm
H1	Highly reactive clay sites, which may experience high ground movement from moisture changes.	40–60mm
H2	Highly reactive clay sites, which may experience very high ground movement from moisture changes.	60–75mm
E	Extremely reactive sites, which may experience extreme ground movement from moisture changes.	>75mm
P	May consist of any of the above soil types, but in combination with site conditions produce undesirable foundations. P sites may also include fill, soft soils, mine subsidence, collapsing soils, prior or potential landslip, soils subject to erosion, reactive sites subject to abnormal moisture conditions, or sites which cannot be classified otherwise.	

3.3 Groundwater

While dedicated groundwater monitoring was not part of the scope of works for this project. Due to the topography of the block, and the relatively low elevation above sea level and proximity to Narrabeen Lagoon estuary it is likely that the site is influenced by a variable standing water table. Based on the results of our limited scope testing, the observed the water table was standing at approx. 1.2m below the current surface levels.

Based on previous experience locally, and dependant on the depth of the proposed pool installation, we would expect the proposed works to be significantly influenced by the water table. We would suggest test pits to the base of the proposed pool be carried out by the pool builder to confirm the presence of the water table, prior to bulk excavations commencing. A construction methodology statement should be prepared by the pool builder and provided to AscentGeo for review

3.4 Surface Water

Overland or surface flows entering the site from the adjoining areas were not identified at the time of our inspection; however, normal overland runoff could enter the site from adjacent areas during heavy or extended rainfall. Appropriate surface water diversions should be implemented to prevent overland runoff entering the site from adjacent areas during heavy or extended rainfall.

3.4 Acid Sulfate Soils

With reference to the *Acid Sulfate Soils Assessment Guidelines* (1998), field pH levels of less than or equal to 3.0 indicates that actual acid sulfate soils (**AASS**) are present in the soil profile. Potential acid sulfate soils (**PASS**) are considered to be present when pH values in hydrogen peroxide solution (pH_{FOX}) are less than or equal to 4.0, or where the drop in pH is greater than one unit.

The proposed new dwelling and inground pool are considered to have minimal impact on the site, with only relatively minor excavations required for their installation. The installation of the proposed works should not have any significant detrimental effects on the groundwater movements or water table in the area.

Based on the preliminary acid sulfate soils testing undertaken on site, pH in Field (pH_F) tests ranged from 7.4 to 8.1, and pH in hydrogen peroxide (pH_{FOX}) produced values ranging from 7.1 to 8.1. Analytical testing of representative samples for pH_F or pH_{FOX} confirmed that potential and actual acid sulfate soils were not present to any significant extent in the soils within and exceeding the proposed maximum excavation depth.

Based on the scope of the proposed works and the results of this preliminary assessment, the site and the proposed works present a low risk of the presence of Acid Sulfate soils and the potential for generation of acid sulfate soils conditions during the proposed works was regarded as negligible.

No further field or laboratory testing nor the preparation of an Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan is considered necessary.

As a precaution excavated material should be stockpiled on plastic sheeting and covered before appropriate off-site disposal, or reintroduction to site as controlled fill.

3.5 Slope Instability

A landslide hazard assessment of the existing slope has been undertaken in general accordance with Australian Geomechanics Society's 'Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management', published in March 2007.

- No evidence of significant soil creep, tension cracks or landslip instability were identified across the site or on adjacent properties as viewed from the subject site at the time of our inspection.
- Based on reference to the plan entitled "Geotechnical Hazard Mapping" (Ref. P21DCP-BC-MDCP2002, dated 2007) prepared by GHD LONGMAC on behalf of Northern Beaches Council (Pittwater), the site is not mapped in a Geotechnical Hazard zone.




Image 2. PLEP Geotechnical Hazard Map
– 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW © NBC Maps

LEGEND
Pittwater Geotechnical Hazard Map
■ Geotechnical Hazard H1
■ Geotechnical Hazard H2

3.6 Geotechnical Hazards and Risk Analysis

No significant geotechnical hazards were identified beside or below the subject site, including but not limited to the immediately adjoining residential properties, and the road reserve.

The scope of the proposed excavations on site, and the local geology make this site susceptible to instability during the proposed construction works. Careful control of all site works will be required during the installation of any required retention systems, excavations, and the construction of the proposed structures to maintain the stability of the block, and adjacent land.

Based on observation made during our site assessment the following geological/geotechnical hazards have been identified in relation to the proposed works:

- **Hazard Three:** Failure of the proposed excavations.

Table 5. Risk analysis summary

HAZARDS	HAZARD ONE
TYPE	Failure of the proposed excavations
LIKELIHOOD	'Possible' (10^{-3})
CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY	'Minor' (5%)
RISK TO PROPERTY	'Moderate' (2×10^{-3})
RISK TO LIFE	2.1×10^{-5} /annum
COMMENTS	Following implementation of the recommendations outlined in Section 3.7, the above risk levels would reduce to 'Acceptable' levels within the site.

3.7 Conclusion and Recommendations

The proposed development is considered to be suitable for the site. 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 Table 6 are adhered to during design and construction.***

Table 6. Geotechnical recommendations

Recommendation	Description
Soil Excavation	<p>All excavation recommendations as outlined below should be read in conjunction with Safe Work Australia's <i>Code of Practice: Excavation Work</i>, published in October 2018.</p> <p>Due to the topography of the block, and the relatively low elevation above sea level, and the groundwater encountered in site testing, it is likely that the site is influenced by a variable standing water table.</p> <p>We suggest test pits to the base of the proposed foundations and the proposed pool be carried out by the relevant builders to confirm the presence of the water table, prior to bulk excavations commencing. A construction methodology statement should be prepared by the builders and provided to AscentGeo for review</p> <p>Soil excavation will be required to establish new footings across the site. It is anticipated that these excavations will encounter shallow uncontrolled fill and silty topsoil, silty-sandy clay, and possible weathered bedrock. The excavation of soil, clay and extremely weathered rock should be possible with the use of</p>

Recommendation	Description																								
	<p>bucket excavators and rippers, or for piered footings, traditional auger attachments.</p> <p>For shallow excavations (<1.0m), provided the residual soil is battered back to a minimum of 45 degrees and covered, they should remain stable without support for a short period until permanent support is in place.</p> <p>All excavated material is to be removed from the site in accordance with current Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) regulations.</p>																								
Excavation Support	<p>Provided the appropriate batter angles, mentioned above, are achieved, and any exposed soil batter is covered to prevent excessive infiltration or evaporation of moisture, no significant excavation support is anticipated.</p>																								
Retaining Structures	<p>Retention systems should be designed by a qualified structural engineer in accordance with Australian Standard 4678–2002 using the following geotechnical parameters:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="3"></th><th colspan="3">Earth Pressure Coefficients</th></tr><tr><th>(Unit) Material</th><th>Bulk Unit Weight (kN/m³)</th><th>Friction Angle (°)</th><th>Active K_a</th><th>At Rest K₀</th><th>Passive K_p</th></tr><tr><td>(Unit 1) Fill / Topsoil</td><td>18</td><td>29</td><td>0.38</td><td>0.60</td><td>2.00</td></tr><tr><td>(Unit 3) Sand</td><td>19</td><td>29</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.50</td><td>2.00</td></tr></table> <p>Retention systems should be designed to prevent hydrostatic pressure from developing behind the wall. As such, retaining walls to be constructed as part of the site works are to incorporate back wall subsoil drainage pipes, and 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 fine-grained sediment.</p> <p>Design of appropriate retention systems should consider potential surcharges from sloping land above the wall, soil creep, adjacent structures and footings, and construction related activities such as compaction of fill, traffic of vehicles and construction plant.</p>				Earth Pressure Coefficients			(Unit) Material	Bulk Unit Weight (kN/m ³)	Friction Angle (°)	Active K _a	At Rest K ₀	Passive K _p	(Unit 1) Fill / Topsoil	18	29	0.38	0.60	2.00	(Unit 3) Sand	19	29	0.33	0.50	2.00
			Earth Pressure Coefficients																						
(Unit) Material	Bulk Unit Weight (kN/m ³)	Friction Angle (°)	Active K _a	At Rest K ₀	Passive K _p																				
(Unit 1) Fill / Topsoil	18	29	0.38	0.60	2.00																				
(Unit 3) Sand	19	29	0.33	0.50	2.00																				
Footings	<p>The allowable bearing pressure for footings taken to natural medium dense silty sand of the natural profile is 100kPa. Due to the depth of natural soil materials, foundations in natural soil materials are likely to be below the tidal water table and should be designed accordingly. Due to the potential for collapse, and the possibility of encountering a standing water table screw piles may provide a practical alternative to shallow pad or traditional bored pile footings.</p>																								

Recommendation	Description
	<p>Pier footings should be of sufficient diameter to enable effective base cleaning to be carried out during construction.</p> <p>To mitigate the risk of differential settlement, it is essential that all footings are founded on material of similar consistency.</p> <p>It is essential that the foundation materials of all footing excavations be inspected and approved before steel reinforcement and concrete is placed. This inspection should be scheduled while excavation plant and operators are still on site, and before steel reinforcement has been fixed or the concrete booked.</p> <p>It should be noted that if screw piles are adopted, certification of the structural engineer's pile installation parameters should be sought from the specialist pile installer. AscentGeo cannot certify pile installation.</p>
Fills	<p>Any fill that may be required is to comprise 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 250mm thick and compacted to not less than 95% of Standard Optimum Dry Density at plus or minus 2% of Standard Optimum Moisture Content. If supporting pavements or slabs, any new fill must be compacted to not less than 98% of Standard Optimum Dry Density at plus or minus 2% of Standard Optimum Moisture Content for the uppermost 300mm.</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>
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, siltation fencing and barriers will be required and are to be designed by others.</p>
Stormwater Disposal	<p>The effective management of ground and surface water on site may be the most important factor in the long-term performance of built structures, and the stability of the block more generally.</p> <p>It is essential that gutters, downpipes, drains, pipes and connections are appropriately sized, functioning effectively, and discharging appropriately via non-erosive discharge.</p> <p>All stormwater collected from hard surfaces is to be collected and piped directly to the council stormwater network or Narrabeen Lagoon watercourse 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.</p>

Recommendation	Description
	Saturation of soils is one of the key triggers for many landslide events and a significant factor in destabilisation of structures over time. As such, the review and design of stormwater systems must consider climate change and the increased potential for periods of concentrated heavy rainfall.
Inspections	<p>It is essential that the foundation materials of all footing excavations be visually assessed and approved by AscentGeo before steel reinforcement and concrete is placed.</p> <p>Failure to engage AscentGeo for the required hold point / excavation or foundation material inspections will negate our ability to provide final geotechnical sign off or certification.</p> <p>It should be noted that if screw piles are adopted, certification of the structural engineer's pile installation parameters should be sought from the specialist pile installer. AscentGeo cannot certify pile installation.</p>
Conditions Relating to Design and Construction Monitoring	<p>To comply with Northern Beaches Council conditions and enable the completion of Forms 2B and 3, as required by Council's Geotechnical Risk Management Policy, it may be necessary at the following stages for Ascent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Review the geotechnical content of all structural engineer designs prior to the issue of Construction Certificate – Form 2B● Complete the abovementioned excavation hold point and foundation material inspections during construction to ensure compliance to design with respect to stability and geotechnical design parameters● By Occupation Certificate stage (project completion), AscentGeo must have inspected and certified excavation/foundation materials. A final site inspection will be required at this stage before the issue of the Form 3.

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 **AscentGeo**,



Riley Turnbull BEnvSc&Mngt MAIG
Engineering Geologist



Ben Morgan BScGeol MAIG RPGeo
Managing Director | Engineering Geologist



4 References

Ahern CR, Stone, Y & Blunden B (1998). 'Acid Sulfate Soils Assessment Guidelines'. Published by the Acid Sulfate Soil Management Advisory Committee, Wollongbar, NSW, Australia.

Australian Geomechanics Society Landslide Taskforce, Landslide Practice Note Working Group 2007 (Mar), 'Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management 2007', *Australian Geomechanics Journal*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 63–114.

Colquhoun, GP, Hughes, KS, Deyssing, L, Ballard, JC, Phillips, G, Troedson, AL, Folkes, CB & Fitzherbert, JA 2024, *The Geological Survey of New South Wales (GSNSW) Seamless Geology Project*, Version 2.5, May 2024, State of New South Wales and Department of Regional NSW, accessed via MinView.

GHD Geotechnics 2007, *Geotechnical Hazard Mapping of the Pittwater LGA 2007*, Pittwater Council's Geotechnical Risk Management Map P21CDP-BC-MDCP083, GHD Longmac.

Pells, PJN, Mostyn, G & Walker, F 1998 (Dec), 'Foundations on sandstone and shale in the Sydney region', *Australian Geomechanics Journal*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 17–29.

Safe Work Australia 2018 (Oct), *Code of Practice: Excavation Work*, Safe Work Australia.

Standards Australia 1997, *Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes*, AS 1289.6.3.2–1997, Standards Australia, NSW.

Standards Australia 2001, *Evaluation of Human Exposure to Whole-Body Vibration – Part 1: General Requirements*, AS 2670.1–2001, Standards Australia, NSW.

Standards Australia 2011, *Residential Slabs and Footings*, AS 2870–2011, Standards Australia, NSW.

Standards Australia 2011, *Structural Design Actions – Part 2: Wind Actions*, AS 1170.2–2011, Standards Australia, NSW.

Standards Australia 2017, *Geotechnical Site Investigations*, AS 1726–2017, Standards Australia, NSW.

Appendix A

Site plans




LEGEND



DCP LOCATIONS



BOREHOLE LOCATIONS



SITE PLAN/GROUND TEST LOCATIONS
SCALE NTS

A	29.05.25	PRELIMINARY ISSUE	VT	BM	
REV	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	REV BY	CHKD	



ABN: 71 621 428 402
www.ascentgeo.com.au

(02) 9913 3179
admin@ascentgeo.com.au

1457 Pittwater Road
North Narrabeen NSW 2101

CLIENT:
**JONATHAN &
VIRGINIA YOUNGER**

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 71 WIMBLEDON AVENUE
NORTH NARRABEEN NSW


DATE: 29/05/2025

SCALE: AS SHOWN @ A3

DRAWING TITLE:
SITE PLAN

DRAWING NO:
AG 25215- S1

INTERPRETED SUBSURFACE SECTION ONLY.
ACTUAL GROUND CONDITIONS MAY VARY.



INFERRED GEOLOGICAL SECTION
SCALE NTS

						 <p> ASCENTGEO <small>GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING</small> </p>	<p> ABN: 71 621 428 402 www.ascentgeo.com.au </p> <p> (02) 9913 3179 admin@ascentgeo.com.au </p> <p> 1457 Pittwater Road North Narrabeen NSW 2101 </p>	<p> CLIENT: JONATHAN & VIRGINIA YOUNGER </p> <p> 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 </p>	<p> INFERRED GEOLOGICAL SECTION AT 71 WIMBLEDON AVENUE NORTH NARRABEEN NSW </p>	DATE: 29/05/2025
										SCALE: AS SHOWN @ A3
										DRAWING TITLE: SECTION
										DRAWING NO: AG 25215- S2
A	29.05.25	PRELIMINARY ISSUE	VT	BM						
REV	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	REV BY	CHKD						

Appendix B

Site photos



Photo 1: Site frontage, looking west.



Photo 2: Photo taken from western boundary, looking east.



Photo 3: Rear yard of site looking west.



Photo 4: Subsurface soil profile of BH01.

Appendix C

Bore Logs | DCP Test Results

PROJECT NUMBER AG 25215	DRILLING DATE 28/05/2025	ADDRESS 71 Wimbledon Avenue North Narrabeen
PROJECT NAME New Dwelling	TOTAL DEPTH 1.9	SHEET 1 of 1
CLIENT Jonathan & Virginia Younger	METHOD Hand Auger	

COMMENTS See plan for location	LOGGED BY RT
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Depth (m)	Water	Graphic Log	Moisture	Material Description	USCS	Consistency	Additional Observations
0.1			M	FILL: TOPSOIL Sandy CLAY, low to high plasticity, fine to coarse sand, dark brown, with gravel fine to coarse, moist.			
0.2							
0.3				FILL: SAND with silt, fine to medium grained sand, light brown, trace of shell, appears poorly compacted, moist.			
0.4							
0.5							
0.6							
0.7							
0.8							
0.9							
1.0							
1.1							
1.2							
1.2			W	FILL: SAND with silt, fine to medium grained sand, light brown, trace of shell, appears poorly compacted, wet.			
1.3							
1.4							
1.5							
1.6			W	FILL: TOPSOIL Sandy CLAY, high plasticity, fine to coarse sand, dark brown/ black, organic matter, wet.			
1.7			W	Silty SAND, light brown/grey, fine grained sand, wet.	SM	D	
1.8							
1.9				Termination Depth at: 1.9 m (Limit of Hand Auger)			

PROJECT NUMBER AG 25215	DRILLING DATE 28/05/2025	ADDRESS 71 Wimbledon Avenue North Narrabeen
PROJECT NAME New Dwelling	TOTAL DEPTH 1.9	SHEET 1 of 1
CLIENT Jonathan & Virginia Younger	METHOD Hand Auger	

COMMENTS See plan for location	LOGGED BY RT
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Depth (m)	Water	Graphic Log	Moisture	Material Description	USCS	Consistency	Additional Observations
0.1			M	FILL: TOPSOIL Sandy CLAY, low to high plasticity, fine to coarse sand, dark brown, with gravel fine to coarse, moist.			
0.2							
0.3			M	FILL: SAND with silt, fine to medium grained sand, light brown, trace of shell, appears poorly compacted, moist.			
0.4							
0.5							
0.6							
0.7							
0.8							
0.9							
1.0							
1.1							
1.2							
1.3							
1.4							
1.5	~		W	FILL: SAND with silt, fine to medium grained sand, light brown, trace of shell, appears poorly compacted, wet.			
1.6			W	FILL: TOPSOIL Sandy CLAY, high plasticity, fine to coarse sand, dark brown/ black, organic matter, wet.			
1.7			W	Silty SAND, light brown/grey, fine grained sand, wet.	SM	D	
1.8							
1.9				Termination Depth at: 1.9 m (Limit of Hand Auger)			

Dynamic Cone Penetration Test Report

Client:		Jonathan & Virginia Younger				Job No:		AG 25215	
Project:		New Dwelling				Date:		28/5/2025	
Location:		71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen				Operator:		RT	
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:		RL:		RL:		RL:		RL:	
Soil Classification: P		Soil Classification: P		Soil Classification: P		Soil Classification: P		Soil Classification: P	
Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows	Depth (m)	Blows
0.0 – 0.3	1	0.0 – 0.3	1	0.0 – 0.3	1	0.0 – 0.3	1	0.0 – 0.3	1
0.3 – 0.6	5	0.3 – 0.6	2	0.3 – 0.6	1	0.3 – 0.6	3	0.3 – 0.6	2
0.6 – 0.9	7	0.6 – 0.9	8	0.6 – 0.9	7	0.6 – 0.9	1	0.6 – 0.9	5
0.9 – 1.2	5	0.9 – 1.2	6	0.9 – 1.2	9	0.9 – 1.2	8	0.9 – 1.2	6
1.2 – 1.5	3	1.2 – 1.5	6	1.2 – 1.5	5	1.2 – 1.5	5	1.2 – 1.5	5
1.5 – 1.8	5	1.5 – 1.8	5	1.5 – 1.8	6	1.5 – 1.8	6	1.5 – 1.8	19
1.8 – 2.1	20	1.8 – 2.1	21	1.8 – 2.1	20	1.8 – 2.1	20	1.8 – 2.1	24
2.1 – 2.4	22	2.1 – 2.4	22	2.1 – 2.4	23	2.1 – 2.4	22	2.1 – 2.4	22
2.4 – 2.7	19	2.4 – 2.7	23	2.4 – 2.7	20	2.4 – 2.7	22	2.4 – 2.7	23
2.7 – 3.0	24	2.7 – 3.0	28	2.7 – 3.0	30	2.7 – 3.0	31	2.7 – 3.0	28
3.0 – 3.3	23	3.0 – 3.3	30	3.0 – 3.3	30	3.0 – 3.3	30	3.0 – 3.3	30
3.3 – 3.6	24 EOT	3.3 – 3.6	30 EOT	3.3 – 3.6	31 EOT	3.3 – 3.6	32 EOT	3.3 – 3.6	34 EOT
3.6 – 3.9		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		3.9 – 4.2	
4.2 – 4.5		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		4.5 – 4.8	
DCP 1: End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.		DCP 2: End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.		DCP 3: End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.		DCP 4 : End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.		DCP 4 : End of Test @ 3.6m Limit of equipment. Brown/grey sand on wet tip.	
Remarks: Available test locations limited by existing hard surfaces and possible buried services . Groundwater encountered from approximately 1.5 below existing surface level.						Weight:		9 kg	
						Drop:		510 mm	
						Rod Diameter:		16 mm	

EOT = End of Test

Appendix D

Information Sheets

General Notes About This Report

INTRODUCTION

These notes have been prepared by Ascent Geotechnical Consulting Pty Ltd (Ascent) to help our Clients interpret and understand the limitations of this report. Not all sections below are necessarily relevant to all reports.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

This report has been prepared in accordance with the scope of services set out in Ascent's proposal under Ascent's Terms and Conditions, or as otherwise agreed with the Client. The scope of work may have been limited by a range of factors including time, budget, access and/or site constraints.

RELIANCE ON INFORMATION PROVIDED

In preparing the report, Ascent has necessarily relied upon information provided by the Client and/or their Agents. Such data may include surveys, analyses, designs, maps and design plans. Ascent has not verified the accuracy or completeness of the data except as stated in this report.

GEOTECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING

Geotechnical and environmental reporting relies on the interpretation of factual information, based on judgment and opinion, and is far less exact than other engineering or design disciplines.

Geotechnical and environmental reports are prepared for a specific purpose, development, and site, as described in the report, and may not contain sufficient information for other purposes, developments, or sites (including adjacent sites), other than that described in the report.

SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Subsurface conditions can change with time and can vary between test locations. For example, the actual interface between the materials may be far more gradual or abrupt than indicated.

Therefore, actual conditions in areas not sampled may differ from those predicted, since no subsurface investigation, no matter how comprehensive, can reveal all subsurface details and anomalies.

Construction operations at or adjacent to the site and natural events such as floods, earthquakes or groundwater fluctuations can also affect subsurface conditions, and thus the continuing adequacy of a geotechnical report. Ascent should be kept informed of any such events, and should be retained to identify variances, conduct additional tests if required, and recommend solutions to problems encountered on site.

GROUNDWATER

Groundwater levels indicated on borehole and test pit logs are recorded at specific times. Depending on ground permeability, measured levels may or may not reflect actual levels if measured over a longer time period. Also, groundwater levels and seepage inflows may fluctuate with seasonal and environmental variations and construction activities.

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Data obtained from nominated discrete locations, subsequent laboratory testing and empirical or external sources are interpreted by trained professionals in order to provide an opinion about overall site conditions, their likely impact with respect to the report purpose and recommended actions in accordance with any relevant industry standards, guidelines or procedures.

SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTIONS

Soil and rock descriptions are based on AS 1726 – 1993, using visual and tactile assessment, except at discrete locations where field and / or laboratory tests have been carried out. Refer to the accompanying soil and rock terms sheet for further information.

COPYRIGHT AND REPRODUCTION

The contents of this document are and remain the intellectual property of Ascent. This document should only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and should not be used for other projects, or by a third party without written permission from Ascent.

This report shall not be reproduced either totally or in part without the permission of Ascent. Where information from this report is to be included in contract documents or engineering specification for the project, the entire report should be included in order to minimise the likelihood of misinterpretation.

FURTHER ADVICE

Ascent would be pleased to further discuss how any of the above issues could affect a specific project. We would also be pleased to provide further advice or assistance including:

- Assessment of suitability of designs and construction techniques;
- Contract documentation and specification;
- Construction advice (foundation assessments, excavation support).

Abbreviations, Notes & Symbols

SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

METHOD

Borehole Logs

AS#	Auger screwing (#-bit)
AD#	Auger drilling (#-bit)
B	Blank bit
V	V-bit
T	TC-bit
HA	Hand auger
R	Roller/tricone
W	Washbore
AH	Air hammer
AT	Air track
LB	Light bore push tube
MC	Macro core push tube
DT	Dual core push tube

Excavation Logs

BH	Backhoe/excavator bucket
NE	Natural exposure
HE	Hand excavation
X	Existing excavation

Cored Borehole Logs

NMLC	NMLC core drilling
NQ/HQ	Wireline core drilling

SUPPORT

Borehole Logs

C	Casing
M	Mud

Excavation Logs

S	Shoring
B	Benching

SAMPLING

B	Bulk sample
D	Disturbed sample
U#	Thin-walled tube sample (#mmdiameter)
ES	Environmental sample
EW	Environmental water sample

FIELD TESTING

PP	Pocket penetrometer (kPa)
DCP	Dynamic cone penetrometer
PSP	Perth sand penetrometer
SPT	Standard penetration test
PBT	Plate bearing test
s_u	Vane shear strength peak/residual (kPa) and vane size (mm)
N*	SPT (blows per 300mm)
Nc	SPT with solid cone
R	Refusal

*denotes sample taken

BOUNDARIES

————	Known
-----	Probable
.....	Possible

SOIL

MOISTURE CONDITION

D	Dry
M	Moist
W	Wet
Wp	Plastic Limit
WL	Liquid Limit
MC	Moisture Content

CONSISTENCY

VS	Very Soft
S	Soft
F	Firm
St	Stiff
VSt	Very Stiff
H	Hard
Fb	Friable

DENSITY INDEX

VL	Very Loose
L	Loose
MD	Medium Dense
D	Dense
VD	Very Dense

USCS SYMBOLS

GW	Well graded gravels and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines
GP	Poorly graded gravels and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines
GM	Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures
GC	Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures

SW	Well graded sands and gravelly sands, little or no fines
SP	Poorly graded sands and gravelly sands, little or no fines
SM	Silty sand, sand-silt mixtures
SC	Clayey sand, sand-clay mixtures
ML	Inorganic silts of low plasticity, very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands
CL	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays
OL	Organic silts and organic silty clays of low plasticity
MH	Inorganic silts of high plasticity
CH	Inorganic clays of high plasticity
OH	Organic clays of medium to high plasticity
PT	Peat muck and other highly organic soils

ROCK

WEATHERING

RS	Residual Soil
XW	Extremely Weathered
HW	Highly Weathered
MW	Moderately Weathered
DW*	Distinctly Weathered
SW	Slightly Weathered
FR	Fresh

*covers both HW & MW

STRENGTH

EL	Extremely Low
VL	Very Low
L	Low
M	Medium
H	High
VH	Very High
EH	Extremely High

ROCK QUALITY DESIGNATION (%)

= $\frac{\text{sum of intact core pieces} > 100\text{mm}}{\text{total length of section being evaluated}} \times 100$

CORE RECOVERY (%)

= $\frac{\text{core recovered}}{\text{core lift}} \times 100$

NATURAL FRACTURES

Type

JT	Joint
BP	Bedding plane
SM	Seam
FZ	Fractured zone
SZ	Shear zone
VN	Vein

Infill or Coating

Cn	Clean
St	Stained
Vn	Veneer
Co	Coating
Cl	Clay
Ca	Calcite
Fe	Iron oxide
Mi	Micaceous
Qz	Quartz

Shape

pl	Planar
cu	Curved
un	Undulose
st	Stepped
ir	Irregular

Roughness

pol	Polished
slk	Slickensided
smo	Smooth
rou	Rough

Soil & Rock Terms

SOIL

MOISTURE CONDITION

Term	Description
Dry	Looks and feels dry. Cohesive and cemented soils are hard, friable or powdery. Uncemented granular soils run freely through the hand.
Moist	Feels cool and 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.

For cohesive soils, moisture content may also be described in relation to plastic limit (W_p) or liquid limit (W_L). [$>>$ much greater than, $>$ greater than, $<$ less than, $<<$ much less than].

CONSISTENCY

Term	c (kPa)	Term	c (kPa)
	^u		^u
Very Soft	< 12	Very Stiff	100 - 200
Soft	12 - 25	Hard	> 200
Firm	25 - 50	Friable	-
Stiff	50 - 100		

DENSITY INDEX

Term	I_D (%)	Term	I_D (%)
Very Loose	< 15	Dense	65 - 8
Loose	15 - 35	Very Dense	> 85
Medium Dense	35 - 65		

PARTICLE SIZE

Name	Subdivision	Size (mm)
Boulders		> 200
Cobbles		63 - 200
Gravel	coarse	20 - 63
	medium	6 - 20
	fine	2.36 - 6
Sand	coarse	0.6 - 2.36
	medium	0.2 - 0.6
	fine	0.075 - 0.2
Silt & Clay		< 0.075

MINOR COMPONENTS

Term	Proportion by Mass coarse grained	fine grained
Trace	$\leq 5\%$	$\leq 15\%$
Some	5 - 2%	15 - 30%

SOIL ZONING

Layers	Continuous exposures
Lenses	Discontinuous layers of lenticular shape
Pockets	Irregular inclusions of different material

SOIL CEMENTING

Weakly	Easily broken up by hand
Moderately	Effort is required to break up the soil by hand

SOIL STRUCTURE

Massive	Coherent, with any partings both vertically and horizontally spaced at greater than 100mm
Weak	Peds indistinct and barely observable on pit face. When disturbed approx. 30% consist of peds smaller than 100mm
Strong	Peds are quite distinct in undisturbed soil. When disturbed $>60\%$ consists of peds smaller than 100mm

ROCK

SEDIMENTARY ROCK TYPE DEFINITIONS

Rock Type	Definition (more than 50% of rock consists of....)
Conglomerate	... gravel sized ($> 2\text{mm}$) fragments
Sandstone	... sand sized (0.06 to 2mm) grains
Siltstone	... silt sized ($<0.06\text{mm}$) particles, rock is not laminated
Claystone	... clay, rock is not laminated
Shale	... silt or clay sized particles, rock is laminated

STRENGTH

Term	I_s50 (MPa)	Term	I_s50 (MPa)
Extremely Low	< 0.03	High	1 - 3
Very Low	0.03 - 0.1	Very High	3 - 10
Low	0.1 - 0.3	Extremely High	> 10
Medium	0.3 - 1		

WEATHERING

Term	Description
Residual Soil	Soil developed on extremely weathered rock; the mass structure and substance fabric are no longer evident
Extremely Weathered	Rock is weathered to such an extent that it has 'soil' properties, i.e. it either disintegrates or can be remoulded, in water. Fabric of original rock is still visible
Highly Weathered	Rock strength usually highly changed by weathering; rock may be highly discoloured
Moderately Weathered	Rock strength usually moderately changed by weathering; rock may be moderately discoloured
Distinctly Weathered	See 'Highly Weathered' or 'Moderately Weathered'
Slightly Weathered	Rock is slightly discoloured but shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock
Fresh	Rock shows no signs of decomposition or staining

NATURAL FRACTURES

Type	Description
Joint	A discontinuity or crack across which the rock has little or no tensile strength. May be open or closed
Bedding plane	Arrangement in layers of mineral grains of similar sizes or composition
Seam	Seam with deposited soil (infill), extremely weathered insitu rock (XW), or disoriented usually angular fragments of the host rock (crushed)
Shear zone	Zone with roughly parallel planar boundaries, of rock material intersected by closely spaced (generally $< 50\text{mm}$) joints and /or microscopic fracture (cleavage) planes
Vein	Intrusion of any shape dissimilar to the adjoining rock mass. Usually igneous

Shape

Shape	Description
Planar	Consistent orientation
Curved	Gradual change in orientation
Undulose	Wavy surface
Stepped	One or more well defined steps
Irregular	Many sharp changes in orientation

Infill or Coating








































Infill or Coating	Description
Clean	No visible coating or discolouring
Stained	No visible coating but surfaces are discoloured
Veneer	A visible coating of soil or mineral, too thin to measure; may be patchy
Coating	Visible coating $\leq 1\text{mm}$ thick. Thicker soil material described as seam

Roughness

Roughness	Description
Polished	Shiny smooth surface
Slickensided	Grooved or striated surface, usually polished
Smooth	Smooth to touch. Few or no surface irregularities
Rough	Many small surface irregularities (amplitude generally $< 1\text{mm}$). Feels like fine to coarse sandpaper

Note: soil and rock descriptions are generally in accordance with AS1726-1993 Geotechnical Site Investigations

Graphic Symbols Index

Soil		Rock		Water Measurements	
	Fill		Sandstone		Level at time of drilling
	Peat, Topsoil		Shale		Level after drilling
	Clay		Clayey Shale		Inflow
	Silty Clay		Siltstone		Outflow
	Gravelly Clay		Conglomerate		
	Sandy Clay		Claystone		
	Silt		Dolerite, Basalt		
	Sandy Silt		Granite		
	Clayey Silt		Limestone		
	Gravelly Silt		Tuff		
	Gravel		Coarse grained Metamorphic		
	Sandy Gravel		Medium grained Metamorphic		
	Clayey Gravel		Fine grained Metamorphic		
	Silty Gravel		Coal		
	Sand				
	Gravelly Sand	Other			
	Silty Sand		Asphalt		
	Clayey Sand		Concrete		
			Brick		

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	A
10 ⁻²	5x10 ⁻³	100 years	The event will probably occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	LIKELY	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

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.

Appendix E

Geotechnical Forms 1 & 1A
Northern Beaches Council – Pittwater LEP

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

Development Application for	<u>Jonathan & Virginia Younger</u>
	Name of Applicant
Address of site	<u>71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW</u>

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

I, Ben Morgan on behalf of AscentGeo Geotechnical Consulting
(insert name) (Trading or Company Name)

on this the 03.06.2025 certify that I am a geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist or coastal engineer

as defined by the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 and I am authorised by the above organisation/company to issue this document and to certify that the organisation/company has a current professional indemnity policy of at least \$2 million.

Please mark appropriate box

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

Geotechnical Report Details:

Report Title: Geotechnical Assessment Report for the proposed new dwelling at 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen (AG 25215)
Report Date: 3 June 2025
Author: Cameron Young/Riley Turnbull
Author's Company/Organisation: AscentGeo Geotechnical Consulting

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

Architectural design plans prepared by Action Plans, drawing numbers DA03 to DA19, dated 16 May 2025.

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

Signature



Name

Ben Morgan

Chartered Professional Status

MAIG RPGeo (Geotechnical & Engineering)

Membership No.

10269

Company

AscentGeo Geotechnical Consulting



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

Development Application for Jonathan & Virginia Younger
Name of Applicant
Address of site 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen NSW

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

Geotechnical Report Details:

Report Title: Geotechnical Assessment Report for the proposed new dwelling at 71 Wimbledon Avenue, North Narrabeen (AG 25215)
Report Date: 3 June 2025
Author: Riley Turnbull
Author's Company/Organisation: AscentGeo Geotechnical Consulting

Please mark appropriate box

- ☒ Comprehensive site mapping conducted 28/05/2025
(date)
- ☒ Mapping details presented on contoured site plan with geomorphic mapping to a minimum scale of 1:200 (as appropriate)
- ☒ Subsurface investigation required
☐ No Justification
- ☒ ☒ Yes Date conducted 28/05/2025
- ☒ Geotechnical model developed and reported as an inferred subsurface type-section
- ☒ Geotechnical hazards identified
☐ Above the site
☒ On the site
☐ Below the site
☐ Beside the site
- ☒ Geotechnical hazards described and reported
- ☒ Risk assessment conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
☒ Consequence analysis
☒ Frequency analysis
- ☒ Risk calculation
- ☒ Risk assessment for property conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- ☒ Risk assessment for loss of life conducted in accordance with the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- ☒ Assessed risks have been compared to "Acceptable Risk Management" criteria as defined in the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009
- ☒ Opinion has been provided that the design can achieve the "Acceptable Risk Management" criteria provided that the specified conditions are achieved.
- ☒ Design Life Adopted:
☒ 100 years
☐ Other specify
- ☒ Geotechnical Conditions to be applied to all four phases as described in the Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater - 2009 have been specified
- ☒ Additional action to remove risk where reasonable and practical have been identified and included in the report.
- ☒ Risk Assessment within Bushfire Asset Protection Zone

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

Signature



Name

Ben Morgan

Chartered Professional Status

MAIG RPGeo (Geotechnical & Engineering)

Membership No.

10269

Company

AscentGeo Geotechnical Consulting

