



Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd

## **Proposed J-bar Ski Lift Perisher NSW**

Geotechnical Investigation

Our ref: 6728-G1 Rev 1  
22 August 2022

Your trusted engineering professionals

## Document Authorization

**Proposed J-bar Ski Lift  
Perisher NSW  
Geotechnical Investigation**

Prepared for Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd

Our ref: 6728-G1 REV 1  
22 August 2022

For and on behalf of  
**AssetGeoEnviro**



**Mark Bartel**  
BE, MEngSc, GMQ, CPEng, RPEQ/NER(Civil), APEC IntPE(Aus)  
Managing Director | Senior Principal Geotechnical Engineer

## Document Control

### Distribution Register

| Copy | Media      | Recipient         | Location                             |
|------|------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1    | Secure PDF | Michael Fearnside | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd |
| 2    | Secure PDF | Mark Bartel       | AssetGeoEnviro                       |
|      |            |                   |                                      |

### Document Status

| Rev | Revision Details | Author | Reviewer  |            | Approved for Issue |            |                 |
|-----|------------------|--------|-----------|------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
|     |                  |        | Name      | Initials   | Name               | Initials   | Date            |
| 0   | Initial issue    | A. To  | M. Bartel | <i>MAB</i> | M. Bartel          | <i>MAB</i> | 7 February 2022 |
| 1   | Minor updates    | A. To  | M, Bartel | <i>MAB</i> | M. Bartel          | <i>MAB</i> | 22 August 2022  |



ISO 9001:2015  
ISO 14001:2015  
ISO 45001:2018 AS/NZS 4801:2001

Suite 2.06 / 56 Delhi Road  
North Ryde NSW 2113  
02 9878 6005  
assetgeoenviro.com.au

© Copyright Asset Geotechnical Engineering Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

AssetGeoEnviro is a registered business name of Asset Geotechnical Engineering Pty Ltd. This document is and shall remain the property of Asset Geotechnical Engineering Pty Ltd. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Agreement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

## Contents

### Department of Planning & Environment Form 1

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction .....</b>                                | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 General .....   | 1         |
| 1.2 Scope of Work .....                                     | 1         |
| <b>2. Compliance with Geotechnical Policy .....</b>         | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>3. Regional Topography &amp; Geology .....</b>           | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>4. Site Description .....</b>                            | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>5. Fieldwork .....</b>                                   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>6. Subsurface Conditions.....</b>                        | <b>5</b>  |
| 6.1 Geology.....  | 5         |
| 6.2 Subsurface Conditions .....                             | 5         |
| 6.3 Groundwater .....                                       | 6         |
| <b>7. Discussions &amp; Recommendations .....</b>           | <b>6</b>  |
| 7.1 Key Geotechnical Site Constraints .....                 | 6         |
| 7.2 Landslide Risk Assessment .....                         | 6         |
| 7.3 Earthworks.....   | 7         |
| 7.4 Footings .....  | 9         |
| <b>8. Site Suitability.....</b>                             | <b>10</b> |
| <b>9. Recommended Development Approval Conditions .....</b> | <b>10</b> |
| <b>10. Limitations.....</b>                                 | <b>11</b> |

### Tables

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Table 1 – Generalised Site Geotechnical Model.....   | 5 |
| Table 2 – Compaction Specifications .....            | 8 |
| Table 3 – Recommended Maximum Dry Batter Slopes..... | 9 |

### Slope Risk Assessment Tables

- A Preliminary Landslide Risk Assessment (Risk to Property)
- B Preliminary Landslide Risk Assessment (Risk to Life)

### Figures

- 1 Site Locality
- 2 Test Locations

### Appendices

- A Information Sheets
- B Field Investigation Results
- C Site Photos

## Form 1 – Declaration and certification made by geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist in a geotechnical report.

DA Number: \_\_\_\_\_

To be submitted with a development application

You can use Form 1 to verify that the author of a geotechnical report is a geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist as defined by the Department of Planning & Environment (DP&E) Geotechnical Policy. Alternatively, where a geotechnical report has been prepared by a professional person not recognised by DP&E Geotechnical Policy, then Form 1 may be used as technical verification of the geotechnical report if signed by a geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist as defined by the DP&E Geotechnical Policy.

**Please contact the Alpine Resorts Team in Jindabyne for further information - phone 02 6456 1733.**

To complete this form, please place a cross in the appropriate boxes  and complete all sections.

### 1. Declaration made by geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist as part of a geotechnical report

I,

Mr  Ms  Mrs  Dr  Other

First Name

Family Name

Mark

Bartel

OF

Company/organisation

AssetGeoEnviro

on this the 22nd day of August 2022

certify that I am a geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist as defined by the "Policy" and I (tick appropriate box)

- prepared the geotechnical report referenced below in accordance with the AGS 2000 and DP&E Geotechnical Policy – Kosciuszko Alpine Resorts.
- am willing to technically verify that the Geotechnical Report referenced below has been prepared in accordance the AGS 2000 and DP&E Geotechnical Policy – Kosciuszko Alpine Resorts.

### 2. Geotechnical Report Details

Report Title

Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed J-bar Ski Lift, Perisher NSW, ref: 6728-G1 Rev 1

Author

Mark Bartel

Dated

22 August 2022

DA Site Address

Perisher NSW

DA Applicant

Vail Resorts

I am aware that the Geotechnical Report I have either prepared or am technically verifying, (referenced above) is to be submitted in support of a development application for the proposed development site (referenced above), and it's findings will be relied upon by the Consent Authority in determining the development application.

### 3. Checklist of essential requirements to be contained in a geotechnical risk assessment report to be submitted with a development application

The following checklist covers the minimum requirements to be addressed in a Geotechnical Risk Management Report. This checklist is to accompany the report.

Please tick appropriate box

- Risk assessment of all identifiable geotechnical hazards in accordance with AGS 2000, as per 6.1 (a) of the policy.
- Site plans with key hazards identified and other information as per 6.1 (b)
- Details of site investigation and inspections as per 6.1 (c)
- Photographs and/or drawings of the site as per 6.1 (d)
- Presentation of geotechnical model as per 6.1 (e)
- A specific conclusion as to whether the site is suitable for the development proposed on the above site, if applicable, subject to the following conditions;
  - Conditions to be provided to establish design parameters,
  - Conditions to be incorporated into the detailed design to be submitted for the construction certificate,
  - Conditions applying to the construction phase,
  - Conditions relating to ongoing management of the site/structure.

### 4. Signatures

Signature

*Mark Bartel*

Chartered professional status

CPEng 35641 NER (Civil)

Name

Mark Bartel

Date

22 August 2022

### 5. Contact details

Department of Planning & Environment  
Alpine Resorts Team  
Shop 5A, 19 Snowy River Avenue  
PO Box 36, JINDABYNE 2627  
Telephone: 02 6456 1733  
Facsimile: 02 6456 1736  
Email: alpineresorts@planning.nsw.gov.au

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 General

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation for a Proposed J-bar Ski Lift at Perisher NSW (the Site). The investigation was commissioned on 26 November 2021 by Mr. Michael Fearnside of Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd Pty Ltd. The work was carried out in accordance with the email proposal by AssetGeoEnviro (Asset) dated 26 November 2021, reference 6728-P1.

Drawings and report supplied to us for this investigation comprised:

- Leichhardt J-Bar Survey profile (prepared by: Doppelmayr; dwg: 2011-11-P-001; dated: 26 June 2022)
- Leichhardt J-Bar Site Layout plan (prepared by: Dabyne Planning Pty Ltd; dwg: U255-2; Sheet 1 to 4; dated: 7 July 2022)
- Structural Plan – Tower Assembly (General Arrangement) (prepared by Doppelmayr; project no: 2022-11; dwg: M-001, dated 11 April 2022)
- Structural Plans – Drive Terminal & Return Terminal (prepared by: Doppelmayr; project no: 2022-11; dwg: S-35668 & S-35660; dated: non referenced.)
- Statement of Environmental Effects (prepared by Dabyne Planning Pty Ltd, dated July 2022)

Based on client information and supplied drawings, we understand that Perisher Ski Resort seek to construct a new J-bar lift comprising of two stations (bottom and top) with intermediate towers in between for the replacement of the existing Home Rope Tow lift. The new lift is offset about 10m to 15m from the existing Home Rope Tow lift alignment to the north-east and is indicated to be approximately 300m long.

The objective of this investigation is to provide information on the surface and subsurface conditions including a landslide risk assessment, and to provide geotechnical recommendations to aid with design and construction of the proposed development.

## 1.2 Scope of Work

The main objectives of the investigation were to assess the surface and subsurface conditions and to provide comments and recommendations relating to:

- Slope instability risk assessment as per AGS 2007<sup>1</sup>.
- Key geotechnical constraints to the development.
- Excavation conditions, methodology and methodology.
- Subgrade preparation and earthworks.
- Site Classification to AS2870–2011 “Residential Slabs and Footings”.
- Suitable foundation options.
- Allowable bearing pressure (and shaft adhesion for shallow pile-type footings).
- Preliminary groundwater condition.
- Maximum allowable permanent and temporary batter slopes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Landslide Risk Management, Australian Geomechanics, Vol 42, No. 1, March 2007.

The following scope of work was carried out to achieve the project objectives:

- A review of existing regional maps and reports relevant to the Site held within our files.
- Clearance of underground services at proposed test locations.
- Visual observations of surface features.
- Subsurface investigation at six locations to assess the nature and consistency of subsurface soils and bedrock at accessible areas of the Site.
- Engineering assessment and reporting.

This report must be read in conjunction with the attached “Important Information about your Geotechnical Report” in Appendix A. Attention is drawn to the limitations inherent in site investigations and the importance of verifying the subsurface conditions inferred herein. Landslide risk considerations presented in this report must be read in conjunction with the attached GeoGuides for Slope Management and Maintenance.

## 2. Compliance with Geotechnical Policy

The following table indicates how this report addresses the elements in Section 4.1 of the Department of Planning Industry & Environment’s Geotechnical Policy (Policy):

| Paragraph | Element  | Addressed in Report  |
|-----------|--|--|
| 4.1 (a)   | An assessment of the risk posed by all reasonably identifiable geotechnical hazards which have the potential to either individually or cumulatively impact upon people or property upon the site or related land to the proposed development in accordance with the guidelines set out in ‘Landslide Risk Management Concepts and Guidelines’ first published in the Australian Geomechanics Journal, Vol. 35 No.1, March 2000 (guidelines). | Risk assessment has been carried out by a highly experienced geotechnical practitioner and outlined in Tables A and B attached to this report. |
| 4.1 (b)   | Plans and sections of the site and related land from survey and field measurements with contours and key features identified, including the locations of the proposed development, buildings/structures on both the subject site and adjoining site, stormwater drainage, sub-surface drainage, water supply and sewerage pipelines, trees, and other identifiable geotechnical hazards.   | Figure 1 – Site Locality Plan<br>Figure 2 – Test Locations   |

| Paragraph                   | Element   | Addressed in Report   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| 4.1 (c)                     | Details of all site inspections and site investigations and any other information used in preparation of the geotechnical report. A site inspection is required in all cases. Site investigation may require subsurface investigation; appropriate investigation may involve boreholes and/or test pit excavations or other methods necessary to adequately assess the geotechnical/geological model for the site. At Thredbo, reference may be made to the suite of existing geotechnical data and regional studies held by Kosciuszko Thredbo Pty Ltd, as part of the information to be used in assessing the site. Where similar information data exists for the other Kosciuszko Ski Resorts then this information may be similarly used in assessing the site. | Borehole and DCP logs provided in Appendix B, including Soil & Rock Explanation Sheets.   |
| 4.1 (d)                     | Photographs and/or drawings of the site and related land adequately illustrating all geotechnical features referred to in the geotechnical report, as well as the locations of the proposed development.  | Photos included in Appendix C, figures listed in response to 4.1 (b).   |
| 4.1 (e)                     | Presentation of a geological model of the site and related land showing the proposed development, including an analysis of sub-surface conditions, considering thickness of the fill, alluvium, topsoil, colluvium, and residual soil layers, depth to underlying bedrock, and the location and depth of groundwater.   | Refer Section 6.  |
| 4.1 (f)                     | A conclusion as to whether the site is suitable for the development proposed to be carried out either conditionally or unconditionally.   | Refer Section 8.  |
| 4.1 (f)<br>(i), (ii), (iii) | Conditions to establish the design parameters, conditions applying to the detail design to be undertaken for the construction certificate, conditions applying to the construction phase, and conditions regarding ongoing management of the site/structure.  | Refer Section 9.<br>A qualified and experienced Geotechnical Engineer is to be engaged to provide further input and review during the design development; including site visits during construction to verify the site conditions and provide advice where conditions vary from those assumed in this report.<br>After initial inspection by an experienced Geotechnical Engineer, inspection may be carried out by suitably experienced site personnel under direction of an Experienced Geotechnical Engineer.<br>No specific conditions are identified for ongoing management of the site / structure. |

### 3. Regional Topography & Geology

The regional topography comprises moderately to steeply sloping terrain flanking the north-easterly then northerly flowing Perisher Creek, with ground slopes over the land flanking the river generally ranging from 10° to 30° and some locally steeper sections up Mt Perisher, and more gentle slopes over the river shoulders. Numerous drainage depressions and watercourse flow towards the river, with some of the

persistent watercourses to the north of the river carved several metres into the underlying granite bedrock.

The Site lies within the G-line as defined in DIPNR's "Geotechnical Policy – Kosciuszko Alpine Resorts", November 2003, and therefore a geotechnical report is required to accompany the development application as per the requirements of the Geotechnical Policy.

## 4. Site Description

The proposed lift follows a similar alignment as the existing Home Rope Tow lift within the western part of the Perisher Ski Fields, as shown in Figure 1. The ground surface slopes are generally between about 3° and 5° over the lower slopes increasing up to about 10° to 15° over the mid and upper slopes with some areas of localised steeper slopes up to about 20° to 25°.

Photos 1 to 2 shows the lower part of the proposed bottom station. Photo 3 shows an area of ponded seepage in the vicinity of the existing bottom station. The existing Leichhardt Chairlift and Home Rope Tow lift bottom stations appeared to be in modest condition.

Slightly weathered and fresh granite of at least high strength frequently outcropped across the hillside, particularly over the upper reaches. We did not observe any obvious signs of hillside slope instability during the walkover inspection. The rough access track for quad bike and tracked plant is locally heavily eroded by equipment movement.

We note that at the time of walkover inspection, the ground surface was 'wet' to 'damp' under foot, with localised shallow streams running clear water. Localised peat/moss deposits up to 200mm were also observed.

The mid slopes are generally free draining with regards to surface water flows. However, the lower slopes were observed to have areas of waterlogged soils and free surface water at the time of the fieldwork.

The geotechnical investigation was carried out from the existing bottom station progressing uphill. Borehole locations were numbered from bottom to top (See Figure 2).

## 5. Fieldwork

The fieldwork was undertaken on 29 November 2021 by a Project Geotechnical Engineer from Asset and included invasive investigation at six locations.

The test locations are shown in the attached Figure 2 and were set out by our Geotechnical Engineer by pacing measurements relative to existing site features. Surface levels at the test locations were estimated by interpolation from levels shown on Google Earth and are approximate only.

Buried metallic services and utilities within the Site boundaries near the test locations were cleared by Perisher Blue personnel.

The invasive investigation included drilling of hand-drilled boreholes at four locations and conducting Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) soundings at six locations. The boreholes were auger drilled to depths of 0.6m to 1.2m below ground level (bgl) and were discontinued at the recorded depths due to

reaching practical refusal on very dense clayey sand or completely weathered granite. The DCP soundings were terminated at depths of 0.6m to 4.4m at 'solid' and 'practical' refusal on inferred weathered granite or very dense sand respectively.

The subsurface conditions encountered were logged during drilling and testing. On completion of logging and sampling, the boreholes were backfilled with the drilling spoil.

Engineering logs are provided in Appendix B together with their explanatory notes.

## 6. Subsurface Conditions

### 6.1 Geology

The 1:250,000 Tallangatta Geological Map indicates the Site is underlain by Lower Devonian aged intrusive granites, micro-diorites and tonalites. This is locally weathered to produce core-stones and tor outcrops. These can be of significant size.

### 6.2 Subsurface Conditions

A generalised geotechnical model for the Site has been developed is shown in Table 1. For a detailed description of the subsurface conditions, refer the attached engineering logs and explanatory notes. For specific design input, reference should be made to the logs and/or the specific test results, in place of the following summary.

**Table 1 – Generalised Site Geotechnical Model**

| Unit | Origin              | Description  | Depth to Top of Unit <sup>1</sup> (m) | Unit Thickness <sup>1</sup> (m)        |
|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1    | Topsoil             | Silty CLAY/ Clayey SILT matrix, organic matter intrusion (grass rootlets, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey. Root content reducing with depth. | Ground surface                        | 0.2 to 0.6                             |
| 2    | Alluvium/ Slopewash | Silty CLAY grading to Sandy CLAY, medium to high plasticity, fine to coarse grained sand, brown/ brown grey/ dark grey, trace of rootlets and high content of organic matter.                    | 0.2 to 0.4                            | 0.5 to 1                               |
| 3    | Inferred Bedrock    | GRANITE, CW, GRANITE cobbles within a fine to medium grained Silty, clayey SAND matrix, assessed very dense. DCP bounding on XW-HW GRANITE.  | 0.6 to 1.2                            | Not proven below a depth of 4.4 by DCP |

Notes:

1. The depths and unit thicknesses are based on the information from the test locations only and do not necessarily represent the maximum and minimum values across the Site.

### **Special Note for DCP testing**

*Caution must be used when inferring subsurface conditions from DCP results. Refusal can be encountered on obstructions such as gravel, cemented materials, rock floaters, or other inclusions within a soil mass. DCP testing on soils with a gravel component or cementation can indicate a higher density than actual. Also, the DCP results in clay soils are significantly affected by the in-situ moisture content. It is therefore strongly recommended that an experienced Geotechnical Engineer is engaged to confirm the inferred subsurface conditions during construction and to provide advice where subsurface conditions are significantly different.*

## **6.3 Groundwater**

Spring water was observed in all test locations above the bedrock. It is expected to flow on top of the underlying granite bedrock and down towards Perisher Creek to the south and south-east.

It is noted that the groundwater observation may have been made before water levels had stabilised. No long-term groundwater monitoring was carried out.

## **7. Discussions & Recommendations**

### **7.1 Key Geotechnical Site Constraints**

The development will generally require modest bearing capacity for the footings for the J-bar lift which is generally available at shallow depth. Key geotechnical constraints to the development include potential slope instability, excavation conditions, groundwater control (during construction and long-term) and variable depths to a suitable founding stratum for the proposed footings. Recommendations for design and construction of the development are provided in the following sections.

### **7.2 Landslide Risk Assessment**

A landslide risk assessment has been carried out for this site using the methods of AGS 2007.

There were no obvious signs of slope instability around the proposed ski lift. It is expected that there could be shallow, surficial creep of the topsoils in some of the steeper areas, and in some of the open depressions where surface water and subsurface seepage concentrates. However, the depth of creeping soils in the mid and upper slopes is likely to be relatively shallow (less than about 0.3m to 0.5m depth), and the lateral extent is likely to be relatively limited.

The basis of the assessment undertaken for this site and important factors relating to slope conditions and the impacts of the development that commonly influence risks of slope instability are discussed in the attached “Important Information about your Landslide Risk Assessment”, and the attached GeoGuides.

The preliminary assessment has been carried out by:

- Consideration of the likely slope failure mechanisms and the likely initiating circumstances that could affect the elements at the Site. The type and mode of landslide failure has also been classified.
- **Risk to Property.** For each case, the likely consequences with respect to future development have been considered. The current assessed probability of occurrence of each event has been estimated on a qualitative basis. The consequences and probability of occurrence have been combined for each case to provide the risk assessment.

- **Risk to Life.** For each case, the risk for the person most at risk is assessed based on multiplying the indicative annual probability of the occurrence of the hazard, the probability of spatial impact, the temporal probability, the vulnerability, and the probability of not evacuating. The risk is then compared with acceptable and tolerable risk criteria.

The following general potential hazards/events are identified for this site and relate to slope instability:

- A. Shallow earth slide
- B. Deep-seated earth slide
- C. Translational earth slide (slow creep movement)
- D. Rock topple (whole or partial) of detached granite boulders.
- E. Instability of permanent cut/fill slopes

For the hazards / events identified, the elements of a future development on the Site that are at risk are the proposed dwelling and associated site development comprising services, utilities, and retaining walls. Table A provides our preliminary risk assessment for the Site with respect to risk to property, and Table B provides our preliminary risk assessment for the Site with respect to risk to life.

Provided the development is carried out in accordance with the recommendations in this report, a **Low** risk is assessed with respect to property and the risk to life is assessed to be **Acceptable**. These risk levels are acceptable for the development.

The development should be carried out in accordance with good engineering practice that is described in the attached GeoGuides, and in accordance with the general recommendations in the following sections.

## 7.3 Earthworks

### 7.3.1 Excavation

The excavation for the proposed development is anticipated to be partially within soils, partially within cobbles / boulders, and possibly some excavation within granite bedrock. Excavation within the soils and completely weathered granite bedrock would be achievable using conventional earthmoving equipment (i.e. hydraulic excavator bucket).

Excavation within the cobbles / boulders and deeper, less weathered granite may require low-energy explosive charges in drill holes filled with water or another suitable low-energy methodology.

### 7.3.2 Subgrade Preparation

The following general recommendations are provided for subgrade preparation for earthworks, pavements, slab-on-ground construction, and minor structures including reinforced earth:

- Strip existing fill and topsoil. Remove unsuitable materials from the Site (e.g., material containing deleterious matter). Stockpile remainder for re-use as landscaping material or remove from site.
- Excavate residual soils (and rock if required) to design subgrade level, stockpiling for re-use as engineered fill or remove to spoil.
- Where rock is exposed at footing invert level, it should be free of loose, “drummy” and softened material before concrete is poured.

- Where soil is exposed at bulk excavation level, compact the upper 150mm depth to a dry density ratio (AS1289.5.4.1–2007) not less than 100% Standard.
- Areas which show visible heave under compaction equipment should be over-excavated a further 0.3m and replaced with approved fill compacted to a dry density ratio not less than 100%.

Any waste soils being removed from the Site must be classified in accordance with current regulatory authority requirements to enable appropriate disposal to an appropriately licensed landfill facility.

### 7.3.3 Filling

Where filling is required, place in horizontal layers over prepared subgrade and compact as per Table 2.

**Table 2 – Compaction Specifications**

| Parameter                                    | Cohesive Fill   | Non-Cohesive Fill |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| Fill layer thickness (loose measurement):    |                 |                   |
| • Within 1.5m of the rear of retaining walls | 0.2m            | 0.2m              |
| • Elsewhere                                  | 0.3m            | 0.3m              |
| Density:                                     |                 |                   |
| • Beneath Pavements                          | ≥ 95% Std       | ≥ 70% ID          |
| • Beneath Structures                         | ≥ 98% Std       | ≥ 80% ID          |
| • Upper 150mm of subgrade                    | ≥ 100% Std      | ≥ 80% ID          |
| Moisture content during compaction           | ± 2% of optimum | Moist but not wet |

Filling within 1.5m of the rear of any retaining walls should be compacted using lightweight equipment (e.g., hand-operated plate compactor or ride-on compactor not more than 3 tonnes static weight) to limit compaction-induced lateral pressures.

Fill batters should be constructed by over-filling beyond the design batter surface then trimming back after compaction. Fill placed as part of reinforced earth wall construction should be in accordance with the design and specification for that work.

Any soils to be imported onto the Site for backfilling and reinstatement of excavated areas should be free of contamination and deleterious material and should include appropriate validation documentation in accordance with current regulatory authority requirements which confirms its suitability for the proposed land use.

### 7.3.4 Batter Slopes

Recommended maximum slopes for permanent and temporary batters are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Recommended Maximum Dry Batter Slopes**

| Unit                                   | Maximum Batter Slope (H : V) |           |
|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|  | Permanent                    | Temporary |
| Residual Soils                         | 2 : 1                        | 1 : 1     |
| Granite Cobbles / Boulders             | 1 : 1                        | 0.75 : 1  |
| MW, Medium strength, or better Granite | Vertical*                    | Vertical* |

\* subject to inspection by a Geotechnical Engineer and carrying out remedial works as recommended.

## 7.4 Footings

Recommendations for footings are provided for the various areas of the site in the following sections.

An experienced Geotechnical Engineer should review footing designs to check that the recommendations of the geotechnical report have been included and should assess footing excavations to confirm the design assumptions.

### 7.4.1 Bottom Station

The testing carried out in the vicinity of the proposed bottom station indicates that inferred less weathered bedrock level is present below 4.5m depth with buried boulders above at shallow depth at about 1m depth.

Topsoil / remnant grass overlying natural soils in the borehole, with the completely weathered bedrock (remoulded as sandy clay) commencing at about 1.2m depth. The soft soil encountered at shallow depths is not considered to be a suitable founding stratum.

If founding on the underlying natural soils or completely weathered granite, a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 200 kPa could be adopted for very stiff or better clay soils, with the footing invert level at least 1.5m (preferably 2m) below existing ground level to ensure that adequate penetration into suitable quality soil is achieved and to enhance bearing capacity of the footing, as well as mitigation of the risk of creeping soils.

If founding on the bedrock, pile foundations may be more appropriate given the anticipated variation in rock depths which may make it impractical to carry out bulk excavation. A relatively conservative allowable bearing pressure of 800 kPa may be adopted for footings on moderately weathered, medium strength or better granite bedrock.

Groundwater control will also need to be considered particularly for deeper footing excavations and piles where the risk of encountering groundwater is likely to be significant. This will require temporary dewatering during footing excavation and pouring of concrete, and permanent groundwater control to reduce the risk of long-term groundwater softening of the foundation soils.

### 7.4.2 Bottom Station Surrounding Works

For the works surrounding the Bottom Station, a site classification of Class P (Problem site) is assessed as per AS2870-2011 'Residential Slabs and Footings'. This is due to the presence of variable natural soils beneath. This will require that footings be designed from first principles rather than standard designs.

Where subgrade preparation works as described in Section 7.3.2 are adopted, a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 100 kPa may be adopted for pavement that is formed on the prepared surface. To address the risk of differential movement, a site classification of Class H1 (Highly reactive) is suggested for design purposes, and structural jointing of slab panels should be incorporated.

### 7.4.3 Top Station and Towers

For the works surrounding the Top Station and intermediate towers, a site classification of Class A is assessed as per AS2870-2011 'Residential Slabs and Footings' if all footings are taken down to the granite bedrock.

Settlements for footings on decomposed rock are anticipated to be about 1% of the minimum footing dimension.

Bedrock is anticipated to be exposed or at very shallow depth for the Top Station and many of the Towers, and therefore, footings on bedrock are appropriate. A maximum allowable bearing pressure of 600kPa may be adopted for such footings, assuming that the bedrock at footing subgrade level is relatively weathered. Higher bearing pressures may be available subject to further inspection at each footing.

Where bedrock is not exposed at footing subgrade levels at depths of at least 1.5m below ground level, and the exposed subgrade comprises medium dense or better weathered granite then footings on this material may be adopted and designed for a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 200kPa. Proving during construction should be carried out, comprising inspection by a Geotechnical Engineer, and / or testing by Dynamic Cone Penetrometer to at least 3m below the footing subgrade level.

Where suitable material is not encountered at footing subgrade level (e.g. loose sands or soft clays), options for footings include over-excavation to a suitable founding stratum and backfilling with mass concrete, or pile foundations as per Section 6.4.1.

## 8. Site Suitability

We herewith conclude that the site is geotechnically suitable for the development provided that the development is carried out in accordance with the recommendations and advice in this report including the following Development Approval Conditions.

## 9. Recommended Development Approval Conditions

The following conditions should be included with the development approval:

### **(i) Conditions to be provided to establish the design parameters**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements and recommendations of the report by Asset Geotechnical Engineering Pty Ltd dated 22 August 2022 (Ref: 6728-G1 Rev 1), and in accordance with further geotechnical assessment and advice to be provided during design development and construction.

### **(ii) Conditions applying to the detailed design to be undertaken for the construction certificate**

Structural design relating to the geotechnical aspects of the proposed development shall be checked and certified by a suitably qualified and experienced Geotechnical Engineer as being in accordance with the geotechnical recommendations.

### **(iii) Conditions applying to the construction**

Inspection shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced geotechnical engineer during construction at the following stages, to ensure that the requirements of the geotechnical report are followed:

- a) Footing excavations shall be inspected prior to pouring concrete.
- b) All cut batters shall be inspected immediately after cutting and remedial works carried out as directed by the geotechnical engineer.
- c) Filling shall be tested for compaction and material quality suitability in accordance with the earthworks methodology to be developed for the Construction Certificate.

In the event that Geotechnical Engineer cannot attend site to carry out construction inspections at the time of request, we recommend inspection should be carried out by a qualified certifier and to carry out remote inspection by means of video recording and providing photographic evidence to assist with geotechnical assessment.

### **(iv) Conditions regarding ongoing management of the Site/structure**

No specific conditions are identified for ongoing management of the site / structure.

## **10. Limitations**

In addition to the limitations inherent in site investigations (refer to the attached Information Sheets), it must be pointed out that the recommendations in this report are based on assessed subsurface conditions from limited investigations. To confirm the assessed soil and rock properties in this report, further investigation would be required such as coring and strength testing of rock.

It is recommended that a qualified and experienced Geotechnical Engineer be engaged to provide further input and review during the design development; including site visits during construction to verify the Site conditions and provide advice where conditions vary from those assumed in this report. Development of an appropriate inspection and testing plan should be carried out in consultation with the Geotechnical Engineer.

This report may have included geotechnical recommendations for design and construction of temporary works (e.g. temporary batter slopes or temporary shoring of excavations). Such temporary works are expected to perform adequately for a relatively short period only, which could range from a few days (for temporary batter slopes) up to six months (for temporary shoring). This period depends on a range of factors including but not limited to: site geology; groundwater conditions; weather conditions; design criteria; and level of care taken during construction. If there are factors which prevent temporary works from being completed and/or which require temporary works to function for periods longer than originally designed, further advice must be sought from the Geotechnical Engineer and Structural Engineer.


This report and details for the proposed development should be submitted to relevant regulatory authorities that have an interest in the property or are responsible for services that may be within or adjacent to the Site, for their review.

Asset accepts no liability where our recommendations are not followed or are only partially followed. The document “Important Information about your Geotechnical Report” in Appendix A provides additional information about the uses and limitations of this report.

## Figures

Figure 1 – Site Locality

Figure 2 – Test Locations



APPROXIMATE ONLY – SUBJECT TO DETAIL SURVEY.

SOURCE: SIX MAPS

THIS DRAWING IS USED TO ILLUSTRATE SITE LOCATION ONLY,  
AND MUST NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.  
COPYRIGHT OF SOURCE DRAWING REMAINS WITH SIX MAPS



| issue | date   | description   |
|-------|--------|---------------|
| A     | 3.2.22 | INITIAL ISSUE |



2.06/56 Delhi Rd  
North Ryde NSW 2113  
t: 02 9878 6005  
e: info@assetgeoenviro.com.au


PROPOSED J-BAR SKI LIFT,  
PERISHER NSW  
for  
VAIL RESORT / PERISHER BLUE PTY LTD


SITE LOCALITY

**drawn:** AT  
**date:** 3.2.2022  
**checked:** MAB  
**scale:** 1:3000 @A4

**job no.:**  
6728  
**fig:**  
**1**  
**issue:**  
A

0 1:3000@A4 100m





APPROXIMATE ONLY – SUBJECT TO DETAIL SURVEY.

SOURCE: SIX MAPS

THIS DRAWING IS USED TO ILLUSTRATE TEST LOCATIONS ONLY, AND MUST NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. COPYRIGHT OF SOURCE DRAWING REMAINS WITH SIX MAPS.

## LEGEND



Boreholes with DCP



DCP



| issue | date   | description   |
|-------|--------|---------------|
| A     | 3.2.22 | INITIAL ISSUE |



2.06/56 Delhi Rd  
 North Ryde NSW 2113  
 t: 02 9878 6005  
 e: info@assetgeoenviro.com.au

PROPOSED J-BAR SKI LIFT  
 PERISHER NSW,  
 for  
 VAIL RESORT / PERISHER BLUE PTY LTD

TEST LOCATION

|                         |
|-------------------------|
| <b>drawn:</b> AT        |
| <b>date:</b> 3.2.2022   |
| <b>checked:</b> MAB     |
| <b>scale:</b> 1:1000 A4 |

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| <b>job no.:</b> | 6728 |
| <b>fig:</b>     | 2    |
| <b>issue:</b>   | A    |

## Appendix A

Important Information about your Geotechnical Report  
Important Information about your Slope Instability Risk Assessment  
GeoGuides (pp1-17)  
CSIRO BTF 18

## Scope of Services

The geotechnical report ("the report") has been prepared in accordance with the scope of services as set out in the contract, or as otherwise agreed, between the Client and Asset Geotechnical Engineering Pty Ltd ("Asset"), for the specific site investigated. The scope of work may have been limited by a range of factors such as time, budget, access and/or site disturbance constraints.

The report should not be used if there have been changes to the project, without first consulting with Asset to assess if the report's recommendations are still valid. Asset does not accept responsibility for problems that occur due to project changes if they are not consulted.

## Reliance on Data

Asset has relied on data provided by the Client and other individuals and organizations, to prepare the report. Such data may include surveys, analyses, designs, maps and plans. Asset has not verified the accuracy or completeness of the data except as stated in the report. To the extent that the statements, opinions, facts, information, conclusions and/or recommendations ("conclusions") are based in whole or part on the data, Asset will not be liable in relation to incorrect conclusions should any data, information or condition be incorrect or have been concealed, withheld, misrepresented or otherwise not fully disclosed to Asset.

## Geotechnical Engineering

Geotechnical engineering is based extensively on judgment and opinion. It is far less exact than other engineering disciplines. Geotechnical engineering reports are prepared for a specific client, for a specific project and to meet specific needs, and may not be adequate for other clients or other purposes (e.g. a report prepared for a consulting civil engineer may not be adequate for a construction contractor). The report should not be used for other than its intended purpose without seeking additional geotechnical advice. Also, unless further geotechnical advice is obtained, the report cannot be used where the nature and/or details of the proposed development are changed.

## Limitations of Site Investigation

The investigation program undertaken is a professional estimate of the scope of investigation required to provide a general profile of subsurface conditions. The data derived from the site investigation program and subsequent laboratory testing are extrapolated across the site to form an inferred geological model, and an engineering opinion is rendered about overall subsurface conditions and their likely behavior with regard to the proposed development. Despite investigation, the actual conditions at the site might differ from those inferred to exist, since no subsurface exploration program, no matter how comprehensive, can reveal all subsurface details and anomalies.

The engineering logs are the subjective interpretation of subsurface conditions at a particular location and time, made by trained personnel. The actual interface between materials may be more gradual or abrupt than a report indicates.

Therefore, the recommendations in the report can only be regarded as preliminary. Asset should be retained during the project implementation to assess if the report's recommendations are valid and whether or not changes should be considered as the project proceeds.

## Subsurface Conditions are Time Dependent

Subsurface conditions can be modified by changing natural forces or man-made influences. The report is based on conditions that existed at the time of subsurface exploration. Construction operations adjacent to the site, and natural events such as floods, or ground water fluctuations, may also affect

subsurface conditions, and thus the continuing adequacy of a geotechnical report. Asset should be kept apprised of any such events, and should be consulted to determine if any additional tests are necessary.

## Verification of Site Conditions

Where ground conditions encountered at the site differ significantly from those anticipated in the report, either due to natural variability of subsurface conditions or construction activities, it is a condition of the report that Asset be notified of any variations and be provided with an opportunity to review the recommendations of this report. Recognition of change of soil and rock conditions requires experience and it is recommended that a suitably experienced geotechnical engineer be engaged to visit the site with sufficient frequency to detect if conditions have changed significantly.

## Reproduction of Reports

This report is the subject of copyright and shall not be reproduced either totally or in part without the express permission of this Company. Where information from the accompanying report is to be included in contract documents or engineering specification for the project, the entire report should be included in order to minimize the likelihood of misinterpretation from logs.

## Report for Benefit of Client

The report has been prepared for the benefit of the Client and no other party. Asset assumes no responsibility and will not be liable to any other person or organisation for or in relation to any matter dealt with or conclusions expressed in the report, or for any loss or damage suffered by any other person or organisation arising from matters dealt with or conclusions expressed in the report (including without limitation matters arising from any negligent act or omission of Asset or for any loss or damage suffered by any other party relying upon the matters dealt with or conclusions expressed in the report). Other parties should not rely upon the report or the accuracy or completeness of any conclusions and should make their own inquiries and obtain independent advice in relation to such matters.

## Data Must Not Be Separated from The Report

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

Logs, figures, drawings, test results etc. included in our reports are developed by professionals based on their interpretation of field logs (assembled by field personnel) and laboratory evaluation of field samples. These data should not under any circumstances be redrawn for inclusion in other documents or separated from the report in any way.

## Partial Use of Report

Where the recommendations of the report are only partially followed, there may be significant implications for the project and could lead to problems. Consult Asset if you are not intending to follow all of the report recommendations, to assess what the implications could be. Asset does not accept responsibility for problems that develop where the report recommendations have only been partially followed if they have not been consulted.

## Other Limitations

Asset will not be liable to update or revise the report to take into account any events or emergent circumstances or fact occurring or becoming apparent after the date of the report.

## Basis of The Assessment

Our assessment of landslide risk is presented in the framework of Landslide Risk Management (Australian Geomechanics Society, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007). The attached GeoGuides provide further information on landslide risk management and maintenance.

This assessment is based on a visual inspection of the property and the immediate adjoining land. Limited subsurface investigation may also have been undertaken as part of this appraisal. Slope monitoring has not been carried out within or adjacent to the property for the purpose of this appraisal. The opinions expressed in this report also consider our relevant local experience.

The property is within an area where landslip and/or subsidence have occurred, or where there is a risk of landslide. Important factors relating to slope conditions and the impact of development which commonly influence the landslide risks are discussed herein.

An owner's decision to acquire, develop or build on land within an area such as this involves the understanding and acceptance of a level of risk. It is important to recognise that soil and rock movements are an ongoing geological process, which may be affected by development and land management within the site or on adjoining land. Soil and rock movements may cause visible damage to structures even where the risk of slope failure is considered low. This report is intended only to assess the landslide risk apparent at the time of inspection.

Our opinion is provided on the present landslide risk for the land specifically referenced in the title to this report. Foundations suitable for future building development are discussed in relation to slope stability considerations. Limited foundation advice may be provided. If so, advice is intended to guide the footing design for the proposed development. However, this report is not intended as, is not suitable for, and must not be used in lieu of a detailed foundation investigation for final design and costing of foundations, retaining walls or associated structures.

## Limitations of The Assessment Procedure

The assessment procedures carried out for this appraisal are in accordance with the recommendations in Landslide Risk Management (Australian Geomechanics Society, Vol 42, No 1, March 2007), and with accepted local practice.

The following limitations must be acknowledged:

- the assessment of the stability of natural slopes requires a great degree of judgment and personal experience, even for experienced practitioners with good local knowledge;
- the assessment must be based on development of a sound geological model; slope processes and process rates influencing land sliding or landslide potential will vary according to geomorphic influences;
- the likelihood that land sliding may occur on a given slope is generally hard to predict and is associated with significant uncertainties;
- different practitioners may produce different assessments of risk;

- actual risk of land sliding cannot be determined; risk changes with time;
- consequences of land sliding need to be considered in a rational framework of risk acceptance;
- acceptable risk in relation to damage to property from landslide activity is subjective; it remains the responsibility of the owner and/or local authority to decide whether the risk is acceptable; the geotechnical practitioner can assist with this judgment;
- the extent and methods of investigation for assessment of landslide risk will be governed by experience, by the perceived risk level, and by the degree to which the risk or consequences of land sliding are accepted for a specific project;
- the assessment may be required at several stages of the project or development; frequently (due to time or budget constraints imposed by the client) there will be no opportunity for long-term monitoring of the slope behaviour or groundwater conditions, or for on-going opportunity for the slope processes and performance of structures to be reviewed during and after development; such limitations should be recognised as relevant to the assessment.

## Development on Slopes

Some landslide risk is always attached to the development of land on slopes.

Guidelines for hillside construction and examples of good practices for hillside developments are described in the attached GeoGuides.

# THE AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDES FOR SLOPE MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

## AGS Landslide Taskforce, Slope Management and Maintenance Working Group

The Australian Geomechanics Society (AGS) presents on the following pages a guideline on slope management and maintenance, as part of the landslide risk management guidelines developed under the National Disaster Funding Program (NDMP). This Guideline is aimed at home owners, developers and local councils, but also has applicability to a larger audience which includes builders and contractors, consultants, insurers, lawyers, government departments and in fact any person, or organisation, with a responsibility for the management or maintenance of a slope. The objective is to inform those with little or no knowledge of geotechnical engineering about landslides.

Each GeoGuide is a stand-alone document, which is formatted so that it can be printed on two sides of a single A4 sheet. It is expected that the set of GeoGuides will increase with time to cover a range of topics. As things stand:

- **GeoGuide LR1** is an introductory sheet that should be read by all users, since it explains what the LR (landslide risk) series is about and defines terms.
- **GeoGuides LR2, 3 and 4** explain why landslides occur and provide information on different types of landslide.
- **GeoGuide LR5** discusses the critical part that water often plays in relation to landslide occurrence and discusses measures that can be adopted to limit its effect.
- **GeoGuide LR6** refers to retaining walls and their maintenance.
- **GeoGuide LR7** puts the concept of landslide risk into an everyday context, so users can relate a particular landslide risk to other risks that they know they are prepared to take, sometimes on a daily basis.
- **GeoGuide LR8** retains the ideas of good and poor hillside construction practice originally provided by an AGS sub-committee in 1985.
- **GeoGuide LR9** concentrates specifically on effluent and surface water disposal, which is an important topic in some development areas.
- **GeoGuide LR10** is specifically aimed at those who have property on the coast and could be susceptible to coastal erosion processes.
- **GeoGuide LR11** provides information about the benefits of keeping records on inspection and maintenance activities and provides a proforma record sheet for users.

It is recognised that the GeoGuides are likely to be upgraded from time to time. Feedback on use and suggested changes should be sent to the National Chair of the Australian Geomechanics Society. The latest versions of the GeoGuides will be downloadable from the AGS website [www.australiangeomechanics.org](http://www.australiangeomechanics.org)

Through the NDMP, Australian governments (at Commonwealth, State and Local Government levels) are also funding the development of a Landslide Zoning Guideline (AGS 2007a), and a Practice Note Guideline (AGS 2007c) to which interested readers seeking in-depth information should refer.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These guidelines have been prepared by The Australian Geomechanics Society with funding from the National Disaster Mitigation Program, the Sydney Coastal Councils Group, and The Australian Geomechanics Society.

The Australian Geomechanics Society established a Working Group within a Landslide Taskforce to develop the guidelines. The development of the guidelines was managed by a Steering Committee. Membership of the Working Group, Taskforce and Steering Committee is listed in the Appendix.

Drafts of these GeoGuides have been subject to review by members of the AGS Landslide Taskforce, members of the geotechnical profession and local government.

## REFERENCES

- AGS (2007a) Guideline for Landslide Susceptibility, Hazard and Risk Zoning for Land Use Management. Australian Geomechanics Society, *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No1.
- AGS (2007c). Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management. Australian Geomechanics Society. *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No1,
- AGS (2007e). The Australian GeoGuides for slope management and maintenance –. Australian Geomechanics Society. *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No 1, - this paper.

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR1 (INTRODUCTION)

## INTRODUCTION TO LANDSLIDE RISK

Photographs courtesy of Greg Kotze and Tony Phillips



### AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDES

The **Australian GeoGuides (LR series)** are a set of information sheets on the subject of landslide risk management and maintenance, published by the Australian Geomechanics Society (AGS). They provide background information intended to help people without specialist technical knowledge understand the basic issues involved. Topics covered include:

|                           |                             |   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| LR1 - Introduction        | LR2 - Landslides            | LR3 - Landslides in Soil                |
| LR4 - Landslides in Rock  | LR5 - Water & Drainage      | LR6 - Retaining Walls                   |
| LR7 - Landslide Risk      | LR8 - Hillside Construction | LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal |
| LR10 - Coastal Landslides | LR11 - Record Keeping       |   |

The GeoGuides explain why slopes and retaining structures can be a hazard and what can be done with appropriate professional advice and local authority approval (if required) to remove, or reduce, the risk they represent.

Preparation of the GeoGuides has been funded by Australian governments through the National Disaster Mitigation Program (NDMP). This is a national program aimed at identifying and addressing natural disaster risk priorities across Australia. Technical input has been provided by experienced geotechnical engineers, engineering geologists and local government and government agency representatives from around Australia.

### BACKGROUND

A number of landslides and cliff collapses occurred in Australia in the 1980's and 1990's in which lives were lost. Of these the Thredbo landslide probably received the most publicity, but there were several others. During this period the AGS issued a number of advisory notes to practitioners in relation to the assessment of landslide risk and its reduction. Building on these notes, and responding to changes in technology, a technical paper known as AGS2000 was prepared. It was followed in 2002 by an intensive nation-wide educational campaign attended by a large number of interested professionals from government departments and private industry. This resulted in an increased awareness of the risks associated with unstable slopes and a changed approach in many government departments responsible for regional planning, domestic development, roads, railways and the maintenance of natural features such as cliffs.

### STATUS OF THE GEOGUIDES

The GeoGuides reflect the essence of good practice as perceived by a large number of geotechnical engineers, engineering geologists and other practitioners such as local government planners. **The GeoGuides are generic and do not, and cannot, constitute advice in relation to a specific situation. This must be sought from a geotechnical practitioner with first hand knowledge of the site.** It is expected that some local councils will refer to the GeoGuides and their companion publications in planning and building legislation. Check with your local council to see how it regards these documents. Companion publications to the GeoGuides are:

- AGS (2007a) Guideline for Landslide Susceptibility, Hazard and Risk Zoning for Land Use Management Australian Geomechanics Society, *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No1 and its associated commentary (AGS 2007b).
- AGS (2007c). Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management. Australian Geomechanics Society. *Australian Geomechanics*, Vol 42, No1 2007, and its associated "Commentary" (AGS 2007d).

Copies of the above documents are available on the AGS website [www.australiangeomechanics.org](http://www.australiangeomechanics.org)

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR1 (INTRODUCTION)

## TERMINOLOGY

Terminology tends to change with time and place and with the context in which it is used. The terms listed below have the following meanings in the GeoGuides:

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Consequence               | the outcome, or potential outcome, arising from the occurrence of a landslide expressed quantitatively, or qualitatively, in terms of loss, disadvantage, damage, injury, or loss of life.   |
| Discontinuity             | in relation to the ground is a crack, a bedding plane (a boundary between strata) or fault (a plane along which the ground has sheared) which forms a plane of weakness and reduces the overall strength of the ground.  |
| Equilibrium               | the condition when the forces on a mass of soil or rock in the ground, or on a retaining structure, are equal and opposite.  |
| Factor of safety (FOS)    | theoretically the forces available to prevent a part of the ground, or a retaining structure, from moving divided by those trying to move it. A FOS of one or less indicates that failure is likely to occur, but not how likely it is. To allow for unknowns and to limit movements engineers always aim to achieve a FOS significantly larger than one.  |
| Failure                   | when part of the ground experiences movement as a result of the out of balance forces on it. Failure of a retaining structure means it is no longer able to fulfil its intended function.  |
| Geotechnical practitioner | when referred to in the Australian GeoGuides (LR series), is a professional geotechnical engineer, or engineering geologist, with chartered status in a recognised national professional institution and relevant training, experience and core competencies in landslide risk assessment and management. In some government departments, technical officers are specifically trained to undertake some of the functions of a geotechnical practitioner. |
| Hazard                    | a condition with the potential for causing an undesirable consequence. In relation to landslides this includes the location, size, speed, distance of travel and the likelihood of its occurrence within a given period of time.   |
| Landslide                 | the movement, or the potential movement, of a mass of rock, debris, or earth down a slope.   |
| Likelihood                | a qualitative description of probability, or frequency, of occurrence.   |
| Partial saturation        | the condition in the ground above the water table where both air and water are present as well as soil, or rock.   |
| Perched water table       | a water table above the true water table supported by a low permeability stratum.  |
| Permeability              | a measure of the ability of the ground to allow water to flow through it.  |
| Risk                      | a measure of the probability and severity of an adverse effect to life, health, property or the environment.   |
| Slip failure              | landslide.   |
| Stable                    | the condition when failure will not occur. Over geological time no part of the ground can be considered stable. Over short periods (eg the life of a structure) stability implies a very low likelihood of failure.  |
| Retaining structure       | anything built by humans which is intended to support the ground and inhibit failure.  |
| Structure                 | in relation to rock, or soil, means the spacing, extent, orientation and type of discontinuities found in the ground at a particular location.   |
| Tension crack             | a distinct open crack that normally develops in the ground around a landslide and indicates actual, or imminent, failure.  |
| Water table               | the level in the ground below which it is saturated and the voids are filled with water.   |



Photograph courtesy of Phil Flentje

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR2 (LANDSLIDES)

## LANDSLIDES

### What is a Landslide?

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

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

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

### What Causes a Landslide?

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

### Does a Landslide Affect You?

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

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

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

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

**TABLE 1 - Slope Descriptions**

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

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

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR2 (LANDSLIDES)

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




Figure 1

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



Figure 2

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

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

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




Figure 3

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




Figure 4

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

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

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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR3 (LANDSLIDES IN SOIL)

## LANDSLIDES IN SOIL

Landslides occur on soil slopes and the consequences can include damage to property and loss of life. Soil slopes exist in all parts of Australia and can even occur in places where rock outcrops can be seen on the surface. If you live on, or below, a soil slope it is important to understand why a landslide might occur and what you can do to reduce the risk it presents.

It is always worth asking the question "why is this slope here?", because the answer often leads to an understanding of what might happen in the future. Slopes are usually formed by weathering (breakdown) and erosion (physical movement) of the natural ground - the "parent material". Many factors are involved including rain, wind, chemical change, temperature variation, plant growth, animal activity and our own human enthusiasm for development. The general process is outlined in Figure 1.

The upper levels of the parent material progressively weather over thousands, or millions, of years, losing strength. This can result in a surface layer which looks similar to the parent material (although its colour has probably changed) but has the strength of a soil - this is called "residual soil". At some stage the weathered surface layer is exposed to the elements and fragments are transported down the slope. In this context a fragment could be a single sand grain, a boulder, or a landslide. The time scale could be anything from a few seconds to many thousands of years. The transported fragments often collect on the lower slopes and form a new soil layer that blankets the original slope - "colluvium". If material reaches a river or the sea it is deposited as "alluvium" or as a "marine deposit". With appropriate changes in river and sea level this material can again find itself on the surface to commence another cycle of weathering and erosion. In places often, but not only, near the coast, this can include sand sized fragments which form beaches and are sometimes blown back onto the land to form dunes.




Figure 1

Landslides can occur almost anywhere on a soil slope. Slides can be rotational, translational, or debris flows (see GeoGuide LR2) and may have a number of causes.




Figure 2

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR3 (LANDSLIDES IN SOIL)




Figure 3

Some of the more common causes of landslides in soil are:

- 1) Falls of the parent material or residual soil from above, due to natural weathering processes (Figure 2).
- 2) Increased moisture content and consequent softening of the soil, or a rise in the water table. These can be due to excessive tree clearance, ill-considered soak-away drainage or septic systems, or heavy rainfall (Figure 2).
- 3) Excavation without adequate support, increased surface load from fill placement, or inadequately designed shallow foundations (Figure 3).
- 4) Natural erosion at the toe of the slope due to scour by a river or the sea (Figure 3).
- 5) Re-activation of an ancient landslide (Figure 3).

Most soil slopes appear stable, but they all achieved their present shape through a process of weathering and erosion and are often sensitive to minor changes in the factors that affect their stability. As a general rule, human activities only improve the situation if they have been designed to do so. Once this idea is understood, it is probably easy to see why the following basic rules are so important and should not be ignored without seeking site specific advice from a geotechnical practitioner:

- Do not clear trees unnecessarily.
- Do not cut into a slope without supporting the excavated face with an engineer designed structure.
- Do not add weight to a slope by placing earth fill or constructing buildings with inadequately designed shallow foundations (Note: in certain circumstances weight is added to the toe of a slope to inhibit landslide movement, but this must be carried out in accordance with a proper engineering design).
- Do not allow water from storm water drains, or from septic waste or effluent disposal systems to soak into the ground where it could trigger a landslide.

More information in relation to good and poor hillside construction practice is given in GeoGuide LR8. With appropriate engineering input it is often possible to reduce the likelihood, or consequences, of a landslide and so reduce the risk to property and to life. Such measures can include the construction of properly designed storm water and sub-soil drains, surface protection (GeoGuide LR5) and retaining walls (GeoGuide LR6). **Design should be undertaken by a geotechnical practitioner and will normally require local council approval.**

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping


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

### LANDSLIDES IN ROCK


Rocks have been formed by many different geological processes and may have been subjected to intense pressure, large scale distortion, extreme temperature and chemical change. As a result there are many different rock types and their condition varies enormously. Rock strength varies and is often significantly reduced by the presence of discontinuities (GeoGuide LR1). You may think that rock lasts forever, but in reality it weathers under the combined effects of water, wind, chemical change, temperature variation, plant growth and animal activity and erodes with time. Rock is often the parent material that ends up forming soil slopes (GeoGuide LR3). Inevitably different rocks have different physical and chemical characteristics and they weather and erode to form different types of soil.

Weathering can lead to landslides (GeoGuide LR2) on rock slopes. The type of landslide depends on the nature of rock, the way it has weathered and the presence or absence of discontinuities. It is hard to generalise, though normally a specific combination of discontinuities and material types will be the determining factor and these are often underground and out of sight. Typical examples are provided in the figures 1 to 4. A geotechnical practitioner can assess the landslide risk and propose appropriate maintenance measures. This often entails making geological observations over an area significantly larger than the site and a review of available background information, including records of known landslides and aerial photographs. Depending on the amount of information available, geotechnical investigation may or may not be needed. Every site is different and every site has to be assessed individually.


**It is impossible to predict exactly when a landslide will occur on a rock slope, but failure is normally sudden and the consequences can be catastrophic.**




**Figure 1 - Failure of an undercut block**



**Figure 2 - Toppling failure**



**Figure 3 - Block slide on weak layer**



**Figure 4 - Wedge failure along discontinuities**

If the landslide risk is assessed as being anything other than Low, or Very Low, (GeoGuide LR7) it may be possible to carry out work aimed at reducing the level of risk.

The most common options are:

- 1) Trimming the slope to remove hazardous blocks of rock.
- 2) Bolting, or anchoring, to fix hazardous blocks in position and prevent movement.
- 3) Installation of catch fences and other rockfall protection measures to limit the impact of rockfalls.
- 4) Deep drainage designed to limit changes in the ground water table (GeoGuide LR5).

Although such measures can be effective, they need inspection and on-going maintenance (GeoGuide LR11) if they are to be effective for periods equivalent to the life of a house. **Design should be undertaken by a geotechnical practitioner and will normally require local council approval.** It should be appreciated that it may not be viable to carry out remedial works in all circumstances: for example where the landslide is on someone else's property, where the cost is out of proportion to the value of the property, or where the risk inherent in carrying out the work is actually greater than the risk of leaving things as they are. In situations such as these, development may be considered inappropriate.

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR4 (LANDSLIDES IN ROCK)

## ROCK SLOPE HAZARD REDUCTION MEASURES

**Removal of loose blocks** - may be effective but, depending on rock type, ongoing erosion can result in more blocks becoming unstable within a matter of years. Routine inspection, every 5 or so years, may be required to detect this.

**Rock bolts and rock anchors** (Figure 5) - can be installed in the ground to improve its strength and prevent individual blocks from falling. Rock bolts are usually tightened using a torque wrench, whilst rock anchors carry higher loads and require jacking. Both can be designed to be "permanent" using stainless steel, or sheathing, to inhibit corrosion, but the cost can be up to 10 times that of the "temporary" alternative. You should inspect rock bolts and rock anchors for signs of water seepage, rusting and deterioration around the heads at least once every 5 years. If you notice any of these warning signs, have them checked by a geotechnical practitioner. It is recommended that you keep copies of design drawings and maintenance records (GeoGuide LR11) for the anchors on your site and pass them on to the new owner should you sell.




Figure 5

**Rock fall netting, catch fences and catch pits** (Figure 6) - are designed to catch or control falling rocks and prevent them from damaging nearby property. You should inspect them at least once every 5 years, and after major falls, and arrange for fallen and trapped rocks to be removed if they appear to be filling up. Check for signs of corrosion and replace steel elements and fixings before they lose significant strength.




Figure 6

**Cut-off drains** (Figure 7) - can be used to intercept surface water run-off and reduce flows down the cliff face. Suitable drains are often excavated into the rock, or constructed from mounds of concrete, or stabilised soil, depending on conditions. Drains must be laid to a fall of at least 1% so they drain adequately. Frequent inspection is needed to ensure they are not blocked and continue to function as intended.




Figure 7

**Clear trees and large bushes** (Figure 7) - from slopes since roots can prize boulders from the face increasing the landslide hazard.

**Natural cliffs and bluffs** - often present the greatest hazard and yet are easily overlooked, because they have "been there forever". They can exist above a building, road, or beach, presenting the risk of a rock falling onto whatever is below. They also sometimes support buildings with a fine view to the horizon. Cliffs should be observed frequently to ensure that they are not deteriorating. You may find it convenient to use binoculars to look for signs of exposed "fresh" rock on the face, where a recent fall has occurred, or to go to the foot of the cliff from time to time to see if debris is collecting. A thorough inspection of a cliff face is often a major task requiring the use of rope access methods and should only be undertaken by an appropriately qualified professional. If tension cracks are observed in the ground at the top of a cliff take immediate action, since they could indicate imminent failure. **If you have any concerns at all about the possibility of a rock fall seek advice from a geotechnical practitioner.**

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

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

## WATER, DRAINAGE & SURFACE PROTECTION

One way or another, water usually plays a critical part in initiating a landslide (GeoGuide LR2). For this reason, it is a key factor to be controlled on sites with more than a low landslide risk (GeoGuide LR7).

### Groundwater and Groundwater Flow

The ground is permeable and water flows through it as illustrated in Figure 1. When rain falls on the ground, some of it runs along the surface ("surface water run-off") and some soaks in, becoming groundwater. Groundwater seeps downwards along any path it can find until it meets the water table: the local level below which the ground is saturated. If it reaches the water table, groundwater either comes to a halt in what is effectively underground storage, or it continues to flow downwards, often towards a spring where it can seep out and become surface water again. Above the water table the ground is said to be "partially saturated", because it contains both water and air. Suctions can develop in the partially saturated zone which have the effect of holding the ground together and reducing the risk of a landslide. Vegetation and trees in particular draw large quantities of water out of the ground on a daily basis from the partially saturated zone. This lowers the water table and increases suctions, both of which reduce the likelihood of a landslide occurring.




Figure 1 - Groundwater flow

### Groundwater Flow and Landslides

The landslide risk in a hillside can be affected by increase in soak-away drainage or the construction of retaining walls which inhibit groundwater flow. The groundwater is likely to rise after heavy rain, but it can also rise when human interference upsets the delicate natural balance. Activities such as felling trees and earthworks can lead to:

- a reduction in the beneficial suctions in the partially saturated zone above the water table.
- increased static water pressures below the water table,
- increased hydraulic pressures due to groundwater flow,
- loss of strength, or softening, of clay rich strata,
- loss of natural cementing in some strata,
- transportation of soil particles.

Any of these effects, or a combination of them, can lead to landslides like those illustrated in GeoGuides LR2, LR3 and LR4.


### Limiting the Effect of Water

Site clearance and construction must be carefully considered if changes in groundwater conditions are to be limited. GeoGuide LR8 considers good and poor development practices. Not surprisingly much of the advice relates to sensible treatment of water and is not repeated here. Adoption of appropriate techniques should make it possible to either maintain the current ground water table, or even cause it to drop, by limiting inflow to the ground.

If drainage measures and surface protection are relied on to keep the risk of a landslide to a tolerable level, it is important that they are inspected routinely and maintained (GeoGuide LR11).

The following techniques may be considered to limit the destabilising effects of rising groundwater due to development and are illustrated in Figure 2.

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR5 (WATER & DRAINAGE)



**Figure 2 - Techniques used to control groundwater flow**

**Surface water drains** (dish drains, or table drains) - are often used to prevent scour and limit inflow to a slope. Other than in rock, they are relatively ineffective unless they have an impermeable lining. You should clear them regularly, and as required, and not less than once a year. If you live in an area with seasonal rainfall, it is best to do this near the end of the dry season. If you notice that soil or rock debris is falling from the slope above, determine the source and take appropriate action. This may mean you have to seek advice from a geotechnical practitioner.

**Surface protection** - is sometimes used in addition to surface water drainage to prevent scour and minimise water inflow to a slope. You should inspect concrete, shotcrete or stone pitching for cracking and other signs of deterioration at least once a year. Make sure that weepholes are free of obstructions and able to drain. If the protection is deteriorating, you should seek advice from a geotechnical practitioner.

**Sub-soil drains** - are often constructed behind retaining walls and on hillsides to intercept groundwater. Their function is to remove water from the ground through an appropriate outlet. It is important that subsoil drains are designed to complement other measures being used. They should be laid in a sand, or gravel, bed and protected with a graded stone or geotextile filter to reduce the chance of clogging. Sub-soil drains should always be laid to a fall of at least 1 vertical on 100 horizontal. Ideally the high end should be brought to the surface, so it can be flushed with water from time to time as part of routine maintenance procedures.

**Deep, underground drains** - are usually only used in extreme circumstances, where the landslide risk is assessed as not being tolerable and other stabilisation measures are considered to be impractical. They work by permanently lowering the water table in a slope. They are not often used in domestic scale developments, but if you have any on your site be aware that professional maintenance is essential. If they are not maintained and stop working, the water table will rise and a landslide may even occur during normal weather conditions. Both an increase or a reduction in the normal flow from deep drains could indicate a problem if it appears to be unrelated to recent rainfall. If changes of this sort are observed, you should have the drains and your site checked by a geotechnical practitioner.

**Documentation** - design drawings and specifications for geotechnical measures intended to minimise landslide risk can be of great assistance to a geotechnical specialist, or structural engineer, called in to inspect and report on them. Copies of available documentation should be retained and passed to the new owner when the property is sold (GeoGuide LR11). You should also request details of an appropriate maintenance program for drainage works from the designer and keep that information with other relevant documentation and maintenance records.

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR6 (RETAINING WALLS)

## RETAINING WALLS

Retaining walls are used to support cuts and fills. Some are built in the open and backfill is placed behind them (gravity walls). Others are inserted into the ground (cast *in situ* or driven piles) and the ground is subsequently excavated on one side. Retaining walls, like all man-made structures, have a finite life. Properly engineered walls should last 50 years, or more, without needing significant repairs. However, not all walls fit this category. Some, particularly those built by inexperienced tradesmen without engineering input, can deflect and even fail because they are unable to withstand the pressures that develop in the ground around them or because the materials from which they are built deteriorate with time. **Design of retaining walls more than 900mm high should be undertaken by a geotechnical practitioner or structural engineer and normally require local council approval.**

Retaining walls have to withstand the weight of the ground on the high side, any water pressure forces that develop, any additional load (surcharge) on the ground surface and sometimes swelling pressures from expansive clays. These forces are resisted by the wall itself and the ground on the low side. Engineers calculate the forces that the retained ground, the water, and the surcharge impose on a wall (the disturbing force) as well as the maximum force that the wall and ground on the low side can provide to resist them (the restoring force). The ratio of the restoring force to the disturbing force is called the "factor of safety" (GeoGuide LR1). Permanent retaining walls designed in accordance with accepted engineering standards will normally have a factor of safety in the range 1.5 to 2.

**Never** add surcharge to the high side of a wall (e.g. place fill, erect a structure, stockpile bulk materials, or park vehicles) unless you know the wall has been designed with that purpose in mind.

**Never** more than lightly water plants on the high side of a retaining wall.

**Never** excavate at the toe of a retaining wall.

Any of these actions will reduce the factor of safety of the wall and could lead to failure. If in doubt about any aspect of an existing retaining wall, or changes you would like to make near one, seek advice from a geotechnical practitioner, or a structural engineer. This GeoGuide sets out basic inspection requirements for retaining walls and identifies some common signs that might indicate all is not well. GeoGuide LR11 provides information about records that should be kept.

### GRAVITY WALLS

Gravity walls are so called because they rely on their own weight (the force of gravity) to hold the ground behind in place.

**Formed concrete and reinforced blockwork walls** (Figure 1) - should be built so the backfill can drain. They should be inspected at least once a year. Look for signs of tilting, bulging, cracking, or a drop in ground level on the high side, as any of these may indicate that the wall has started to fail. Look for rust staining, which may indicate that the steel reinforcement is deteriorating and the wall is losing structural strength ("concrete cancer"). Ensure that weep holes are clear and that water is able to drain at all times, as high water pressures behind the wall can lead to sudden and catastrophic failure.

**Concrete "crib" walls** (Figure 2) - should be filled with clean gravel, or "blue metal" with a nominated grading. Sometimes soil is used to reduce cost, but this is undesirable, from an engineering perspective, unless internal drainage is incorporated in the wall's construction. Without backfill drainage, a soil filled crib wall is likely to have a lower factor of safety than is required. Crib walls should be inspected as for formed concrete walls. In addition, you should check that material is not being lost through the structure of the wall, which has large gaps through it.

**Timber "crib" walls** - should be checked as for concrete crib walls. In addition, check the condition of the timber. Once individual elements show signs of rotting, it is necessary to have the wall replaced. If you are uncertain seek advice from a geotechnical practitioner, or a structural engineer.

**Masonry walls: natural stone, brick, or interlocking blocks** (Figure 3) - more than about 1m high, should be wider at the bottom than at the top and include specific measures to permit drainage of the backfill. They should be checked as for formed concrete walls. Natural stone walls should be inspected for signs of deterioration of the individual blocks: strength loss, corners becoming rounded, cracks appearing, or debris from the blocks collecting at the foot of the wall.




Figure 1- Typical formed concrete wall




Figure 2 -Typical crib




Figure 3 -Typical masonry wall

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR6 (RETAINING WALLS)

**Old Masonry walls** (Figure 4) - Many old masonry retaining walls have not been built in accordance with modern design standards and often have a low "factor of safety" (GeoGuide LR1). They may therefore be close to failure and a minor change in their condition, or loading, could initiate collapse. You need to take particular care with such structures and seek professional advice sooner rather than later. Although masonry walls sometimes deflect significantly over long periods of time collapse, when it occurs, is usually sudden and can be catastrophic. Familiarity with a particular situation can instil a false sense of confidence.

**Reinforced soil walls** (Figure 5) - are made of compacted select fill in which layers of reinforcement are buried to form a "reinforced soil zone". The reinforcement is all important, because it holds the soil "wall" together. Reinforcement may be steel strip, or mesh, or a variety of geosynthetic ("plastic") products. The facing panels are there to protect the soil "wall" from erosion and give it a finished appearance.

Most reinforced soil walls are proprietary products. Construction should be carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Inspection and maintenance should be the same as for formed concrete and concrete block walls. If unusual materials such as timber, or used tyres, are used as a facing it should be checked to see that it is not rotting, or perishing.

### OTHER WALLS

**Cantilevered and anchored walls** (Figure 6) - rely on earth pressure on the low side, rather than self-weight, to provide the restoring force and an adequate factor of safety. These walls may comprise:

- a line of touching bored piers (contiguous bored pile wall) or
- sprayed concrete panels between bored piers (shotcrete wall) or
- horizontal timber or concrete planks spanning between upright timber or steel soldier piles or
- steel sheet piles.

Depending on the form of construction and ground conditions, walls in excess of 3 m height normally require at least one row of permanent ground anchors.

### INSPECTION

All walls should be inspected at least once a year, looking for tilting and other signs of deterioration. Concrete walls should be inspected for cracking and rust stains as for formed concrete gravity walls. Contiguous bored pile walls can have gaps between the piles - look for loss of soil from behind which can become a major difficulty if it is not corrected. Timber walls should be inspected for rot, as for timber crib walls. Steel sheet piles should be inspected for signs of rusting. In addition, you should make sure that ground anchors are maintained as described in GeoGuide LR4 under the heading "Rock bolts and rock anchors".

One of the most important issues for walls is that their internal drainage systems are operational. Frequently verify that internal drainage pipes and surface interception drains around the wall are not blocked nor have become inoperative.

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

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| • GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction       | • GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk                    |
| • GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides         | • GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction             |
| • GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil | • GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal |
| • GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock | • GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides               |
| • GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage   | • GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping                   |

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




Figure 4 - Poorly built masonry wall




Figure 5 - Typical reinforced soil wall




Figure 6 - Typical cantilevered or anchored wall

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR7 (LANDSLIDE RISK)

## LANDSLIDE RISK

### Concept of Risk

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

### Landslide Risk Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

### Risk to Property

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

TABLE 2: LIKELIHOOD

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

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

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

TABLE 1: RISK TO PROPERTY

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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR7 (LANDSLIDE RISK)

## Risk to Life

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

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

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

Most local councils and planning authorities that stipulate a tolerable risk to property also stipulate a tolerable risk to life. The AGS Practice Note Guideline recommends that 1:100,000 is tolerable in newly

developed areas, where works can be carried out as part of the development to limit risk. The tolerable level is raised to 1:10,000 in established areas, where specific landslide hazards may have existed for many years. The distinction is deliberate and intended to prevent the concept of landslide risk management, for its own sake, becoming an unreasonable financial burden on existing communities. Acceptable risk is usually taken to be one tenth of the tolerable risk (1:1,000,000 for new developments and 1:100,000 for established areas) and efforts should be made to attain these where it is practicable and financially realistic to do so.

**TABLE 3: RISK TO LIFE**

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

**More information relevant to your particular situation may be found in other AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDES:**

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping


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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR8 (CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE)

## HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE

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

### EXAMPLES OF GOOD HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE



#### WHY ARE THESE PRACTICES GOOD?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

#### ADOPT GOOD PRACTICE ON HILLSIDE SITES

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR8 (CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE)

## EXAMPLES OF **POOR** HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE



### WHY ARE THESE PRACTICES POOR?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR9 (EFFLUENT DISPOSAL)

## EFFLUENT AND SURFACE WATER DISPOSAL

### EFFLUENT AND WASTEWATER

All households generate effluent and wastewater. The disposal of these products and their impact on the environment are key considerations in the planning of safe and sustainable communities. Cities and townships generally have reticulated water, sewer and stormwater systems, which are designed to deliver water and dispose of effluent and wastewater with minimal impact on the environment. However, many smaller communities and metropolitan fringe suburbs throughout Australia are un-sewered. Some of these are located in hillside or coastal settings where landslides present a hazard.

#### Processes by which wastewater can affect slope stability

As explained in GeoGuides LR3 and LR5, groundwater variations have a significant impact on slope stability. Inappropriate disposal of effluent and wastewater may result in the ground becoming saturated. The result is equivalent to a localised rise of the groundwater table and may have the potential to cause a landslide (GeoGuides LR2, LR5 and LR8).

#### On-site effluent disposal

In un-sewered areas disposal of effluent must be achieved through suitable methods. These methods usually involve containment within the boundaries of the site ("on-site disposal"). State environment protection agencies and local government authorities can usually provide advice on suitable disposal systems for your area. Such systems may include:

- *Septic systems*, which involve a storage/digestion tank for solids, with disposal of the liquid effluent via absorption trenches and beds, leach drains, or soak wells. Such systems are best suited to areas not prone to landslides.
- *Aerobic treatment units* which incorporate an individual household treatment plant to aid breakdown of the waste into a higher quality effluent. Such effluent is further treated and disposed of by surface or sub-surface irrigation, sub-soil dripper, or shallow leach drain system.
- *Nutrient retentive leaching systems* which utilise septic tanks to process the solid and liquid wastes in conjunction with discharge of the effluent through sand filters, media filters, mound systems and nutrient retentive leaching systems, which strip the effluent of nutrients.

Toilet (and sometimes kitchen) waste is known as *black water*. Other, less contaminated, wastewater streams from showers, baths and laundries are known as *grey water*. *Grey water re-use systems* allow a household to conserve water from bathrooms, kitchens and laundries, for re-use on gardens and lawns.

#### Recommendations for effluent disposal

In areas prone to landslide hazard, it is recommended that whatever effluent disposal system is employed, it should be designed by a qualified professional, familiar with how such a system can impact on the local environment. Local council, and in some instances state environment protection agency, approval is usually required as well. Many local authorities require a site assessment report, which covers all relevant issues. If approved, the report's recommendations must be incorporated in the system design. Reduction in the volume of effluent is beneficial so composting toilets and highly rated (i.e. low consumption) water appliances are recommended. It should be noted that in some state and local government jurisdictions there are restrictions on the alternative measures that can be applied. Consideration should be given to applying treated wastewater to land at low rates and over as large an area as possible. Further guidance can be found in Australian Standard AS/NZS 1547:2000 On-site domestic wastewater management.

Effluent disposal fields should be sited with due consideration to the overall landscape and the individual characteristics of the property. Some guidance is provided. In particular, effluent fields should be located downslope of the building, away from stormwater, or *grey water*, discharge areas and where there is minimal potential for downstream pollution. Set backs and buffer distances vary from state to state and local requirements should be adhered to. All systems require regular maintenance and inspection. Efficient operation of the system must be a priority for property owners/occupiers to ensure safe and sustainable communities. Responsibility for maintenance rests with owners.

### SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE


Attention to on-site surface water management is also important. Runoff from developments, including buildings, decks, access tracks and hardstand areas should be collected and discharged away from the development and other effluent disposal fields. Particular care must be given to the design of overflows on water tanks, as this is often overlooked. Discharge from any development should be spread out as much as possible, unless it can be directed to an existing natural water course. Ponding of water on hillsides and the concentration of water flows on slopes must be avoided.

It is recommended that a specific drainage plan and strategy should be developed in conjunction with the effluent disposal system for sites with a high potential for slope instability. Maintenance of the surface water drainage system is as important as maintenance of the effluent disposal system and again the responsibility rests with owners.

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR9 (EFFLUENT DISPOSAL)

Avoid concave slopes, depressions and benches


Locate disposal field preferably on downhill side of the house with trenches following the contour, manage landslide risk if this is an issue



Reduce effluent volumes through highly rated appliances and grey water re-use systems

Avoid concentrations of surface water and direct away from effluent fields

Other effluent disposal systems can include soak wells, surface/spray irrigation, drip irrigation and subsurface drippers



Note: Adapted from EPA Vic. Publication 451 (March 1996) "Code of Practice - Septic Tanks", which was sourced from Vic. Department of Planning and Loddon-Campaspe Regional Planning Authority.

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

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

## LANDSLIDES IN THE COASTAL ENVIRONMENT

### Coastal Instability

The coast presents a particularly dynamic environment where change is often the norm. Hazards exist in relation to both cliffs and sand dunes. The coast is also the most heavily populated part of Australia and always regarded as "prime" real estate, because of the views and access to waterways and beaches.




Photo courtesy Greg Kotze

Waves, wind and salt spray play a significant part, causing dunes to move and cliff-faces to erode well above sea level. Our response is often to try to neutralise these effects by doing such things as dumping rock in the sea, building groynes, dredging, or carrying out dune stabilisation. Such works can be very effective, but ongoing maintenance is usually needed and total reconstruction may be necessary after a relatively short working life.

Of particular significance are extreme events that cause destruction on a scale that ignores our efforts at coastal protection. Records show that cliffs have collapsed, taking with them backyards which had been relied upon as a buffer between a house and the ocean. Sand dunes have also been washed away resulting in the dramatic loss of homes and infrastructure. As with most landslide issues, even though such events may be infrequent, they could happen tomorrow. It is easy to be lulled into a false sense of security on a calm day.

In coastal areas, typical landslide hazards (GeoGuides LR1 to LR4) are compounded by coastal erosion which, over time, undercuts cliffs and eventually results in failure. In the case of sand dunes, dune erosion and dune slumping have equally dramatic effects. Coastal locations are subject to particular processes relating to fluctuating water tables, inundation under storm tides and direct wave attack. Large sections of our more sandy coastline are receding under present sea conditions. The hazards are progressive and likely to be exacerbated through climate change.

### Coastal Development

If you own, or are responsible for, a coastal property it is important that you understand that, where the shore line is receding, there is a greater landslide risk than would be the case on a similar site inland. The view may make the risk worthwhile, but does not reduce it.

### Coastal Landslides

Coastal landslides are little different from other landslides in that the signs of failure (GeoGuides LR2) and the causes (LR3, LR4 & LR5) are largely the same. The main difference relates to the overriding influence of wave impact, tidal movement, salt spray and high winds.

#### *Cliff failures*

In addition to the processes that produce cliff instability on inland cliffs, coastal cliffs are also subjected to repeated cycles of wetting and drying which can be accompanied by the expansive effect of salt crystal growth in gaps in the rocks. These processes accelerate the deterioration of coastal cliffs. At the base of cliffs, direct wave attack and the impact of boulders moved by wave action causes undercutting and hence instability of the overall face. Figure 2 of GeoGuide LR4 provides an example. Whilst the processes leading to coastal cliff collapse may take years, failure tends to be catastrophic and with little warning. In many cases, waves produced by large oceanic storms are the trigger assisted by rainfall to produce collapse. These are also the conditions in which you are more likely to be inside your home and oblivious to unusual noises or movements associated with imminent failure.

#### *Sand dune escarpment and slope failures*

An understanding of coastal processes is essential when determining beach erosion potential. Waves produced by large oceanic storms can erode beaches and cut escarpments into dunes. These may be of relatively short duration, when beach rebuilding happens after the storm, but can be a permanent feature where long term beach recession is taking place. In many locations, houses and infrastructure are sited on or immediately behind coastal dunes. After an escarpment has eroded, those assets may be lost or damaged by subsequent slumping of the dune. It is important that, on erodible coastal soils, the potential for landward incursion of an erosion escarpment is determined. Having done this, the likelihood of slope instability can be established as part of the landslide risk management process. Injury, death and structural damage have occurred around the Australian coast from collapsing sand escarpments.




Photo courtesy DNR NSW

## AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR10 (COASTAL LANDSLIDES)

The large scale and potentially high speed of coastal erosion processes means that major civil engineering work and large cost is normally involved in their control. The installation of rock bolts (LR4), drainage (LR5), or retaining walls (LR6) on a single house site may be necessary to provide local stability, but are unlikely to withstand the attack of a large storm on a beach or cliff-line.

### BUILDING NEAR CLIFFS AND HEADLANDS

Coastal cliffs and headlands exist because the rock that they are made from is able to resist erosion. Even so, cliff-faces are not immune and will continue to collapse (Figure 1) by one or other of the mechanisms shown on GeoGuide LR4. If you live on a coastal cliff, you should undertake inspection and maintenance as recommended in LR4 and the other GeoGuides, as appropriate. The top of the cliff, its face, and its base should be inspected frequently for signs of recent rock falls, opening of cracks, and heavy seepage which might indicate imminent failure. Since the sea can remove fallen rocks rapidly, inspections should be made shortly after every major storm as a matter of course. **If collapses are occurring seek advice from an appropriately experienced geotechnical practitioner. Advise you local council if you believe erosion is rapid or accelerating.**




Figure 1

### Building on Coastal Dunes

Any excavation in a natural dune slope is inherently unstable and must be supported and maintained (GeoGuide LR6). Dunes are particularly susceptible to ongoing erosion by wind and wave action and extreme changes can occur in a single storm. Whilst vegetation can help to stabilise dunes in the right circumstances, unfortunately a single storm has the potential to cut well into dunes and, in some cases, remove an entire low lying dune system or shift the mouth of a river. **As for cliffs, it is appropriate to observe the effects of major storms on the coastline. If erosion is causing the coastline to recede at an appreciable rate, seek advice from suitably experienced geotechnical and coastal engineering practitioners and bring it to the attention of the local council.**



Photo courtesy DNR NSW

### CLIMATE CHANGE

The coastal zone will experience the most direct physical impacts of climate change. A number of reviews of global data indicate a general trend of sea level rise over the last century of 0.1 - 0.2 metres. Current rates of global average sea level rise, measured from satellite altimeter data over the last decade, exceed 3 mm/year and are accelerating. The most authoritative and recent (at the time of writing) report on climate change (IPCC, 2007) predicts a global average sea level rise of between 0.2 and 0.8 metres by 2100, compared with the 1980 - 1999 levels (the higher value includes the maximum allowance of 0.2 m to account for uncertainty associated with ice sheet dynamics).

In addition to sea level rise, climate change is also likely to result in changes in wave heights and direction, coastal wind strengths and rainfall intensity, all of which have the capacity

to impact adversely on coastal dunes and cliff-faces. A Guideline for responding to the effects of climate change in coastal areas was published by Engineers Australia in 2004.

### References

- Engineers Australia 2004 'Guidelines for responding to the effects of climate change in coastal and ocean engineering.' The National Committee on Coastal and Ocean Engineering, Engineers Australia, updated 2004.
- IPCC (2007) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Summary for Policy Makers. Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- Nielsen, A.F., Lord D.B. and Poulos, H.G. (1992). 'Dune Stability Considerations for Building Foundations', *Aust. Civil Eng. Transactions* CE No.2, 167-174.

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

- GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction
- GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides
- GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil
- GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock
- GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage
- GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls
- GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk
- GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction
- GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal
- GeoGuide LR11 - Record Keeping

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

# AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR11 (RECORD KEEPING)

## RECORD KEEPING

It is strongly recommended that records be kept of all construction, inspection and maintenance activities in relation to developments on sloping blocks. In some local authority jurisdictions, maintenance requirements form part of the building consent conditions, in which case they are mandatory.

### CONSTRUCTION RECORDS

If at all possible, you should keep copies of drawings, specifications and construction (i.e. "as built") records, particularly if these differ from the design drawings. The importance of these documents cannot be over-emphasised. If a geotechnical practitioner comes to a site to carry out a landslide risk assessment and is only able to see the face of a retaining wall, the heads of some ground anchors, or the outlets of a number of sub-soil drains, it may be necessary to determine how these have been built and how they are meant to work before completing the assessment. This could involve drilling through the wall to determine how thick it is, or probing the length of the drains, or even ignoring the anchors altogether, because it is uncertain how long they are. Such "investigation" of something that may only have been built a few years before is, at best, a waste of time and money and, at worst, capable of coming up with a misleading answer which could affect the outcome of the assessment. Documentary information of this sort often proves to be invaluable later on, so treat it with as much importance as the title deeds to your property.

### INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE RECORDS

If you follow the recommendations of the Australian GeoGuides it is likely that you will either carry out periodic inspections yourself, or you will engage a geotechnical practitioner to do them for you. The collected records of these inspections will provide a detailed history of changes that might be occurring and will indicate, better than your own memory, whether things are deteriorating and, if so, at what rate. Unfortunately, without some form of written record, all information is usually lost each time a property is sold. It is recommended that a prospective purchaser should have a pre-purchase landslide risk assessment carried out on a hillside site, in much the same way that they would commission a structural assessment, or a pest inspection, of the building. If the vendor has kept good records, then the assessment is likely to be quicker and cheaper, and the outcome more reliable, than if none are available. Each site is different, but noting the following would normally constitute a reasonable record of an inspection/maintenance undertaken:

- date of inspection/maintenance and the name and professional status of the person carrying it out
- description of the specific feature (eg. cliff face, temporary rock bolt, cast *in situ* retaining wall, shallow leach drain system)
- sketch plans, sketches and photographs to indicate location and condition
- activity undertaken (eg. visual inspection; cleared vegetation from drain; removed fallen rock about 500 mm diameter)
- condition of the feature and any matters of concern (e.g. weep holes damp and flowing freely; rust on anchor heads getting worse; shotcrete uncracked and no sign of rust stains; ground saturated around leach field)
- specific outcomes (eg. no action necessary; geotechnical practitioner called in to advise on the state of the anchors; cliff face to be trimmed following the most recent rock fall; leach field to be rebuilt at new location)

A proforma record is provided overleaf for convenience. Photographs and sketches of specific observations can prove to be very useful and should be included whenever possible. Geotechnical practitioners may devise their own site specific inspection/maintenance records.

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

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| • GeoGuide LR1 - Introduction       | • GeoGuide LR6 - Retaining Walls                   |
| • GeoGuide LR2 - Landslides         | • GeoGuide LR7 - Landslide Risk                    |
| • GeoGuide LR3 - Landslides in Soil | • GeoGuide LR8 - Hillside Construction             |
| • GeoGuide LR4 - Landslides in Rock | • GeoGuide LR9 - Effluent & Surface Water Disposal |
| • GeoGuide LR5 - Water & Drainage   | • GeoGuide LR10 - Coastal Landslides               |

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

**AUSTRALIAN GEOGUIDE LR11 (RECORD KEEPING)**

**INSPECTION/MAINTENANCE RECORD**

(Tick boxes as appropriate and add information as required)

Date.....

**Site location** (street address / lot & DP numbers / map reference / latitude and longitude)

.....

**FEATURE**

**Slopes & surface protection:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural slope/cliff  | <input type="checkbox"/> Cut/fill slope                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Surface water drains |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shotcrete            | <input type="checkbox"/> Stone pitching <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

| Inspected | Maintained | Tested | By Owner | By Professional |
|-----------|------------|--------|----------|-----------------|
|           |            |        |          |                 |
|           |            |        |          |                 |
|           |            |        |          |                 |

**Retaining walls:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cast in situ concrete   | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete block         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Masonry (natural stone) | <input type="checkbox"/> Masonry (brick, block) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cribwall (concrete)     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cribwall (timber)      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anchored wall           | <input type="checkbox"/> Reinforced soil wall   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-soil drains         | <input type="checkbox"/> Weep holes             |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Ground improvement:**

- |  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rock bolts          |                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ground anchors      | <input type="checkbox"/> Soil nails |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deep subsoil drains |                                     |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Effluent and storm water disposal systems:**

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Effluent treatment system  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Effluent disposal field    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Storm water disposal field |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Other:**

- |                                  |                                      |                                    |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Netting | <input type="checkbox"/> Catch fence | <input type="checkbox"/> Catch pit |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Observations/Notes (Add pages/details as appropriate)

.....

.....

.....

Attachments:     Sketch(es)     Photograph(s)     Other (eg measurements, test results)

Record prepared by ..... (name): .....(signature)

Contact details: Phone:.....    E-mail:.....

Professional Status (in relation to landslide risk assessment):.....

**APPENDIX**  
**AUSTRALIAN GEOMECHANICS SOCIETY**

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

Andrew Leventhal, GHD Geotechnics, Sydney, Chair  
Robin Fell, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, UNSW, Sydney, Convenor Guidelines on Landslide Susceptibility, Hazard and Risk Working Group  
Tony Phillips, Consultant, Sydney, Convenor Slope Management and Maintenance Working Group  
Bruce Walker, Jeffery and Katauskas, Sydney, Convenor Practice Note Working Group  
Geoff Withycombe, Sydney Coastal Councils Group, Sydney

**WORKING GROUP - Guidelines on Slope Management and Maintenance**

Tony Phillips, Tony Phillips Consulting, Sydney, Convenor  
Henk Buys, NSW Roads and traffic Authority, Parramatta  
John Braybrooke, Douglas Partners, Sydney  
Tony Miner, A.G. Miner Geotechnical, Geelong

**LANDSLIDE TASKFORCE**

Laurie de Ambrosis, GHD Geotechnics, Sydney  
Mark Eggers, Pells Sullivan Meynink, Sydney  
Max Ervin, Golder Associates, Melbourne  
Angus Gordon, retired, Sydney  
Greg Kotze, GHD, Sydney  
Arthur Love, Coffey Geotechnics, Newcastle  
Alex Litwinowicz, GHD Geotechnics, Brisbane  
Tony Miner, A.G. Miner Geotechnical, Geelong  
Fiona MacGregor, Douglas Partners, Sydney  
Garry Mostyn, Pells Sullivan Meynink, Sydney  
Grant Murray, Sinclair Knight Merz, Auckland  
Garth Powell, Coffey Geotechnics, Brisbane  
Ralph Rallings, Pitt and Sherry, Hobart  
Ian Stewart, NSW Roads and Traffic Authority, Sydney  
Peter Tobin, Wollongong City Council, Wollongong  
Graham Whitt, Shire of Yarra Ranges, Lillydale

# 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 grated 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               |



- 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.

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:

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

## Appendix B

Soil & Rock Explanation Sheets

Borehole Logs

DCP Logs

## Log Abbreviations & Notes

### METHOD

#### borehole logs

|    |                   |
|----|-------------------|
| AS | auger screw *     |
| AD | auger drill *     |
| RR | roller / tricone  |
| W  | washbore          |
| CT | cable tool        |
| HA | hand auger        |
| D  | diatube           |
| B  | blade / blank bit |
| V  | V-bit             |
| T  | TC-bit            |

\* bit shown by suffix e.g. ADV

#### excavation logs

|    |                    |
|----|--------------------|
| NE | natural excavation |
| HE | hand excavation    |
| BH | backhoe bucket     |
| EX | excavator bucket   |
| DZ | dozer blade        |
| R  | ripper tooth       |

### coring

NMLC, NQ, PQ, HQ

### SUPPORT

#### borehole logs

|    |         |
|----|---------|
| N  | nil     |
| M  | mud     |
| C  | casing  |
| NQ | NQ rods |

#### excavation logs

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| N | nil     |
| S | shoring |
| B | benched |

### CORE-LIFT

|| casing installed

┌─┐ barrel withdrawn

### NOTES, SAMPLES, TESTS

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| D   | disturbed   |
| B   | bulk disturbed  |
| U50 | thin-walled sample, 50mm diameter                       |
| HP  | hand penetrometer (kPa)                                 |
| SV  | shear vane test (kPa)                                   |
| DCP | dynamic cone penetrometer (blows per 100mm penetration) |
| SPT | standard penetration test                               |
| N*  | SPT value (blows per 300mm)                             |
|     | * denotes sample taken                                  |
| Nc  | SPT with solid cone                                     |
| R   | refusal of DCP or SPT                                   |

### USCS SYMBOLS

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| GW     | Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| GP     | Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines, uniform gravels                                  |
| GM     | Gravel-silt mixtures and gravel-sand-silt mixtures.   |
| GC     | Gravel-clay mixtures and gravel-sand-clay mixtures.   |
| SW     | Sand and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| SP     | Sand and gravel sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| SM     | Sand-silt mixtures.   |
| SC     | Sand-clay mixtures.   |
| ML     | Inorganic silt and very fine sand, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sand or silt with low plasticity. |
| CL, CI | Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays.                             |
| OL     | Organic silts   |
| MH     | Inorganic silts   |
| CH     | Organic clays of high plasticity.   |
| OH     | Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silt  |
| PT     | Peat, highly organic soils.   |

### MOISTURE CONDITION

|    |               |
|----|---------------|
| D  | dry           |
| M  | moist         |
| W  | wet           |
| Wp | plastic limit |
| Wl | liquid limit  |


### 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   |

## Graphic Log



### WEATHERING

|    |                      |
|----|----------------------|
| XW | extremely weathered  |
| HW | highly weathered     |
| MW | moderately weathered |
| SW | slightly weathered   |
| FR | fresh                |

### STRENGTH

|    |                |
|----|----------------|
| VL | very low       |
| L  | low            |
| M  | medium         |
| H  | high           |
| VH | very high      |
| EH | extremely high |

### RQD (%)

$$= \frac{\text{sum of intact core pieces} > 2 \times \text{diameter}}{\text{total length of core run drilled}} \times 100$$

### DEFECTS:

| type |            | coating |         |
|------|------------|---------|---------|
| JT   | joint      | cl      | clean   |
| PT   | parting    | st      | stained |
| SZ   | shear zone | ve      | veneer  |
| SM   | seam       | co      | coating |

### shape

|    |            |
|----|------------|
| pl | planar     |
| cu | curved     |
| un | undulating |
| st | stepped    |
| ir | irregular  |

### roughness

|    |              |
|----|--------------|
| po | polished     |
| sl | slickensided |
| sm | smooth       |
| ro | rough        |
| vr | very rough   |

### inclination

measured above axis and perpendicular to core

## AS1726-2017

Soils and rock are described in the following terms, which are broadly in accordance with AS1726-2017.

## Soil

## MOISTURE CONDITION

| Term  | Description   |
|-------|---|
| Dry   | Looks and feels dry. Fine grained and cemented soils are hard, friable or powdery. Uncemented coarse grained soils run freely through hand. |
| Moist | Soil feels cool and darkened in colour. Fine grained soils can be moulded. Coarse soils tend to cohere.                                     |
| Wet   | As for moist, but with free water forming on hand.  |

Moisture content of cohesive soils may also be described in relation to plastic limit (W<sub>p</sub>) or liquid limit (W<sub>L</sub>) [ $\gg$  much greater than,  $>$  greater than,  $<$  less than,  $<<$  much less than].

## CONSISTENCY OF FINE-GRAINED SOILS

| Term      | Su (kPa)   | Term       | Su (kPa)    |
|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Very soft | < 12       | Very Stiff | >100 – ≤200 |
| Soft      | >12 – ≤25  | Hard       | > 200       |
| Firm      | >25 – ≤50  | Friable    | -           |
| Stiff     | >50 – ≤100 |            |             |

## RELATIVE DENSITY OF COARSE-GRAINED SOILS

| Term         | Density Index (%) | Term       | Density Index (%) |
|--------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Very Loose   | < 15              | Dense      | 65 – 85           |
| Loose        | 15 – 35           | Very Dense | >85               |
| Medium Dense | 35 – 65           |            |                   |

## PARTICLE SIZE

| Name        | Subdivision | Size (mm)    |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Boulders    |             | > 200        |
| Cobbles     |             | 63 – 200     |
| Gravel      | coarse      | 19 – 63      |
|             | medium      | 6.7 – 19     |
|             | fine        | 2.36 – 6.7   |
| Sand        | coarse      | 0.6 – 2.36   |
|             | medium      | 0.21 – 0.6   |
|             | fine        | 0.075 – 0.21 |
| Silt & Clay |             | < 0.075      |

## MINOR COMPONENTS

| Term  | Proportion by Mass:   |                     |
|-------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|       | <u>coarse grained</u> | <u>fine grained</u> |
| Trace | ≤ 15%                 | ≤ 5%                |
| With  | >15% – ≤30%           | >5% – ≤12%          |

## SOIL ZONING

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| Layers  | Continuous across exposures or sample.       |
| Lenses  | Discontinuous, lenticular shaped zones.      |
| Pockets | Irregular shape zones of different material. |

## SOIL CEMENTING

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Weakly     | Easily broken up by hand pressure in water or air.         |
| Moderately | Effort is required to break up by hand in water or in air. |

## USCS SYMBOLS

| Symbol | Description   |
|--------|---|
| GW     | Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| GP     | Gravel and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines, uniform gravels.                                 |
| GM     | Gravel-silt mixtures and gravel-sand-silt mixtures.   |
| GC     | Gravel-clay mixtures and gravel-sand-clay mixtures.   |
| SW     | Sand and gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| SP     | Sand and gravel sand mixtures, little or no fines.  |
| SM     | Sand-silt mixtures.   |
| SC     | Sand-clay mixtures.   |
| ML     | Inorganic silt and very fine sand, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sand or silt with low plasticity. |
| CL, CI | Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays.                             |
| OL     | Organic silts   |
| MH     | Inorganic silts   |
| CH     | Inorganic clays of high plasticity.   |
| OH     | Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silt  |
| PT     | Peat, highly organic soils.   |

## Rock

## SEDIMENTARY ROCK TYPE DEFINITIONS

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

## LAYERING

| Term             | Description  |
|------------------|--|
| Massive          | No layering apparent.  |
| Poorly Developed | Layering just visible. Little effect on properties.              |
| Well Developed   | Layering distinct. Rock breaks more easily parallel to layering. |

## STRUCTURE

| Term               | Spacing (mm) | Term                | Spacing     |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Thinly laminated   | <6           | Medium bedded       | 200 – 600   |
| Laminated          | 6 – 20       | Thickly bedded      | 600 – 2,000 |
| Very thinly bedded | 20 – 60      | Very thickly bedded | > 2,000     |
| Thinly bedded      | 60 – 200     |                     |             |

## STRENGTH (NOTE: Is50 = Point Load Strength Index)

| Term          | Is50 (MPa) | Term           | Is50 (MPa) |
|---------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| Extremely Low | <0.03      | High           | 1.0 – 3.0  |
| Very low      | 0.03 – 0.1 | Very High      | 3.0 – 10.0 |
| Low           | 0.1 – 0.3  | Extremely High | >10.0      |
| Medium        | 0.3 – 1.0  |                |            |

## WEATHERING

| Term             | Description   |
|------------------|---|
| Residual Soil    | Material is weathered to an extent that it has soil properties. Rock structures are no longer visible, but the soil has not been significantly transported.             |
| Extremely .....  | Material is weathered to the extent that it has soil properties. Mass structures, material texture & fabric of original rock is still visible.                          |
| Highly .....     | Rock strength is significantly changed by weathering; rock is discolored, usually by iron staining or bleaching. Some primary minerals have weathered to clay minerals. |
| Moderately ..... | Rock strength shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock; rock may be discolored.  |
| Slightly .....   | Rock is partially discolored but shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock.   |
| Fresh            | Rock shows no signs of decomposition or staining.   |

## DEFECT DESCRIPTION

| Type         | Description   |
|--------------|---|
| Joint        | A surface or crack across which the rock has little or no tensile strength. May be open or closed.  |
| Parting      | A surface or crack across which the rock has little or no tensile strength. Parallel or sub-parallel to layering/bedding. May be open or closed.            |
| Sheared Zone | Zone of rock substance with roughly parallel, near planar, curved or undulating boundaries cut by closely spaced joints, sheared surfaces or other defects. |
| Seam         | Seam with deposited soil (infill), extremely weathered in situ rock (XW), or disoriented usually angular fragments of the host rock (crushed).              |

## Shape

|            |                                    |
|------------|------------------------------------|
| Planar     | Consistent orientation.            |
| Curved     | Gradual change in orientation.     |
| Undulating | Wavy surface.                      |
| Stepped    | One or more well defined steps.    |
| Irregular  | Many sharp changes in orientation. |

## Roughness

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 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 <1mm). Feels like fine to coarse sandpaper. |
| Very Rough   | Many large surface irregularities, amplitude generally >1mm. Feels like very coarse sandpaper.     |

## Coating

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| Clean   | No visible coating or discolouring.                                      |
| Stained | No visible coating but surfaces are discolored.                          |
| Veneer  | A visible coating of soil or mineral, too thin to measure; may be patchy |
| Coating | Visible coating =1mm thick. Thicker soil material described as seam.     |



# Borehole Log

|                 |            |
|-----------------|------------|
| <b>BH no:</b>   | <b>BH1</b> |
| <b>sheet:</b>   | 1 of 2     |
| <b>job no.:</b> | 6728       |

|                   |  |                    |                |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>client:</b>    | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd   | <b>started:</b>    | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>principal:</b> |  | <b>finished:</b>   | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>project:</b>   | Proposed J-Bar Ski Lift  | <b>logged:</b>     | AT             |
| <b>location:</b>  | Perisher NSW   | <b>checked:</b>    | MAB            |
| <b>equipment:</b> | HA/DCP   | <b>RL surface:</b> | 1741 m approx. |
| <b>diameter:</b>  | 75mm <b>inclination:</b> -90° <b>bearing:</b> --- <b>E:</b> 5969837.25m <b>N:</b> 625805.19m | <b>datum:</b>      | AHD            |

| drilling information |         |       |                           | material information |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| method               | support | water | notes samples, tests, etc | RL                   | depth metres | graphic log | USCS symbol | material description  | moisture condition | consistency/density index | hand penetrometer | structure and additional observations |
| HA/DCP               | N       |       |                           |                      | 0.2          |             | CLM/MLC     | TOPSOIL, Silty CLAY/ Clayey SILT matrix, high content of organic matter (high grass, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey. | >WI                | VS                        |                   | TOPSOIL                               |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 0.5          |             | CLM         | Silty CLAY, medium to high plasticity, brown grey/ grey, trace of grass rootslets.  |                    | S                         |                   | ALLUVIUM.                             |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1740.5               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 1.0          |             | CLM/SC      | Silty CLAY grading to sandy CLAY, medium to high plasticity, brown/ brown grey, fine to coarse grained sand.  |                    | H                         |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1740.0               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 1.1          |             | CLM/SC      | Silty CLAY grading to sandy CLAY, medium to high plasticity, brown/ brown grey, fine to coarse grained sand.  |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 1.2          |             |             | Hand Auger reached practical refusal @ 1.2m on inferred completely weathered granite or very dense sand.  | M?                 | VD                        |                   | CW GRANITE BEDROCK.                   |
| DCP                  |         |       |                           |                      | 1.5          |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 2.0          |             |             |   |                    | D                         |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1739.5               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 2.5          |             |             |   |                    | VD                        |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1739.0               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 3.0          |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1738.5               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1738.0               |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                   |                                       |

6728 - BH LOGS.GPJ 3/2/22

REFER TO EXPLANATION SHEETS FOR DESCRIPTION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED

Borehole Log - Revision 10



# Borehole Log

|                 |            |
|-----------------|------------|
| <b>BH no:</b>   | <b>BH1</b> |
| <b>sheet:</b>   | 2 of 2     |
| <b>job no.:</b> | 6728       |

|                   |  |                    |                |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>client:</b>    | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd   | <b>started:</b>    | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>principal:</b> |  | <b>finished:</b>   | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>project:</b>   | Proposed J-Bar Ski Lift  | <b>logged:</b>     | AT             |
| <b>location:</b>  | Perisher NSW   | <b>checked:</b>    | MAB            |
| <b>equipment:</b> | HA/DCP   | <b>RL surface:</b> | 1741 m approx. |
| <b>diameter:</b>  | 75mm <b>inclination:</b> -90° <b>bearing:</b> --- <b>E:</b> 5969837.25m <b>N:</b> 625805.19m | <b>datum:</b>      | AHD            |

| drilling information |         |       |                           |        |              | material information |             |  |                    | structure and additional observations |                           |   |
|----------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------|--------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| method               | support | water | notes samples, tests, etc | RL     | depth metres | graphic log          | USCS symbol | material description<br>soil type: plasticity or particle characteristics, colour, secondary and minor components. | moisture condition |                                       | consistency/density index | 100<br>200<br>300<br>400<br>hand penetrometer |
| DCP                  |         |       |                           | 1737.5 | 3.5          |                      |             |  | M?                 | VD                                    |                           |   |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1737.0 | 4.0          |                      |             |  |                    |                                       |                           |   |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1736.5 | 4.5          |                      |             | DCP sounding reached target depth @ 4.4m on very dense sand.<br>Borehole No: BH1 terminated at 4.4m                |                    |                                       |                           | XW GRANITE BEDROCK.                           |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1736.0 | 5.0          |                      |             |  |                    |                                       |                           |   |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1735.5 | 5.5          |                      |             |  |                    |                                       |                           |   |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1735.0 | 6.0          |                      |             |  |                    |                                       |                           |   |

6728 - BH LOGS.GPJ 3/2/22

REFER TO EXPLANATION SHEETS FOR DESCRIPTION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED

Borehole Log - Revision 10



# Borehole Log

BH no: **BH2**

sheet: 1 of 1

job no.: 6728

|                   |                                      |                     |                |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| <b>client:</b>    | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd | <b>started:</b>     | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>principal:</b> |                                      | <b>finished:</b>    | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>project:</b>   | Proposed J-Bar Ski Lift              | <b>logged:</b>      | AT             |
| <b>location:</b>  | Perisher NSW                         | <b>checked:</b>     | MAB            |
| <b>equipment:</b> | HA/DCP                               | <b>RL surface:</b>  | 1755 m approx. |
| <b>diameter:</b>  | 75mm                                 | <b>inclination:</b> | -90°           |
|                   |                                      | <b>bearing:</b>     | ---            |
|                   |                                      | <b>E:</b>           | 5970027.26m    |
|                   |                                      | <b>N:</b>           | 625881.91m     |
|                   |                                      | <b>datum:</b>       | AHD            |

| drilling information |         |       |                           |        |              | material information |             |  |                    |                           |                          |                                       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------|--------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| method               | support | water | notes samples, tests, etc | RL     | depth metres | graphic log          | USCS symbol | material description   | moisture condition | consistency/density index | hand penetrometer        | structure and additional observations |
|                      |         |       |                           |        |              |                      |             | soil type: plasticity or particle characteristics, colour, secondary and minor components.   |                    |                           | 100<br>200<br>300<br>400 |                                       |
| HA/DCP               | N       |       |                           |        |              |                      | MLC/CLM     | TOPSOIL, Silty CLAY/ Clayey SILT matrix, high content of organic matter ( high grass, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey. | >WI                | VS                        |                          | TOPSOIL                               |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1754.5 | 0.4          |                      | CLM         | Silty CLAY, high content of organic matter ( rootlets, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey/ dark brown.                    |                    | St                        |                          | ALLUVIUM/SLOPEWASH                    |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1754.0 | 0.8          |                      | SC          | Sandy CLAY with some silt, medium to high plasticity, medium to coarse grained sand, grey brown/ dark grey, trace of fines.  |                    | VSt                       |                          |                                       |
| DCP                  |         |       |                           | 1754.0 | 0.9          |                      |             | Hand Auger reached practical refusal @ 0.9m on inferred completely weathered granite or very dense sand.   | M?                 | D                         |                          | CW GRANITE BEDROCK.                   |
|                      |         |       |                           |        | 1.0          |                      |             |  |                    | VD                        |                          |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |        |              |                      |             |  |                    | D                         |                          |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |        |              |                      |             |  |                    | VD                        |                          |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1753.5 | 1.5          |                      |             | DCP sounding bouncing @ 1.45m on inferred XW/HW Granite or granite boulder. Borehole No: BH2 terminated at 1.45m   |                    |                           |                          | XW GRANITE BEDROCK.                   |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1753.0 | 2.0          |                      |             |  |                    |                           |                          |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1752.5 | 2.5          |                      |             |  |                    |                           |                          |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           | 1752.0 | 3.0          |                      |             |  |                    |                           |                          |                                       |

6728 - BH LOGS.GPJ 3/2/22

REFER TO EXPLANATION SHEETS FOR DESCRIPTION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED

Borehole Log - Revision 10



# Borehole Log

|                 |            |
|-----------------|------------|
| <b>BH no:</b>   | <b>BH3</b> |
| <b>sheet:</b>   | 1 of 1     |
| <b>job no.:</b> | 6728       |

|                   |  |                    |                |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>client:</b>    | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd   | <b>started:</b>    | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>principal:</b> |  | <b>finished:</b>   | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>project:</b>   | Proposed J-Bar Ski Lift  | <b>logged:</b>     | AT             |
| <b>location:</b>  | Perisher NSW   | <b>checked:</b>    | MAB            |
| <b>equipment:</b> | HA/DCP   | <b>RL surface:</b> | 1770 m approx. |
| <b>diameter:</b>  | 75mm <b>inclination:</b> -90° <b>bearing:</b> --- <b>E:</b> 5970134.94m <b>N:</b> 625899.26m | <b>datum:</b>      | AHD            |

| drilling information |         |       |                           | material information |              |             |             |   |                    |                           |                                 |                                       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| method               | support | water | notes samples, tests, etc | RL                   | depth metres | graphic log | USCS symbol | material description  | moisture condition | consistency/density index | hand penetrometer               | structure and additional observations |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      |              |             |             | soil type: plasticity or particle characteristics, colour, secondary and minor components.  |                    |                           | 100<br>200<br>300<br>400<br>kPa |                                       |
| HA/DCP               | N       |       |                           |                      |              |             | MLC/CLM     | TOPSOIL, Silty CLAY/ Clayey SILT matrix, high content of organic matter (high grass, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey. | >WI                | VS                        |                                 | TOPSOIL/ SLOPEWASH.                   |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 0.4          |             | CLM         | Silty CLAY, medium to high plasticity, brown grey/ grey, trace of grass roots high content of organic matters.  |                    | F                         |                                 | ALLUVIUM.                             |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 0.5          |             |             |   |                    | VSt                       |                                 |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 1.0          |             |             |   |                    | H                         |                                 |                                       |
| DCP                  |         |       |                           |                      | 1.2          |             |             | Hand Auger reached practical refusal @ 1.2m on very stiff clay or very dense sand, inferred as CW Granite.  | >Wp?               |                           |                                 | CW GRANITE BEDROCK.                   |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 1.5          |             |             |   |                    | VSt                       |                                 |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 2.0          |             |             |   |                    | H                         |                                 |                                       |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 2.5          |             |             | DCP bouncing @ 2.25m on inferred weathered Granite bedrock or Granite boulder. Borehole No: BH3 terminated at 2.25m   |                    |                           |                                 | XW GRANITE BEDROCK.                   |
|                      |         |       |                           |                      | 3.0          |             |             |   |                    |                           |                                 |                                       |

6728 - BH LOGS.GPJ 3/2/22

REFER TO EXPLANATION SHEETS FOR DESCRIPTION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED

Borehole Log - Revision 10



# Borehole Log

|                 |            |
|-----------------|------------|
| <b>BH no:</b>   | <b>BH4</b> |
| <b>sheet:</b>   | 1 of 1     |
| <b>job no.:</b> | 6728       |

|                   |  |                    |                |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>client:</b>    | Vail Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd   | <b>started:</b>    | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>principal:</b> |  | <b>finished:</b>   | 29.11.2021     |
| <b>project:</b>   | Proposed J-Bar Ski Lift  | <b>logged:</b>     | AT             |
| <b>location:</b>  | Perisher NSW   | <b>checked:</b>    | MAB            |
| <b>equipment:</b> | HA/DCP   | <b>RL surface:</b> | 1770 m approx. |
| <b>diameter:</b>  | 75mm <b>inclination:</b> -90° <b>bearing:</b> --- <b>E:</b> 5970134.94m <b>N:</b> 625899.26m | <b>datum:</b>      | AHD            |

| drilling information |         |       |                                 |        |                 | material information |             |   |                       |                               |                                  |  |
|----------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| method               | support | water | notes<br>samples,<br>tests, etc | RL     | depth<br>metres | graphic log          | USCS symbol | material description<br>soil type: plasticity or particle characteristics,<br>colour, secondary and minor components.   | moisture<br>condition | consistency/<br>density index | hand<br>penetro-<br>meter<br>kPa | structure and<br>additional observations |
| HA/DCP               | N       |       |                                 | 1769.5 | 0.5             |                      | MLC/CLM     | TOPSOIL, Silty CLAY/ Clayey SILT matrix, organic matter intrusion (grass, mosses, shrubs), trace of medium grained sand, medium to high plasticity, dark grey.  | >WI                   | VS                            | 100<br>200<br>300<br>400         | TOPSOIL/SLOPEWASH.                       |
|                      |         |       |                                 | 1769.0 | 1.0             |                      |             | Hand Auger reached practical refusal @ 0.6m on inferred completely weathered granite or very dense sand. DCP sounding bouncing @ 0.6m on inferred XW/HW Granite or granite boulder. Borehole No: BH4 terminated at 0.6m |                       |                               |                                  | XW GRANITE BEDROCK.                      |
|                      |         |       |                                 | 1768.5 | 1.5             |                      |             |   |                       |                               |                                  |  |
|                      |         |       |                                 | 1768.0 | 2.0             |                      |             |   |                       |                               |                                  |  |
|                      |         |       |                                 | 1767.5 | 2.5             |                      |             |   |                       |                               |                                  |  |
|                      |         |       |                                 | 1767.0 | 3.0             |                      |             |   |                       |                               |                                  |  |

6728 - BH LOGS.GPJ 3/2/22

REFER TO EXPLANATION SHEETS FOR DESCRIPTION OF TERMS AND SYMBOLS USED

Borehole Log - Revision 10



# Dynamic Cone Penetrometer


Sheet: 1 of 2

Job No: 6728

**client:** Vali Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd **started:** 29.11.2021  
**principal:** **finished:** 29.11.2021  
**project:** Proposed J-bar Ski Lift **logged:** AT  
**location:** Perisher NSW **checked:** MAB

**equipment:** 9kg hammer, 510mm drop, cone tip  
**standard:** AS1289.6.3.2-1997

| Depth (m)   | Test Results (blows / 100mm) |      |      |      |      |
|-------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
|             | BH1                          | BH2  | BH3  | DCP4 | DCP5 |
| 0.00 – 0.10 | 0.25                         | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.5  |
| 0.10 – 0.20 | 0.25                         | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.5  |
| 0.20 – 0.30 | 0.25                         | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 2    |
| 0.30 – 0.40 | 0.25                         | 0.33 | 2    | 0.25 | 9    |
| 0.40 – 0.50 | 1                            | 0.33 | 2    | 1    | 5    |
| 0.50 – 0.60 | 1                            | 0.33 | 6    | 4    | SR   |
| 0.60 – 0.70 | 1                            | 4    | 8    | SR   |      |
| 0.70 – 0.80 | 1                            | 4    | 8    |      |      |
| 0.80 – 0.90 | 10                           | 8    | 8    |      |      |
| 0.90 – 1.00 | 12                           | 8    | 6    |      |      |
| 1.00 – 1.10 | 15                           | 12   | 6    |      |      |
| 1.10 – 1.20 | 15                           | 6    | 16   |      |      |
| 1.20 – 1.30 | 16                           | 5    | 12   |      |      |
| 1.30 – 1.40 | 15                           | 14   | 15   |      |      |
| 1.40 – 1.50 | 15                           | 20   | 10   |      |      |
| 1.50 – 1.60 | 15                           | SR   | 10   |      |      |
| 1.60 – 1.70 | 15                           |      | 8    |      |      |
| 1.70 – 1.80 | 15                           |      | 7    |      |      |
| 1.80 – 1.90 | 16                           |      | 8    |      |      |
| 1.90 – 2.00 | 10                           |      | 7    |      |      |
| 2.00 – 2.10 | 6                            |      | 6    |      |      |
| 2.10 – 2.20 | 6                            |      | 7    |      |      |
| 2.20 – 2.30 | 6                            |      | 10   |      |      |
| 2.30 – 2.40 | 6                            |      | SR   |      |      |
| 2.40 – 2.50 | 6                            |      |      |      |      |
| 2.50 – 2.60 | 7                            |      |      |      |      |
| 2.60 – 2.70 | 8                            |      |      |      |      |
| 2.70 – 2.80 | 9                            |      |      |      |      |
| 2.80 – 2.90 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 2.90 – 3.00 | 11                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.00 – 3.10 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.10 – 3.20 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.20 – 3.30 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.30 – 3.40 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.40 – 3.50 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.50 – 3.60 | 10                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.60 – 3.70 | 12                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.70 – 3.80 | 12                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.80 – 3.90 | 11                           |      |      |      |      |
| 3.90 – 4.00 | 12                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.00 – 4.10 | 13                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.10 – 4.20 | 17                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.20 – 4.30 | 18                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.30 – 4.40 | 20                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.40 – 4.50 | TD                           |      |      |      |      |
| 4.50 – 4.60 |                              |      |      |      |      |
| 4.60 – 4.70 |                              |      |      |      |      |
| 4.70 – 4.80 |                              |      |      |      |      |
| 4.80 – 4.90 |                              |      |      |      |      |
| 4.90 – 5.00 |                              |      |      |      |      |



**Notes:**  
 RL = ground surface level (m) AHD  
 TD = target depth, PR = practical refusal (15+ blows per 100mm), SR = "solid" refusal (no further penetration and "solid" ringing sound from slide hammer)




# Dynamic Cone Penetrometer

Sheet: 2 of 2  
Job No: 6728

client: Vali Resorts / Perisher Blue Pty Ltd  
 principal:  
 project: Proposed J-bar Ski Lift  
 location: Perisher NSW  
 equipment: 9kg hammer, 510mm drop, cone tip  
 standard: AS1289.6.3.2-1997  
 started: 29.11.2021  
 finished: 29.11.2021  
 logged: AT  
 checked: MAB

| Depth (m)   | Test Results (blows / 100mm) |      |  |  |
|-------------|------------------------------|------|--|--|
|             | DCP6                         | DCP7 |  |  |
| 0.00 – 0.10 | 0.2                          | 0.2  |  |  |
| 0.10 – 0.20 | 0.2                          | 0.2  |  |  |
| 0.20 – 0.30 | 0.2                          | 0.2  |  |  |
| 0.30 – 0.40 | 0.2                          | SR   |  |  |
| 0.40 – 0.50 | 0.2                          |      |  |  |
| 0.50 – 0.60 | 1                            |      |  |  |
| 0.60 – 0.70 | 2                            |      |  |  |
| 0.70 – 0.80 | 4                            |      |  |  |
| 0.80 – 0.90 | 5                            |      |  |  |
| 0.90 – 1.00 | SR                           |      |  |  |
| 1.00 – 1.10 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.10 – 1.20 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.20 – 1.30 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.30 – 1.40 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.40 – 1.50 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.50 – 1.60 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.60 – 1.70 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.70 – 1.80 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.80 – 1.90 |                              |      |  |  |
| 1.90 – 2.00 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.00 – 2.10 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.10 – 2.20 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.20 – 2.30 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.30 – 2.40 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.40 – 2.50 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.50 – 2.60 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.60 – 2.70 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.70 – 2.80 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.80 – 2.90 |                              |      |  |  |
| 2.90 – 3.00 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.00 – 3.10 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.10 – 3.20 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.20 – 3.30 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.30 – 3.40 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.40 – 3.50 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.50 – 3.60 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.60 – 3.70 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.70 – 3.80 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.80 – 3.90 |                              |      |  |  |
| 3.90 – 4.00 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.00 – 4.10 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.10 – 4.20 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.20 – 4.30 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.30 – 4.40 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.40 – 4.50 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.50 – 4.60 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.60 – 4.70 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.70 – 4.80 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.80 – 4.90 |                              |      |  |  |
| 4.90 – 5.00 |                              |      |  |  |



Notes:  
 RL = ground surface level (m) AHD  
 TD = target depth, PR = practical refusal (15+ blows per 100mm), SR = "solid" refusal (no further penetration and "solid" ringing sound from slide hammer)

—◆— DCP6    —■— DCP7

## Appendix C

### Site Photos



**Photo 1**  
Overview of the  
proposed ski lift area.



**Photo 2**  
Continuation of Photo  
1



**Photo 3**  
Saturated/  
Waterlogged subsoil  
condition at bottom of  
the slope onsite.



**Photo 4**  
Hand Auger Borehole  
and DCP sounding at  
BH2 location.