

# REPORT

---

**WFH PROPERTIES LTD**

**MILLWATER - PRECINCT 3 STAGE 1  
Geotechnical Completion Report**

**Report prepared for:**

**WFH PROPERTIES LTD**

**Report prepared by:**

**Tonkin & Taylor Ltd**

**Distribution:**

**WFH PROPERTIES LTD**

**2 copies**

**WOODS**

**4 copies**

**Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (FILE)**

**1 copy**

**March 2014**

**T&T Ref: 21854.008/S1**



## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Description of Subdivision	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Earthworks Operations</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Plant	3
2.2	Construction Programme	3
2.3	Compaction Control	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Geotechnical Development Works</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Subsoil Drainage	5
3.2	Shear Keys	5
3.3	Undercuts	6
3.4	Reinforced Earth Slopes	6
3.5	Retaining Walls	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Project Evaluation / Building Design Considerations</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Bearing capacity for building foundations	8
4.2	Settlement	8
4.3	Retaining walls	8
4.4	Subsoil drainage	9
4.5	Natural subsoils	9
4.6	Stormwater	9
4.7	Service lines	10
4.8	Road subgrades	10
4.9	Topsoil	10
4.10	Expansive soils	11
<b>5</b>	<b>Statement of Professional Opinion as to the Suitability of Land for Building Development</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>Appendix A1:</b>	<b>Woods Drawings</b>
<b>Appendix A2:</b>	<b>T&amp;T Drawings</b>
<b>Appendix B:</b>	<b>Contractors Certificates</b>
<b>Appendix C:</b>	<b>NZS 3604:2011 Expansive Soils</b>
<b>Appendix D:</b>	<b>CSIRO – BTF18 – Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Homeowners Guide</b>
<b>Appendix E:</b>	<b>Post Earthworks Investigations</b>

## Executive summary

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd were engaged by WFH Properties Ltd through Woods Ltd to monitor and provide earthworks certification for forty eight Residential Lots contained within Precinct 3, Stage 1 of the Millwater Subdivision in Silverdale. Stage 1 comprises residential Lots 53, 54, 62 to 98 and 104 to 112 inclusive, accessways 500 and 501 and reserve Lots 818 and 819.

This report contains information required for subdivisional earthworks completion reporting, as well as outlining geotechnical design issues that need to be considered for subsequent building design and construction on each residential Lot.

Previous geotechnical investigation work across the subdivision was undertaken by Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (T&T) and reported in:

- T&T Ref. No. 21854.008, Silverdale North Precinct Three, Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated June 2008.

Initial bulk earthworks across Precinct 3, Stage 1 were certified in the Precinct 3 Geotechnical Completion Report:

- T&T Ref. No. 21854.008, Millwater Precinct 3 Geotechnical Completion Report, dated March 2010.

Woods Ltd was responsible for undertaking the subdivision engineering design.

Current civil earthworks commenced on site in September 2013 and were completed by February 2014, and comprised the following:

- Stripping of vegetation, organic materials and topsoil to stockpile;
- Minor cut to fill earthworks across parts of the site;
- Construction of two timber pole retaining walls (walls 2 and 4 on the T&T design drawings, Walls 1 and 2 on the Woods as-built drawings);
- Installation of roading and services.

Overall subdivisional soil types are moderately expansive (class M), based on laboratory testing undertaken in accordance with AS 2870:2011. On the basis of this classification, the soils lie outside the definition of good ground within NZS 3604:2011. Building foundations will require specific foundation design for expansive soils, with reference to AS 2870:2011.

Each residential Lot is considered to have a building platform area generally suitable for domestic residential development, subject to design issues outlined in Section 3 and recommendations outlined in the appendices relating to expansive soils, foundation design and home owner maintenance. Foundation design should proceed in accordance with Clauses 5.5.1 to 5.5.5 of this report, which requires specific geotechnical assessment or specific investigation & foundation design due to the presence of expansive soils.



# 1 Introduction

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (T&T) were engaged by WFH Properties Ltd through Woods Ltd to undertake earthworks compaction control and provide the geotechnical earthworks certification for the forty eight residential Lots of Precinct 3, Stage 1, of the Millwater Subdivision in Silverdale North. Stage 1 comprises residential Lots 53, 54, 62 to 98 and 104 to 112 inclusive, accessways 500 and 501 and reserve Lots 818 and 819, as shown on Woods Final Contour As-built Plans (Woods DWG Ref. 33301-01-AB-100).

Site investigations for the subdivision were undertaken by Tonkin & Taylor and reported in:

- T&T Ref. No. 21854.008, Silverdale North Precinct Three, Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated June 2008;

Initial bulk earthworks across Precinct 3, Stage 1 were undertaken between 2008 and 2010 and have been certified in the Precinct 3 Geotechnical Completion Report:

- T&T Ref. No. 21854.008, Millwater Precinct 3 Geotechnical Completion Report, dated March 2010.

The investigation report noted the presence of existing instability comprising landsliding, soil creep and shallow slope movement. These features were stabilised, and/or undercut and replaced with engineered fill, during development works.

Compaction control in terms of minimum shear strengths and maximum air voids was recommended and has been incorporated into our control of the works and, where applicable, included in completion reporting.

The scope of work covered by this completion report includes:

- Review of geotechnical investigation and completion reporting for the site;
- Monitoring and certification of earthworks operations;
- Assessment of soils for expansive conditions in accordance with AS 2870:2011<sup>1</sup>;
- Certification of completed Lots for residential development in accordance with NZS 3604:2011<sup>2</sup>.

Woods undertook subdivision engineering design and civil works construction observation. As-built plans showing final contours and cut and fill depths have been prepared by Woods and are attached in Appendix A1.

## 1.1 Description of Subdivision

The Millwater subdivision is situated to the north of the Silverdale Township, and west of the proposed Metro Park East reserve area, and comprises approximately 260 hectares. The subdivision is bound to the south and west by Wainui Road, to the north by the Orewa Estuary and to the east by the Orewa Estuary and the recently constructed Millwater Parkway. The original site comprised a mix of farm properties and associated dwellings and existing residential developments.

The Precinct 3, Stage 1 area of the Millwater subdivision is located within what is known as Precinct 3 in the Silverdale North Structure Plan. Precinct 3 is bound to the east by the Millwater Parkway and an existing stream, to the north by Bankside Road, to the west by Manuel Road and

<sup>1</sup> AS 2870:2011: Residential Slabs & Footings

<sup>2</sup> NZS 3604:2011: Timber Framed Buildings



to the south by existing pasture. An existing residence (the Stoney property) is located in the northwest corner of the Precinct. The site is shown on the as-built plans included in Appendix A1.

Stage 1 lies in the north western corner of the Precinct 3 area, bound to the north by Bankside Road, the east by Kingsway Primary School, the south by Stage 2 of Precinct 3 and the west by Manuel Road and the Stoney Property.

Pre-development gradients within the Stage 1 area were gentle to moderate with an overall fall to the southeast. A number of slip debris lobes and areas of instability had been identified within the investigation report and were remediated during bulk earthworks operations.

Post-development gradients within the Stage 1 area are gentle (1 in 5 to 1 in 15 (V:H)) and generally fall to the southeast. In order to form more level building platforms, several timber pole retaining walls have been constructed along some Lot boundaries.

Stage 1 is presently accessed from the existing Bankside Road.

## 2 Earthworks Operations

### 2.1 Plant

Initial bulk earthworks were undertaken by Hick Bros Civil Construction Ltd. More recent civil works have been completed by Hopper Construction Ltd (HCL). Various earthworks equipment was used to undertake the works, comprising D6 and D8 bulldozers and scoops, motor scrapers, tractors and discs, sheepsfoot compactors, padfoot rollers, and a number of 20 to 35 tonne excavators. This plant generally carried out all construction earthworks.

Specialist contractors and plant were brought on site for retaining wall and pavement construction.

### 2.2 Construction Programme

Initial bulk earthworks commenced from April 2008 through to February 2010 under Hick Bros control. These earthworks have previously been certified in the Geotechnical Completion Report for Precinct 3 (T&T Ref. 21854.008, dated March 2010). Relevant drawings from this bulk earthworks Geotechnical Completion Report are included in Appendix A, which show finished ground levels at the completion of bulk earthworks. Final earthworks and civil construction works for the residential Lots were under HCL's control and were undertaken progressively from September 2013 and were generally completed by February 2014.

Key Stage 1 civil earthworks components included:

- Stripping of vegetation, organic materials and topsoil to stockpile;
- Minor cut to fill earthworks across parts of the site;
- Construction of two timber pole retaining walls (walls 2 and 4);
- Installation of roading and services.

During the initial earthworks in the 2008 to 2010 earthworks seasons, maximum cut depth from the original bulk earthworked surface within Stage 1 was approximately 18 metres with fill heights from the original surface of up to 15 metres. Additional earthworks within the Stage 1 area have been minimal during the current civil earthworks, and generally only Lots within close proximity to the timber pole retaining walls have been affected.

Drawings prepared by Woods, showing the as-built contours, the cut/fill areas and depths and subsoil drainage systems are attached in Appendix A1. We note that two sets of As-Built Plans have been presented. The original plans (Woods Drawings 2010) show the bulk earthworks undertaken in the 2008 to 2010 seasons, while the second set of plans (Woods Drawings 2014) show the final civil earthworks undertaken in the 2013/2014 season.

Two shear keys were excavated into the underlying Northland Allochthon siltstone and sandstone, in the locations shown on the as-built plans (Woods Drawing P3-GCR-103-UC CFC) in Appendix A1, and also detailed on the appended T&T drawings 21854.008-510 to 517 in Appendix A2. These keys were constructed during the original bulk earthworks to provide stability of the development, especially where deeper, or steep fills were proposed. Substantial underfill drainage was installed during key construction and elsewhere across the stage, as shown on the Woods 2010 as-built plans in Appendix A1.

In order to provide for gentler finished gradients across Stage 1, two reinforced earth slopes (RE Slopes 1 and 2) were constructed during the original bulk earthworks and two timber pole retaining walls (Walls 2 and 4) were constructed during the recent civil earthworks operations. The location of the reinforced earth slopes are shown in T&T Drawing 21854.008-500 and typical

reinforced earth slope construction details are shown in T&T Drawing 21854.800-503 in Appendix A2. The locations of the timber pole retaining walls are shown on T&T Drawing 21854.008-RW-01 in Appendix A2. Long sections for retaining walls 2 and 4 are shown in T&T Drawings 21854.008-RW-04 and 21854.008-RW-5 in Appendix A2. Typical retaining wall construction details are presented in T&T Drawing 21854.008-RW-07.

## 2.3 Compaction Control

Compaction control criteria consisting of maximum allowable air voids and minimum allowable shear strengths were used for fill control. The fill specification outlined below was used for subdivisional earthworks. Specification details were as follows:

### Minimum Shear Strength and Maximum Air Voids Method

**Minimum Undrained Shear Strength** (Measured by insitu vane – IANZ calibrated)

#### General fills:

Average value not less than	140 kPa
Minimum single value	110 kPa

### Maximum Air Voids Percentage (as defined in NZS 4402:1986)

#### General fills:

Average value not more than	10%
Maximum single value	12%

The average corrected shear strength value was determined over any ten consecutive tests.

Regular in situ density, strength and water content tests were carried out on the filling at or in excess of the frequency recommended by NZS 4431:1989. Test results have previously been presented in the Precinct 3 Geotechnical Completion Report (T&T Ref. No. 21854.008, dated March 2010).

Control testing showed that the results for the filling were consistently meeting the required undrained shear strength and air voids criteria, demonstrating that the water content of placed fill was consistently at, or close to, optimum. To the best of our knowledge, any problems encountered were rectified by close monitoring of the selection of borrow materials, discing and remixing of the available soil types and minor reworking where required.



## 3 Geotechnical Development Works

### 3.1 Subsoil Drainage

A network of subsoil drains has been installed across Stage 1 during the original bulk earthworks, in addition to those drains installed as part of the shear key construction.

The drains comprised 600mm to 1 metre wide trenches, excavated to either 1 metre below the soil / rock interface, or 5 to 6 metres depth, and filled with:

- 160mm diameter, Hiway grade, perforated Novaflo pipes along the base of the trench;
- SAP50 scoria to within 1 metre of the ground surface (at time of construction);
- Bidim A19 geotextile filtercloth over the top of the scoria;
- Compacted, engineered fill within the top metre of the trench.

The drain pipes were connected to either the reticulated stormwater system or appropriate discharge points. Where discharge points are not into stormwater manholes, they have had a concrete collar installed to protect them from future damage.

The subsoil drainage system is shown on the T&T 2010 as-built plans (21854.008-500) in Appendix A2.

### 3.2 Shear Keys

Based on stability analyses undertaken as part of the investigation reporting (Ref 21854.008, Silverdale North Precinct Three, Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated June 2008), shear keys were identified as being required to provide satisfactory factors of safety against instability for the finished development of Stage 1.

Two shear keys were excavated within Stage 1 during the initial bulk earthworks in the locations shown on T&T Drawing 21854.008-500, included in Appendix A2. Excavations were inspected and mapped by a Geologist or Engineering Geologist to check that the keys had been extended sufficiently into the underlying rock materials and that there was no adverse structure or feature exposed within the excavation. Any areas of suspect ground, including areas of identified land-slippage, were removed under the instruction of our site Geologist and replaced with compacted, engineered fill, placed in accordance with the compaction specification described in Section 2.3 above.

Shear key long-sections were developed based on the mapping undertaken and are included in Appendix A2 (drawings 21854.008-510 to 517). These sections show the materials exposed within the excavations and relevant geological structural information mapped during our inspections.

Following completion of the excavations, drainage blankets were placed along the rear face of the shear keys, and comprised the following:

- 160mm diameter perforated Hiway grade Novaflo drain pipe: This pipe was run along the base of the rear of the excavation and connected through to either the reticulated stormwater system, via the subsoil drainage network, or to an appropriate discharge point. Additional Novaflo pipes were also installed along mid-height benches where appropriate and connected into the key drainage outlet system;
- SAP50 scoria: A layer of minimum 300mm thickness of SAP 50 was placed across the entire rear face, and extended to within 1.0m of the top of the key. It should be noted that the top of the key at this stage generally comprised the original ground surface;

- Bidim A19 geotextile filtercloth: This was placed over the surface of the SAP 50 scoria to prevent contamination of the drainage aggregate with bulk earthworks materials.

The rear face drainage blanket was extended up to at least 1 metre above the soil / rock interface to intercept groundwater flows which typically flow along this interface.

Stability analyses were undertaken on the finished bulk earthworks profiles, utilising information obtained during the shear key excavations, to confirm satisfactory factors of safety were achieved. The analyses were presented in the Geotechnical Completion Report (T&T Ref. 21854.008, dated March 2010) and are not included in this report. Subsequent earthworks for Stage 1 have been relatively minor and have not required additional stability analyses to be undertaken.

### 3.3 Undercuts

In a number of future residential Lot areas in Stage 1, initial earthworks operations resulted in exposure of the underlying rock materials. In these areas, the rock was undercut by 0.6m and replaced with engineered, compacted fill, placed in accordance with the bulk earthworks specification (Section 2.3 above).

The rock undercut was undertaken to seal off the underlying rock from ingress of surface water flows, to reduce the potential effects of expansive soils as the rock weathers, and to allow for ease of construction of domestic service connections.

The extents of the undercut areas are shown on the as-built plan P3-GCR-104-AUC in Appendix A1. The specific Stage 1 Lots affected are Lots 83 to 85, 88 to 90, 108 to 110 and 112.

### 3.4 Reinforced Earth Slopes

Two reinforced earth slopes (RE Slopes 1 and 2 – see drawing 21854.008-500) were constructed adjacent to the eastern boundary of Stage 1 during the initial bulk earthworks. These slopes comprise biaxial geogrids placed at 0.5m (vertical) intervals within the engineered, compacted earth fill. The grids extend up to within 1.5 (vertical) metres of the slope crest. They have been placed at various lengths, starting at the face of the slope. A typical cross-section through each of the RE Slopes is shown on T&T Drawing 21854.008-503 in Appendix A2.

The placement of the geogrid allows steeper finished gradients than is typically possible with bulk fills, and will minimise the risk of instability across the face of the slope, particularly where finished slope gradients are up to 1 in 2 (V:H).

Construction of the slopes comprised the following:

- placement and compaction of fill to the required levels;
- placement of the geogrid, ensuring that the grid is held tightly in place;
- spreading of fill across the surface of the geogrid with lightweight plant;
- compaction and placement of further fill up to the level of the next grid layer.

The fill was placed and compacted beyond the limit of the final slope face and then trimmed back to ensure full compaction of the slope face was achieved.

A drainage blanket was installed at the rear of the reinforced block of soil and comprises a minimum of 300mm thickness of SAP50 scoria, covered in Bidim A19 geotextile filtercloth. A 160mm diameter Novaflo pipe at the base of the drainage blanket provides a discharge outlet for any groundwater captured in the drainage blanket.



A commentary on the construction of specific parts of the works are as follows:

- Within RE Slope 1, the drainage blanket from the underlying Shear Key 2 was extended and used for the RE Slope drainage blanket. This drainage blanket connects via the subsoil drain network into the "Subsoil drain manhole" and then discharges into the stream along the eastern boundary of the site.
- Within RE Slope 2, the drainage blanket from the underlying Shear Key 2 was extended and used for the RE Slope drainage blanket. This drainage blanket connects to the reticulated stormwater system via RE Slope 3 (outside Stage 1) and then into stormwater manhole 200/1 (See T&T Drawing 21854.008-500 in Appendix A2).

These slopes have all been designed to accommodate construction of a lightweight structure of up to 10kPa distributed load at the crest of the slope.

### 3.5 Retaining Walls

Two timber pole retaining walls (Retaining Walls 2 and 4 on the T&T design drawings, 1 and 2 on the Woods As-builts) have been constructed during the recent Stage 1 civil earthworks. The walls were built from October 2013 through December 2014, with regular visits by an engineer from Tonkin & Taylor during construction to check that the works were generally in accordance with the design drawings and specifications.

Tonkin & Taylor project staff undertook observations of each foundation excavation (i.e. bored pile shaft), prior to placement of the timber piles and concrete, to confirm that the assumed design shear strength of 50 kPa was available. In all cases the in-situ shear strength test results confirmed that the minimum allowable criteria had been met.

T&T checked pile embedment depths, pile hole diameters and undertook observations of the timber piles and lagging used in the wall to confirm they met the requirements of the design. A certificate has been provided by the Contractor's supplier (TTT) certifying the H5 treatment levels of the timber delivered to site for use in the wall construction.

Following concreting of the piles, timber lagging was installed along the rear of the wall, in accordance with the design. A 110 mm diameter perforated Novaflo pipe was run along the base of the excavation and connected to the stormwater system, to discharge any captured groundwater. A layer of "SAP50" drainage scoria was placed against the rear face of the wall. A layer of geotextile filter cloth was placed over top of the SAP50 scoria, prior to placement of a clay and topsoil cap to seal off the SAP50 from surface water infiltration in accordance with the design.

Following completion of the wall, a 1.3m high, powder coated 'pool type' fence was constructed along the top of the wall.

Design drawings for the timber pole retaining walls are presented in Appendix A2.



## 4 Project Evaluation / Building Design Considerations

Ground conditions within Precinct 3, Stage 1 straddle a range of “design conditions” including cut ground, filled ground, expansive soils and slopes at, or steeper than, 1 in 3. The following sections set out relevant design issues.

### 4.1 Bearing capacity for building foundations

All filled and natural ground within the influence of conventional residential shallow strip and pad foundation loads generally has a geotechnical ultimate bearing capacity of 300kPa, as required by NZS 3604:2011. This corresponds to a factored (Ultimate Limit State) bearing capacity of 150kPa and working bearing capacity of 100kPa.

Due to the presence of expansive soils, foundation conditions fall outside the definition of “good ground” contained in NZS 3604:2011. In terms of AS 2870:2011, the soils present are considered to lie within Site Class M (moderately expansive) with characteristic surface movements anticipated to be in the range 20mm to 40mm. Due allowance should be made for expansive soils, as discussed in Section 4.10.

Where an ultimate bearing capacity greater than 300kPa is required to support any dwelling constructed outside the scope of NZS 3604:2011, further specific site investigation and design of foundations will be required. Rock was encountered at subgrade level within all or part of Lots 83 to 85 and 88 to 90. The rock in these lots was undercut by 600mm and backfilled with compacted engineered fill to facilitate foundation construction and service installation. Any deeper excavation into the rock should at least allow for use of a rock bucket and/or rock breaking equipment.

### 4.2 Settlement

On the basis of our fill inspections and compaction quality control testing, differential settlements induced by self-weight of the engineered fill should now be largely complete. Further settlements should be within normally accepted design tolerances with respect to conventional residential building development.

In order to minimise the risk of ground settlements exceeding 20 to 25 mm, NZS 3604:2011 allows a maximum fill surcharge of 600 mm over the building platform during future development. Filling in excess of this thickness should be subject to specific foundation design and assessment.

### 4.3 Retaining walls

It is not anticipated that significant retaining walls will be required due to the shallow grades across most of the Stage 1 Lots. However, if low walls are required (e.g. up to 1m retained height), then retaining wall design will be dependent on the site specific requirements. For preliminary design we recommend the use of the following geotechnical design parameters:

$$\gamma = 18\text{kN/m}^3,$$

$$c' = 0\text{kPa}$$

$$\phi' = 30^\circ,$$

$$K_a = 0.30,$$

$$K_p = 3.33,$$

“Su” for the embedment soil of 50kPa (subject to confirmation during construction)

These values are based on level ground above and below the wall and will require appropriate amendment to allow for slope, traffic and other surcharges or toe slopes, as applicable.

All retaining walls should include a layer of free draining granular fill immediately behind the wall covered with a 0.3m thick (minimum) clay cap, with intercepted groundwater seepage piped into the reticulated stormwater system.

Any walls greater than 1.5m retained height will require a geotechnical assessment, as a minimum, to ensure stability of the subject or adjacent Lot is not detrimentally affected.

The timber pole retaining walls constructed within the Precinct 3 Stage 1 area are shown on the Woods “Finished Contours” As Built Plan (Ref 33301-01-AB-100). These walls have been designed to accommodate a maximum 5kPa surcharge, although development immediately behind/above the walls is likely to be precluded by Council planning rules. The presence of these walls should be taken into account in any proposed works downslope of the walls, specifically to ensure that any proposed cuts do not undermine the base of the wall. In general, earthworks should be limited to no closer than 1.5m from the toe of the walls. The design plan and long section of the walls is also included in Appendix A2 for reference.

For clarity, the Lots that will need to consider the presence of the existing retaining walls are:

- Timber wall #2 – Lots 53, 54 and 62 to 64
- Timber wall #4 – Lots 65 to 71, 73, 74, 77, 79, 80 and 87

#### **4.4 Subsoil drainage**

Following gully muckouts during the initial bulk earthworks, groundwater drainage was accomplished by installation of Novaflo drains covered in a minimum thickness of 500mm of SAP50 scoria, which was then covered in geotextile cloth, to handle ground water flows.

The subsoil drainage system is shown on the appended underfill and drainage as-built plans, provided by Woods (P3-GCR-102-CFC in Appendix A1).

This drainage system is unlikely to be encountered during future site development and is expected to be maintenance free over the design life of the development. Any deep excavations should take account of the presence of these drains nonetheless. If a drain is encountered or damaged, repairs should be observed by a Chartered Professional (Geotechnical) Engineer familiar with this report, and notified to Auckland Council.

#### **4.5 Natural subsoils**

Following the completion of earthworks operations, T&T have undertaken additional site investigations comprising hand augered boreholes to determine the consistency of the subsoils. The subsoils are considered to have an ultimate bearing capacity of 300 kPa (150 kPa factored (ULS), 100 kPa working). Associated borehole logs and site plans are attached in Appendix E.

#### **4.6 Stormwater**

Public stormwater services have been installed within the Precinct 3, Stage 1 area and the Woods plans of these are included in Appendix A1 (Woods Ref. 33301-01-AB-300 to -306). Stormwater and runoff from roofs, decks and paved areas, together with discharges from retaining wall drains and other subsoil drains should be connected directly into the public stormwater drainage network.



## **4.7 Service lines**

Trench backfill has been compacted to minimise potential for future settlements. However, where building envelopes lie adjacent to or across service lines, all foundations should extend and be founded below the 45 degree zone of influence line from pipe inverts. This requirement is to avoid excessive pipe surcharges, and to allow for future maintenance of the system without detrimentally affecting adjacent structures. Subject to approval from Auckland Council, foundations may extend and bridge over service lines provided specific foundation design is undertaken.

Any disturbance of service lines in the future should be remediated to ensure the drains operation is not compromised.

A copy of the sewer and stormwater as-built plans (Woods Ref 33301-01-AB-300 to -306 and 33301-01-AB-400 to -406) is included in Appendix A1.

## **4.8 Road subgrades**

Based on the fill monitoring and site observations during development, filled and natural ground within the road and vehicle access Lots is considered generally suitable for the proposed residential pavements. Subgrade strength testing was carried out following excavation to formation levels along the road alignments. These subgrade test results were passed on to Woods for use in their pavement design. All road subgrades have been lime stabilised to assist in pavement strengths, and to minimise the impact of expansive soils on road pavements. Within natural (unstabilised) ground, a design CBR of 2% is considered appropriate, while within unstabilised filled areas, a design CBR of 7% is appropriate.

## **4.9 Topsoil**

Following completion of topsoil spreading and grassing, topsoil depths were measured in each of the Lots and these are shown on T&T Drawing 21854.008-S1-102 attached in Appendix E. Due to variations in placement depths and earth worked surface levels, topsoil depths may vary from those recorded.



## 4.10 Expansive soils

Expansive soils (or “reactive soils” using Australian terminology) are clay soils that undergo appreciable volume change upon changes in moisture content. The reactivity and the typical range of movement that could be expected from soils underlying any given building site depends on the amount of clay present, clay mineral type, and proportion, depth and distribution of clay throughout the soil profile. Moisture changes tend to occur slowly in clays and produce swelling upon wetting and shrinkage upon drying.

Apart from seasonal moisture changes (wet winters / dry summers) other factors that can influence soil moisture content include:

- Influence of garden watering and site drainage;
- The presence of large trees (especially fast growing Australian species such as eucalyptus) close to building envelopes, and;
- Initial soil moisture conditions at construction time.

Visually, expansive soils are noted for developing extensive cracking during dry periods (especially late summer through autumn in Auckland) and can be locally identified by this feature when sites are excavated and left for a week or two to dry out. Further information on expansive soils is given in Appendices C and D of this report.

In order to assess for the presence of expansive soils on this stage of the development, representative soil samples were retrieved from near surface strata and tested in our laboratory to determine soil shrinkage characteristics in accordance with AS 1289.7.1.1.

Based on the laboratory results (attached in Appendix E), the foundation soils on this stage of the subdivision lie outside the definition of ‘good ground’ as outlined in NZS 3604:2011. In terms of AS 2870:2011, the soils present are considered to lie within Site Class M (moderately expansive) with characteristic surface movements anticipated to be in the range of 20 mm to 40 mm.

Accordingly, building foundations on this subdivision will need to be subject to specific foundation design by a Chartered Professional Engineer familiar with the contents of this report and responsible for design of structural elements (including foundations) of the building. Reference should be made to AS 2870:2011 for assistance.

## 5 Statement of Professional Opinion as to the Suitability of Land for Building Development

I, Mr C.J. Freer of Tonkin & Taylor Ltd, P O Box 5271, Wellesley St, Auckland, hereby confirm that:

- 5.1 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer experienced in the field of geotechnical engineering and was retained by WFH Properties Ltd as the Geotechnical Engineer on Precinct 3, Stage 1 comprising residential Lots 53, 54, 62 to 98 and 104 to 112 inclusive, accessways 500 and 501 and reserve Lots 818 and 819 of the Millwater Residential Subdivision Development off the Millwater Parkway in Silverdale. Inspection and observation of the works have been carried out during construction by either myself or staff acting under my direction.
- 5.2 The extents of preliminary investigations are described in Tonkin & Taylor Ltd report Ref No. 21854.008, dated June 2008. Bulk earthworks certification of the broader Precinct 3 area was provided in the T&T Geotechnical Completion Report Ref. 21854.008, dated March 2010. The conclusions and recommendations of those documents have been re-evaluated in the preparation of this report.
- 5.3 The Contractor shall confirm that the work undertaken has been completed in accordance with the drawings, specifications and any variations issued and is consistent with the inspections and observations carried out by Tonkin & Taylor Ltd. Complete Certificates-Construction have been provided by the Contractors and are presented in Appendix B.
- 5.4 On the basis of our observations and inspections together with the information supplied by others, including the Contractor's Construction Certificate, it is my professional opinion, not to be construed as a guarantee that:
  - 5.4.1 The earth fills shown on the attached Woods drawings, Project No 33301, Millwater, Precinct 3, Stage 1 GCR, Drawing Number 33301-01-AB-120, have been generally placed in compliance with NZS 4431:1989.
  - 5.4.2 The completed earthworks give due regard to land slope and foundation stability considerations.
- 5.5 For Lots 53, 54, 62 to 98 and 104 to 112 inclusive:
  - 5.5.1 Foundation design
 

The filled and natural ground within residential Lot boundaries is considered generally suitable for the erection thereon of light timber framed, flexibly clad residential buildings not requiring specific design in terms of NZS 3604:2011 and related documents subject to clauses 5.5.2, 5.5.3, 5.5.4 and 5.5.5.
  - 5.5.2 Bearing capacity
 

Foundation design for these Lots should limit geotechnical ultimate bearing capacity to 300 kPa (factored (ULS) 150 kPa, working 100 kPa). This is as specified in NZS 3604:2011.
  - 5.5.3 Expansive soils
 

Foundation soils lie outside the definition of 'good ground' in NZS 3604:2011 due to the presence of expansive clay soils,. Soils are considered to lie in Site Class M (moderately expansive) as defined in AS 2870:2011 with anticipated characteristic surface ground movements of 20mm to 40mm.



#### 5.5.3.1 Specific foundation design for expansive soils

Specific foundation design should be undertaken by a Chartered Professional Engineer familiar with the contents of this report and responsible for design of structural elements (including foundations) of the building.

The minimum specific design requirements set for expansive soils within this clause are:

- i) Minimum foundation embedment of 600 mm following topsoil removal and benching of building platform areas to finished ground levels
- ii) Four bar steel reinforcing cages should be used
- iii) For buildings having brittle exterior cladding such as brick veneer, stucco plaster, solid plaster, block work, styrofoam type cladding or sprayed plaster over harditex systems etc the potential effects of seasonal ground movements need to be considered by the building designer.

The above minimum requirements within this clause may be superseded if individual engineers are able to demonstrate their specific design solutions are applicable to site soil conditions to the satisfaction of Auckland Council. Specific design may be undertaken by first principles or by reference to AS 2870:2011, Section 4 and related documents.

#### 5.5.4 Building maintenance - Owners responsibility

The owner is responsible for maintenance of the building and site and should be familiar with the performance and maintenance requirements set out in CSIRO sheet BTF18 Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Home Owners Guide. A copy of this sheet is included in Appendix D.

#### 5.5.5 Retaining walls / Earthworks

No retaining wall construction in excess of 1.5 metres height and no earthworks involving fills or unsupported cuts in excess of 600mm depth should take place on these Lots unless endorsed by a suitable design undertaken by a Chartered Professional (Geotechnical) Engineer familiar with the contents of this report and responsible for design of structural elements of the building.

Where existing walls are located on property boundaries, consideration shall be given to the potential impacts on these walls of any additional proposed cuts, fills, surcharges or new walls.

#### 5.6 Underfill (Subsoil) drainage

Underfill (Subsoil) drains have been installed during subdivisional development in the locations shown on the Woods Undercut Surface As-Built Plan (P3-GCR-103-UC CFC) in Appendix A1. These drains are considered to be maintenance free. Although future works are unlikely to encounter the drains, their location should be considered prior to designing deep foundations and, if damaged, repairs should be observed by a Chartered



Professional (Geotechnical) Engineer familiar with this report, and notified to Auckland Council.

#### 5.7 Stormwater and Sanitary Sewer Lines

Where building envelopes lie adjacent to or across service lines, all foundations should extend and be founded below the 45 degree zone of influence line extending from pipe inverts. This requirement is to avoid excessive pipe surcharges, and to allow for future maintenance of the system without detrimentally affecting adjacent structures. Subject to approval from Auckland Council, foundations may extend and bridge over service lines provided specific foundation design is undertaken. A copy of the stormwater and sanitary sewer as-built plans are included in Appendix A (Woods Ref 33301-01-AB-300 to -306 and 33301-01-AB-400 to -406).

#### 5.8 Road and Access Lots

Based on the fill monitoring and site observations undertaken during site development, the filled and natural ground within Precinct 3, Stage 1 is considered generally suitable for residential road and accessway construction. Scala penetrometer testing should be undertaken when road subgrades have been prepared to confirm subgrade strengths. Subject to such subgrade testing, within natural ground a design CBR of 2% is recommended, while within filled ground a design CBR of 7% should be available.

#### 5.9 Unexpected ground conditions

Our assessment is based on interpolation between borehole positions, site observations and periodic earthworks control visits. Local variations in ground conditions may occur. Although highly unlikely, unfavourable ground conditions may be encountered during site benching and footing excavations. It is important that we be contacted in this eventuality, or in the event that any variation in subsoil conditions from those described in the report are found. Design assistance is available as required to accommodate any unforeseen ground conditions present.

## 6 Applicability


The professional opinion contained within this report is furnished to WFH Properties Ltd with respect to the particular brief given to us, and it may not be relied upon in other contexts or for any other purpose without our prior review and agreement.

It does not remove the necessity for the normal inspection of foundation conditions at the time of erection of any dwelling, especially in cases where concrete blockwork and/or brick veneer or stucco plaster buildings are sited partly on fill or partly on natural ground, or where they are entirely sited on filling whose depth changes significantly across the building platform.

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd

Environmental and Engineering Consultants

Report prepared by:



Andrew Linton

Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Authorised for Tonkin & Taylor by:



Chris Freer

Project Director

Technical Review by Robert Hillier, Geotechnical Group Manager

Jason Kelly

jkk25022014.P3 Stage 1 GCR.doc

## **Appendix A:      Field Data Sheets**



## **Appendix A1: Woods Drawings**

### **WOODS DRAWINGS (2010)**

- **P3-GCR-101-FC**      **Final Contours**
- **P3-GCR-102-CFC**      **Cut Fill Contours from Original Surface**
- **P3-GCR-103-UC CFC**      **Cut fill contours including undercuts**
- **P3-GCR-104-AUC**      **Plan showing all undercut areas**

### **WOODS DRAWINGS (2014)**

- **33301-01-AB-100**      **Final Contour Plan**
- **33301-01-AB-120**      **Cut/Fill Contour Plan**
- **33301-01-AB-300 to -306**      **Stormwater As-Built Plans**
- **33301-01-AB-400 to -405**      **Wastewater As-Built Plans**



# NOTES

1. CONTOURS ARE AT 1.0m INTERVALS



# LEGEND

--- PRECINCT 3 GCR EXTENTS

# CERTIFICATION


I, Jamie Alastair White  
LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR, HEREBY CERTIFY THE  
ACCURACY OF THIS AS-BUILT INFORMATION.

SIGNED: [Signature]  
LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR

DATE: 18/2/2010

# NOTES

1. HEIGHTS ARE IN TERMS OF AUCKLAND DATUM 1946
2. COORDINATES ARE IN TERMS OF NZGD2000 MOUNT EDEN CIRCUIT
3. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.



## LATEST REVISION DETAILS

1. FOR ASBUILT

NAME DATE  
JAW FEB 2010

CLIENT:



**MILLWATER**  
PRECINCT 3  
FINAL EARTHWORKS CONTOURS  
ASBUILT PLAN  
RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL



**WOODS**  
Engineers. Surveyors. Planners.

PO BOX 6752, WELLESLEY ST, AUCKLAND 1141  
BLDG 3, LEVEL 4, 666 GREAT SOUTH ROAD, PENROSE  
PHONE +64 9 571 2470 FAX +64 9 571 3405 WWW.WOODS.CO.NZ

DESIGNED: WOODS	ASBUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: JAW
APPROVED:	SURVEYED: WOODS
JOB NUMBER: 33300	SCALE: 1:1250 @ A1 1:2500 @ A3
ISSUED: FEB 2010	REV. 1
DWG. NO. P3-GCR-101-FC	



# NOTES

1. CONTOURS ARE AT 1.0m INTERVALS



## LEGEND

- P3 GCR EXTENTS
- FILL CONTOURS
- CUT CONTOURS
- ZERO CONTOURS
- UNDERFILL DRAINS

## CERTIFICATION


I, Janie Alastair White, LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR, HEREBY CERTIFY THE ACCURACY OF THIS AS-BUILT INFORMATION.

SIGNED.....Janie R.....  
LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR

DATE 18/2/2010

## NOTES

1. HEIGHTS ARE IN TERMS OF AUCKLAND DATUM 1946
2. COORDINATES ARE IN TERMS OF NZGD2000 MOUNT EDEN CIRCUIT
3. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.



### LATEST REVISION DETAILS

1. FOR ASBUILT

NAME	DATE
JAW	FEB 2010

CLIENT:



### MILLWATER PRECINCT 3

CUT/FILL CONTOURS - ORIGINAL SURFACE TO FINAL EARTHWORKS SURFACE  
ASBUILT PLAN  
RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL




**WOODS**  
Engineers. Surveyors. Planners.

PO BOX 4752, WELLESLEY ST, AUCKLAND 1141  
BLDG 3, LEVEL 4, 666 GREAT SOUTH ROAD, PENROSE  
PHONE +64 9 571 2470 FAX +64 9 571 3403 WWW.WOODS.CO.NZ

DESIGNED: WOODS	AS BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: JAW
APPROVED:	SURVEYED: WOODS
JOB NUMBER: 33300	SCALE: 1:1250 @ A1 1:2500 @ A3
ISSUED: FEB 2010	
DWC. NO. P3-GCR-102-CFC	REV. 1





# NOTES

1. CONTOURS ARE AT 1.0m INTERVALS



## LEGEND

- P3 GCR EXTENTS
- FILL CONTOURS
- CUT CONTOURS
- ZERO CONTOURS
- UNDERFILL DRAINS

## CERTIFICATION

I, Jonie Alister White, LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR, HEREBY CERTIFY THE ACCURACY OF THIS AS-BUILT INFORMATION.

SIGNED: [Signature] LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR

DATE: 22/3/2010

## NOTES

1. HEIGHTS ARE IN TERMS OF AUCKLAND DATUM 1946
2. COORDINATES ARE IN TERMS OF NZGD2000 MOUNT EDEN CIRCUIT
3. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.

### LATEST REVISION DETAILS

1. FOR ASBUILT

NAME: JAW  
DATE: FEB 2010

### CLIENT:



## MILLWATER PRECINCT 3

CUT/FILL CONTOURS - UNDERCUT SURFACE TO FINAL EARTHWORKS SURFACE  
ASBUILT PLAN  
RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL




**WOODS**  
Engineers, Surveyors, Planners.

PO BOX 6752, WELLESLEY ST, AUCKLAND 1141  
BLDG 3, LEVEL 4, 666 GREAT SOUTH ROAD, PENROSE  
PHONE +64 9 571 2470 FAX +64 9 571 3405 WWW.WOODS.CO.NZ

DESIGNED: WOODS	AS BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: JAW
APPROVED:	SURVEYED: WOODS
JOB NUMBER: 33300	SCALE: 1:1250 @ A1 1:2500 @ A3
ISSUED: FEB 2010	
DWG. NO. P3-CCR-103-UC CFC	REV. 1





# LEGEND

- UNDERCUT AREAS
- HOED AREAS  
(150mm UNDERCUT & REPLACED, 300mm HOED)
- UNDERFILL DRAINS



## CERTIFICATION

I, Janie Alister Woods LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR, HEREBY CERTIFY THE ACCURACY OF THIS AS-BUILT INFORMATION.

SIGNED [Signature] LICENSED CADASTRAL SURVEYOR

DATE 23/2/2010

## NOTES

- HEIGHTS ARE IN TERMS OF AUCKLAND DATUM 1946
- COORDINATES ARE IN TERMS OF NZGD2000 MOUNT EDEN CIRCUIT
- LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.

### LATEST REVISION DETAILS

1. FOR ASBUILT

NAME DATE  
JAW FEB 2010

CLIENT:



**MILLWATER**  
PRECINCT 3  
AREAS OF UNDERCUT  
ASBUILT PLAN  
RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL



**WOODS**  
Engineers, Surveyors, Planners.

PO BOX 4752, WELLESLEY ST., AUCKLAND 1141  
BLDG 3, LEVEL 4, 666 GREAT SOUTH ROAD, PENROSE  
PHONE +64 9 571 2470 FAX +64 9 571 3405 WWW.WOODS.CO.NZ

DESIGNED: WOODS	AS BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: JAW
APPROVED:	SURVEYED: WOODS
JOB NUMBER: 33300	SCALE: 1:1250 @ A1 1:2500 @ A3
ISSUED: FEB 2010	REV. 1
DWG. NO. P3-GCR-104-AUC	






# LEGEND

- 40--- CONTOURS (0.5m INTERVAL)
- STAGE 1 EXTENTS

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:

- The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000
- The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
 Date: 14/3/14  
 Name: TIM JAMES

REVISION DETAILS	NAME	DATE	CLIENT:
1. DRAWING ISSUED	SM	11/03/2014	



## MILLWATER PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 ASBUILT FINAL CONTOUR PLAN AUCKLAND COUNCIL




DESIGNED:	ASBUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: SM
APPROVED:	SURVEYED: WOODS
JOB NUMBER: 33301	SCALE: 1:1500 @ A3
ISSUED: MARCH 2014	
DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-100	REV. 1














**LEGEND**

OVERLAND FLOW

NEW STORMWATER

EXISTING STORMWATER

STAGE 1 EXTENTS

I certify that these As-Built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:  
The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000  
The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed: Registered Professional Surveyor


Date: 14/3/14

Name: Tim James

- NOTES**
1. ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
  2. ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLIES WITH AC STANDARDS
  3. ALL BERM SUMP AND CESSPIT LEADS ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES CLASS 4 (Z) RRJ. ALL OTHER PIPELINES ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE CLASS 2 (X) RRJ UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  4. ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS AND ACCESSWAYS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED.
  5. ALL SW 100mm DIA. RAMPED RISERS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED AND CAPPED OFF 1.0m BELOW THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE.
  6. ALL PRIVATE DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS ARE 100mmØ.
  7. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
  8. ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.

REVISION DETAILS		NAME	DATE	CLIENT:
1. DRAWING ISSUED		SM	11/03/2014	
		<b>MILLWATER</b> PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 STORMWATER ASBUILT PLAN SHEET 1 OF 6 AUCKLAND COUNCIL		
		DESIGNED: WOODS	AS-BUILT	
		CHECKED:	DRAWN: SM	
		APPROVED:	SURVEYED:	
		JOB NUMBER: 33301	SCALE: 1:500 @ A3	
		ISSUED: MARCH 2014		
		DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-301	REV. 1	






#### LEGEND

OVERLAND FLOW  
NEW STORMWATER  
EXISTING STORMWATER  
STAGE 1 EXTENTS

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:  
The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000  
The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Registered Professional Surveyor  
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: Tim JAMES

#### NOTES

1. ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
2. ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLIES WITH AC STANDARDS
3. ALL BERM SUMP AND CESSPIT LEADS ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES CLASS 4 (Z) RRJ. ALL OTHER PIPELINES ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE CLASS 2 (X) RRJ UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
4. ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS AND ACCESSWAYS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED.
5. ALL SW 100mm DIA. RAMPED RISERS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED AND CAPPED OFF 1.0m BELOW THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE.
6. ALL PRIVATE DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS ARE 100mmØ.
7. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
8. ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.

REVISION DETAILS	NAME	DATE
1. DRAWING ISSUED	SM	1/03/2014




### MILLWATER PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 STORMWATER ASBUILT PLAN SHEET 2 OF 6 AUCKLAND COUNCIL



DESIGNED: WOODS	AS-BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: SM
APPROVED:	SURVEYED:
JOB NUMBER: 33301	SCALE: 1:500 @ A3
ISSUED: MARCH 2014	
DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-302	REV. 1





**LEGEND**

OVERLAND FLOW  
NEW STORMWATER  
EXISTING STORMWATER  
STAGE 1 EXTENTS


I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:  
The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000  
The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1948 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Registered Professional Surveyor  
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: TINA JAMES


- NOTES**
1. ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
  2. ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLIES WITH AC STANDARDS
  3. ALL BERM SUMP AND CESSPIT LEADS ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES CLASS 4 (Z) RRJ. ALL OTHER PIPELINES ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE CLASS 2 (X) RRJ UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  4. ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS AND ACCESSWAYS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED.
  5. ALL SW 100mm DIA. RAMPED RISERS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED AND CAPPED OFF 1.0m BELOW THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE.
  6. ALL PRIVATE DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS ARE 100mmØ.
  7. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
  8. ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.

REVISION DETAILS		NAME	DATE	CLIENT:
1. DRAWING ISSUED		SM	11/03/2014	
		<b>MILLWATER</b> PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 STORMWATER ASBUILT PLAN SHEET 3 OF 6 AUCKLAND COUNCIL		
DESIGNED: WOODS		AS-BUILT		
CHECKED:		DRAWN: SM		
APPROVED:		SURVEYED:		
JOB NUMBER: 33301		SCALE: 1:500 @ A3		
ISSUED: MARCH 2014				
DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-303		REV. 1		









# LEGEND

OVERLAND FLOW	
NEW STORMWATER	
EXISTING STORMWATER	
STAGE 1 EXTENTS	

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:  
The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000  
The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Registered Professional Surveyor  
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: TIM JAMES

# NOTES

- ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLIES WITH AC STANDARDS
- ALL BERM SUMP AND CESSPIT LEADS ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES CLASS 4 (Z) RRJ. ALL OTHER PIPELINES ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE CLASS 2 (X) RRJ UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS AND ACCESSWAYS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED.
- ALL SW 100mm DIA. RAMPED RISERS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED AND CAPPED OFF 1.0m BELOW THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE.
- ALL PRIVATE DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS ARE 100mmØ.
- LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
- ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.




REVISION DETAILS	NAME	DATE
1. DRAWING ISSUED	SM	11/03/2014



**MILLWATER**  
PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1  
STORMWATER ASBUILT PLAN  
SHEET 5 OF 6  
AUCKLAND COUNCIL

DESIGNED: WOODS	AS-BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: SM
APPROVED:	SURVEYED:
JOB NUMBER: 33301	SCALE: 1:500 @ A3
ISSUED: MARCH 2014	
DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-305	REV. 1






Lot 2 DP 428122


KINGSWAY PRIMARY SCHOOL

# LEGEND

OVERLAND FLOW  
NEW STORMWATER  
EXISTING STORMWATER  
STAGE 1 EXTENTS




I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:  
The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000  
The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Registered Professional Surveyor  
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: TIM JAMES

# NOTES

1. ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
2. ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLIES WITH AC STANDARDS
3. ALL BERM SUMP AND CESSPIT LEADS ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES CLASS 4 (Z) RRJ. ALL OTHER PIPELINES ARE REINFORCED CONCRETE CLASS 2 (X) RRJ UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
4. ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS AND ACCESSWAYS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED.
5. ALL SW 100mm DIA, RAMPED RISERS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED AND CAPPED OFF 1.0m BELOW THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE.
6. ALL PRIVATE DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS ARE 100mmØ.
7. LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
8. ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.



REVISION DETAILS	NAME	DATE
1. DRAWING ISSUED	SM	11/03/2014




**MILLWATER**  
PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1  
STORMWATER ASBUILT PLAN  
SHEET 6 OF 6  
AUCKLAND COUNCIL



DESIGNED: WOODS	AS-BUILT
CHECKED:	DRAWN: SM
APPROVED:	SURVEYED:
JOB NUMBER: 33301	SCALE: 1:500 @ A3
ISSUED: MARCH 2014	
DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-306	REV. 1





## NOTES

- ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLY WITH AC STANDARD DETAIL DRAWINGS 18000 SHEET 4.4 & SHEET 4.6 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED. ALL LPS ROAD CROSSINGS ARE THROUGH DUCTS.
- ALL LPS BOUNDARY KIT CONNECTIONS TO MAIN LINES ARE 50mmØ.
- PIPE TYPE SDR 11, PE100 PN16 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- LPS PIPE SIZE SHOWN ARE EXTERNAL DIAMETERS.
- LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
- ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.

## LEGEND

BOUNDARY KIT	BK60
ISOLATION VALVE	IV
FLUSHING POINT	FP
AIR VALVE	AV
BLANK CAP	C
LOW PRESSURE SEWER	
EXISTING LOW PRESSURE SEWER	

NOTE - LOTS 104-112 PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED IN PRECINCT 4 STAGE 1A


SCHEDULE OF COORDINATES		
FLUSH PIT		
	mE	mN
FP1	1749728.17	5947461.61
FP2	1749810.23	5947409.27
ISOLATION VALVE		
	mE	mN
IV1	1749789.84	5947608.89
IV2	1749792.15	5947608.25
IV3	1749791.52	5947607.82
IV4	1749728.30	5947458.99
IV5	1749812.12	5947408.35
IV6	1749835.87	5947441.67
IV7	1749879.94	5947490.71
IV8	1749931.67	5947556.55
IV9	1749931.94	5947556.26
IV10	1749931.99	5947556.63
AIR VALVE		
	mE	mN
AV1	1749725.36	5947461.77
BLANK CAP		
	mE	mN
BC1	1749763.79	5947614.11
BC2	1749717.28	5947443.40
BC3	1749810.16	5947402.96

BOUNDARY KIT BOX		
	mE	mN
BK33	1749730.30	5947433.83
BK34	1749730.76	5947434.58
BK59	1749783.61	5947570.19
BK60	1749783.46	5947569.34
BK61	1749770.38	5947526.35
BK62	1749770.02	5947525.51
BK63	1749747.97	5947487.64
BK64	1749747.44	5947486.92
BK65	1749800.88	5947567.33
BK66	1749800.64	5947566.53
BK67	1749790.73	5947530.28
BK68	1749790.51	5947529.60
BK69	1749775.85	5947497.78
BK70	1749775.29	5947497.11
BK71	1749765.72	5947481.61
BK72	1749831.59	5947437.96
BK73	1749801.98	5947456.99
BK74	1749801.88	5947459.22
BK75	1749846.87	5947455.41
BK76	1749862.24	5947472.36
BK77	1749847.41	5947456.10
BK78	1749862.77	5947473.04
BK79	1749844.46	5947516.65
BK80	1749844.77	5947517.84
BK81	1749857.27	5947512.37
BK82	1749892.41	5947506.05
BK83	1749904.63	5947519.57
BK84	1749905.20	5947520.25
BK85	1749870.80	5947569.54
BK86	1749870.01	5947570.04
BK87	1749852.24	5947576.10
BK88	1749907.95	5947566.59
BK89	1749948.08	5947600.96
BK90	1749947.86	5947600.13
BK91	1749907.18	5947567.10
BK92	1749879.61	5947584.91
BK93	1749878.76	5947585.27
BK94	1749846.11	5947596.01
BK95	1749845.25	5947596.27
BK96	1749808.65	5947605.42
BK97	1749807.85	5947605.67
BK98	1749790.53	5947609.91

DENOTES BUILT FOR FUTURE STAGE

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:

- The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000
- The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: TIM JAMES

REVISION DETAILS	NAME	DATE
1. DRAWING ISSUED	SM	11/03/2014


CLIENT: 

## MILLWATER PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 WASTEWATER (LPS) ASBUILT PLAN OVERALL AUCKLAND COUNCIL




DESIGNED:	WOODS	AS-BUILT
CHECKED:		SM
APPROVED:		
JOB NUMBER:	33301	SCALE: 1:1500 @ A3
ISSUED:	MARCH 2014	
DWG. NO.	33301-01-AB-400	REV. 1















**LEGEND**

BOUNDARY KIT	BK60
ISOLATION VALVE	IV
FLUSHING POINT	FP
AIR VALVE	AV
BLANK CAP	C
LOW PRESSURE SEWER	
EXISTING LOW PRESSURE SEWER	

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:


- The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000
- The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1948 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:   
Registered Professional Surveyor

Date: 14/3/14


Name: Tim JAMES

- NOTES**
- ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
  - ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLY WITH AC STANDARD DETAIL DRAWINGS 18000 SHEET 4.4 & SHEET 4.6 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  - ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED. ALL LPS ROAD CROSSINGS ARE THROUGH DUCTS.
  - ALL LPS BOUNDARY KIT CONNECTIONS TO MAIN LINES ARE 50mmØ.
  - PIPE TYPE SDR 11, PE100 PN16 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  - LPS PIPE SIZE SHOWN ARE EXTERNAL DIAMETERS.
  - LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
  - ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.



REVISION DETAILS		NAME	DATE	CLIENT:							DESIGNED: WOODS		AS-BUILT		
1. DRAWING ISSUED		SM	11/03/2014			<p>MILLWATER PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 WASTEWATER (LPS) ASBUILT PLAN SHEET 3 OF 5 AUCKLAND COUNCIL</p>						CHECKED:		DRAWN: SM	
												APPROVED:		SURVEYED:	
												JOB NUMBER: 33301		SCALE: 1:500 @ A3	
												ISSUED: MARCH 2014			
												DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-403		REV. 1	











LEGEND	
BOUNDARY KIT	BK60
ISOLATION VALVE	IV
FLUSHING POINT	FP
AIR VALVE	AV
BLANK CAP	C
LOW PRESSURE SEWER	
EXISTING LOW PRESSURE SEWER	

I certify that these As-built Plans are an accurate record of the works undertaken and that:

- The coordinates (X,Y) are in terms of NZTM on NZGD2000
- The Levels (Z) are in terms of Auckland Vertical Datum 1946 (MSL) LINZ datum

Signed:  Registered Professional Surveyor  
Date: 14/3/14  
Name: TIM JAMES

- NOTES**
- ALL WORKS AND MATERIALS COMPLY WITH AC STANDARDS FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.
  - ALL PIPE BEDDING COMPLY WITH AC STANDARD DETAIL DRAWINGS 18000 SHEET 4.4 & SHEET 4.6 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  - ALL PIPE CROSSINGS UNDER ROADS HAVE BEEN HARDFILL BACKFILLED. ALL LPS ROAD CROSSINGS ARE THROUGH DUCTS.
  - ALL LPS BOUNDARY KIT CONNECTIONS TO MAIN LINES ARE 50mmØ.
  - PIPE TYPE SDR 11, PE100 PN16 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
  - LPS PIPE SIZE SHOWN ARE EXTERNAL DIAMETERS.
  - LOT BOUNDARIES ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL SURVEY.
  - ASBUILT DATA HAS BEEN SOURCED FROM A COMBINATION OF WOODS SURVEY MEASURED DATA AND CONTRACTOR RECEIVED DATA.



<b>REVISION DETAILS</b> 1. DRAWING ISSUED		NAME	DATE	CLIENT:
		SM	11/03/2014	
				
<b>MILLWATER</b> PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1 WASTEWATER (LPS) ASBUILT PLAN SHEET 5 OF 5 AUCKLAND COUNCIL				
			DESIGNED: WOODS CHECKED: SM APPROVED: SM JOB NUMBER: 33301 ISSUED: MARCH 2014 DWG. NO. 33301-01-AB-405	
			<b>AS-BUILT</b> DRAWN: SM SURVEYED: SM SCALE: 1:500 @ A3 REV. 1	



## **Appendix A2: T&T Drawings**

### **T&T DRAWINGS (2010)**


- 21854.008-500 Geotechnical Works Plan
- 21854.008-501 Geological Cross Sections (1 of 2)
- 21854.008-502 Geological Cross Sections (2 of 2)
- 21854.008-503 Typical Reinforced Earth Slope Details
- 21854.008-510 Overall Shear Key Plan
- 21854.008-511 Shear Key 1 Plan
- 21854.008-512 Shear Key 2 Plan
- 21854.008-514 Shear Key – Legends and Definitions of Terms
- 21854.008-516 Shear Key 2 – Upslope Face Long Section (1 of 3)
- 21854.008-517 Shear Key 2 – Upslope Face Long Section (2 of 3)
- 21854.008-518 Shear Key 2 – Upslope Face Long Section (3 of 3)

### **T&T DRAWINGS (2013)**

- |                       |                                       |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| • 21854.008 – RW - 01 | Retaining Walls 2 and 4 – Layout Plan |
| • 21854.008 – RW - 04 | Retaining Wall 2 – Long Section       |
| • 21854.008 – RW - 05 | Retaining Wall 4 – Long Section       |
| • 21854.008 – RW - 07 | Retaining Walls – Typical Details     |



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-500.dwg, 500, 28/03/2014 2:50:31 p.m., agj, 1:1



				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-500.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>		
				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
0	First Issue			COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE			

NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
2. Base information supplied by Woods data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb. 10.
3. Coordinates in terms of New Zealand Mount Eden Local Circuit, NZD2000.
4. Cadastral boundary information provided by Wood & Partners Consultants Ltd.
REFERENCE :


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering  
Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT


CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES MILLWATER PRECINCT 3
TITLE	GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Geotechnical Works Plan
SCALE (AT A3 SIZE)	1:2500
DWG. No.	21854.008-500
REV.	0




L:\21854\21854.008 - Predict 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-501-502.dwg, 501, 10/01/2014 4:16:53 p.m., agl, 1:1



SECTION I  
SCALE 1:2000



SECTION L  
SCALE 1:2000



SECTION M  
SCALE 1:2000

LEGEND	
	Colluvium
	Engineered fill
	Northland Allochthon

A3 SCALE 1:2000  
0 20 40 60 80 100 (m)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-501-502.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>		
				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
0	First Issue			COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		
REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE			

- NOTES :
- All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
  - Excavated profiles based upon Woods survey, data file P3-3D. Contours Cut-Fill undercut .dwg, date: February 2010.

REFERENCE :



**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental &  
Engineering Consultants


Auckland 105 Carlton Gore Rd. Newmarket  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
Email : auck@tonkin.co.nz  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT


CLIENT, PROJECT		WFH PROPERTIES LTD MILLWATER PRECINCT 3	
TITLE		GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Geological Cross Sections (1 of 2)	
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.	
1:2000	21854.008-501	0	



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-501-502.dwg, 502, 10/01/2014 4:20:57 p.m., agj, 1:1



SECTION 0  
SCALE 1:2000 500



SECTION P  
SCALE 1:2000 500

LEGEND

	Colluvium
	Engineered fill
	Northland Allochthon



				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE :	\\21854.008-501-502.dwg	
				APPROVED :	<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>	
0	First Issue			This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :

- All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
- Excavated profiles based upon Woods survey, data file P3-3D. Contours Cut-Fill undercut .dwg, date: February 2010.

REFERENCE :

**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental &  
Engineering Consultants


Auckland 105 Carlton Gore Rd. Newmarket  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
Email : auck@tonkin.co.nz  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT


CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES LTD MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE	GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Geological Cross Sections (2 of 2)		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	1:2000	DWG. No.	21854.008-502
		REV.	0



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-503-505.dwg, 503, 10/01/2014 4:21:47 p.m., agj, 1:1



SECTION 1 SLOPE 1  
SCALE 1:200



SECTION 2 SLOPE 2  
SCALE 1:200

LEGEND	
2.0m	Tensor SS20 (secondary) reinforcement (number indicates grid length)
7.0m	Tensor RE40 (primary) reinforcement (number indicates grid length)
11.0m	Tensor RE55 (primary) reinforcement (number indicates grid length)
15.0m	Tensor RE80 (primary) reinforcement (number indicates grid length)

A3 SCALE 1:200  
0 2 4 6 8 10 (m)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-503-505.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
0	First Issue			This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
REFERENCE :


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT

CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES MILLWATER PRECINCT 3
TITLE	GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Typical Reinforced Earth Slope Details
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.
1:200	21854.008-503
	REV. 0



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-510.dwg, 510, 13/01/2014 12:09:15 p.m., agj, 1:1



A3 SCALE 1:2000  
0 20 40 60 80 100 (m)

	DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar.10
	DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar.10
	DESIGN CHECKED :		
	DRAFTING CHECKED :		
	CADFILE :	\\21854.008-510.dwg	
	APPROVED :	<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>	
0	First Issue	This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved	
REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE
COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED			


NOTES :	
1.	All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
2.	Base information supplied by Woods data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb.10.
3.	Coordinates in terms of New Zealand Mount Eden Local Circuit, NZD2000.
4.	Base plan supplied by Woods. Reference dwg, "millwater P3 Base_25 July 2013 2.dwg"
REFERENCE :	

**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT			
CLIENT, PROJECT			
WFH PROPERTIES			
MILLWATER PRECINCT 3			
TITLE			
GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT			
Overall Shear Key Plan			
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)		DWG. No.	REV.
1:2000		2 1854.008-5 10	0



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-511.dwg, 511, 13/01/2014 12:09:35 p.m., agj, 1:1



**LEGEND**

- Shear key boundary
- 20- Shear key contour (5.0m Intervals)
- Shear key contour (1.0m Intervals)
- Shear key top of bank
- Shear key bottom of bank
- Stage boundary

A3 SCALE 1:750  
0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 (m)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar.10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar.10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-511.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>		
				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
0	First Issue			COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE			

**NOTES :**

- All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
- Base information supplied by Woods data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb.10.
- Coordinates in terms of New Zealand Mount Eden Local Circuit, NZD2000.
- Base plan supplied by Woods. Reference dwg, "millwater P3 Base\_25 July 2013 2.dwg"

**REFERENCE :**



**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz









<b>DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT</b>		
CLIENT, PROJECT		
WFH PROPERTIES		
MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE		
GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT		
Shear Key 1 Plan		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.
1:750	21854.008-511	0











L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-514.dwg, 514, 13/01/2014 12:16:41 p.m., agj, 1:1

LONGSECTION MATERIAL LEGEND	
	Alluvium Silty Clay and Clayey Silt, firm to stiff, moist to wet, light grey to white, organic layers, generally thinly bedded (subhorizontal)
	Colluvium Clayey Silt, firm to stiff, moist, light grey mottled orange/brown
	Sheared Zone Predominantly highly sheared and softened, soft to firm clayey silt.
	Northland Allochthon residual soil (colluvium), stiff to very stiff silts and clays, moist, moderately to highly plastic, light yellow grey
	Northland Allochthon "softened zone" Highly weathered siltstone and/or mudstone, extremely to very weak, dark grey, light grey & red/brown, sheared fabrics, breaks apart easily in hand, many polished surfaces. Some green, grey and black beds.
	Northland Allochthon "transition zone" Typically highly to slightly weathered siltstone or sandstone, weak to moderately strong, light to dark grey, occasional sheared fabric, more difficult to break apart in hands
	Northland Allochthon Typically UW siliceous Siltstone with minor Mudstone, very tight, weak, dark grey, defects, very difficult to break in hands
	Groundwater seepage

DEFECT CODE LEGEND						
SHAPE		ROUGHNESS		APERTURE		
TERM	CODE	DESCRIPTION OF JOINT SURFACE	CODE	TERM	SYMBOL	DESCRIPTION (Seperation)
Planar	PL	Slickensided	SL	Very Tight	VT	less than 0.1mm
Slightly Curved	SC	Smooth	SM	Tight	T	0.1 to 1.0mm
Curved	CV	Defined Ridges	DR	Open	O	1.0 to 10.0mm
Irregular	IR	Small Steps	ST	Very Open	VO	more than 10mm
Stepped	ST	Rough	R			
Wavy	WV	Very Rough	VR			
INFILLINGS AND COATINGS						
Clay Gauge	CG	Joints have openings between opposing faces of intact rock substance in excess of 1mm filled with clay gauge. Clay is generally described in terms of soil properties.				
Clay Veneers	CV	Joints contain clay coating whose maximum thickness does not exceed 1mm. Note: Describe clay in terms of soil properties.				
Penetrative Limonite	PL	Joint traces are marked in terms of well defined zones of slightly to moderately weathered ferruginised rock—substance within the adjacent rock.				
Limonite Stained	FeSt	Joint surfaces are stained or coated with limonite, although the rock substance immediately adjacent to the joints is fresh.				
Coated	CT SC	Joints exhibit Coatings other than clay or limonite, eg. Carbonate (CT) or silica (SC)				
Cemented	CL CS CC	Joints are cemented with limonite (CL), silica (CS), or carbonates (CC)				
Clean	CN	Joint surfaces show no trace of clay, limonite, or other coatings				

TYPE		
TERM	CODE	SYMBOL
Bedding	B	 Dip angle Strike
Joint	J	 Dip angle Strike
Shear zone	SZ	 Dip angle Strike
Fault trace	F	 Dip angle Strike

TYPICAL EXAMPLE:  
③ J60/152°, PL, SL, T, CV, stiff green CLAY

No. in defect set  
Type  
Dip angle  
Dip direction  
Shape  
Roughness  
Aperture  
Infilling/Coating Type  
Infilling Description  
(as per Soil Description)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Mar. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Mar. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-514.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>		
0	First Issue			This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
REFERENCE :




**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental & Engineering Consultants

Auckland 105 Carlton Gore Rd. Newmarket  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
Email : auck@tonkin.co.nz  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT		
CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES LTD SILVERDALE NORTH	
TITLE	PRECINCT 3 – SHEAR KEY LONGSECTIONS Legends & Definition of Terms	
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No. 21854.008-514	REV. 0
NTS		



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-516-518.dwg, 516, 13/01/2014 12:18:20 p.m., agj, 1:1



⑩ SZ 25/060,IR,R,T,CN      ⑤ B 22/288,PL,SM,T,CN      ④ Contact 85/030,PL,SM,T,CN      ④ J 70/098,IR,R,D,CG      ④ Fault 68/026,PL  
⑦ B 8/352,PL,SM,T,CN      ⑥ SZ 50/227,PL,SM,O,CG      ④ SZ/Contact 120/300,PL,R,O,CG  
⑩ B 15/086,PL,SM,T,CN      ⑥ B 73/262,WV,SM,T,CN      ④ J 80/005,IR,SM,VT,CN  
⑤ SZ 23/090,PL,R,T,CN  
④ SZ 8/090,PL,R,T,CN  
⑤ SZ 20/168,PL,SM,O,CG

SECTION 3 SHEARKEY 2  
SCALE 1:250

A3 SCALE 1:250  
0 5 10 15 (m)

				DESIGNED :		AJL	Feb. 10
				DRAWN :		BNRB	Feb. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :			
				DRAFTING CHECKED :			
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-515.dwg			
				APPROVED :			
				NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION			
0 First Issue				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved			
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED			

NOTES :

- All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
- Base information supplied by GCR data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb.10.
- For legends & definition of terms, refer to Drawing 21854.008-514.

REFERENCE :


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT

CLIENT, PROJECT		
WFH PROPERTIES		
MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE		
GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT		
Shearkey 2 - Upslope Face Long Section		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.
1:250	21854.008-516	0



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-516-518.dwg, 517, 13/01/2014 12:18:33 p.m., agi, 1:1



Ⓚ SZ 40/046,SC,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ SZ 22/008,PL,SL,T,CV

Ⓛ SZ 35/060,CV,SL,T,CV

Ⓜ SZ 45/020,SC,SL,O,CV

Ⓜ SZ 52/122,IR,SL,T,CN

Ⓜ SZ 50/208,WV,R,T,CN

Ⓜ SZ 21/280,IR,SL,T,CN

Ⓜ Contact 30/138,PL,R,T,CN

Ⓜ Contact 25/072,WV,SL,T,CV

Ⓜ SZ 35/075,WV,SL,T,CN

Ⓜ B 26/084,IR,R,T,CN

Ⓛ Contact 22/018,PL,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 70/092,PL,SL,T,CV

Ⓜ Contact 51/076,PL,SL,O,CG

Ⓜ SZ 23/128,WV,SL,T,CV

Ⓜ J 7/020,PL,SL,O,CN

Ⓜ J 32/026,PL,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 21/156 WV,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 21/152,WV,SL,T,CV

Ⓜ J 28/140,WV,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 30/070,PL,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 6/190,WV,SL,O,CG

Ⓜ J 10/135,WV,SL,O,CG

Ⓜ J 10/135,PL,SM,O,CG

Ⓜ J 80/355,PL,SM,T,CV

Ⓜ J 6/050 PL,SL,O,CV

Ⓜ J 3/130,WV,SM,T,CN

Ⓜ J 15/255,PL,SM,T,CN

SECTION 4 SHEARKEY 2  
SCALE 1:250

A3 SCALE 1:250  
0 5 10 15 (m)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Feb. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Feb. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CAOFILE : \\21854.008-516-518.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
0 First Issue				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
2. Base information supplied by GCR data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb.10.
3. For legends & definition of terms, refer to Drawing 21854.008-514.
REFERENCE :


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering  
Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT

CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE	GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Shearkey 2 - Upslope Face Long-Section		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.	
1:250	21854.008-517	0	



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-516-518.dwg, 518, 13/01/2014 12:18:47 p.m., agj, 1:1



14 J 80/355,PL,SM,T,CV  
15 J 6/050 PL,SL,O,CV  
16 J 3/130,WV,SM,T,CN  
17 J 15/255,PL,SM,T,CN  
19 J 35/040,PL,SM,T,CN  
20 J 20/255,PL,SM,T,CV  
21 J 45/040,PL,SM,T,CN  
22 J 80/355,PL,SL,T,CV  
23 J 30/035,PL,SM,T,CN  
24 J 85/090,PL,SM,T,CN  
25 J 85/265,PL,SM,T,CN  
26 Contact 9/135,PL,SM,T,CV  
27 J 70/270WV,SM,T,CN  
28 J 70/270,WV,SM,T,CN

SECTION 5 SHEARKEY 2  
SCALE 1:250

A3 SCALE 1:250  
0 5 10 15 (m)

				DESIGNED :	AJL	Feb. 10
				DRAWN :	BNRB	Feb. 10
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-516-518.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>		
0 First Issue				This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :

- All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
- Base information supplied by GCR data file: P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.zip date: Feb.10.
- For legends & definition of terms, refer to Drawing 21854.008-514.

REFERENCE :


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT

CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE	GEOTECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT Shearkey 2 - Upslope Face Long-Section		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	1:250	DWG. No.	21854.008-518
REV.			0



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\21854.008-RW-01.dwg, 01, 28/03/2014 2:49:51 p.m., agl, 1:1



DESIGNED :		CCD	Apr. 13
DRAWN :		JATG	Apr. 13
DESIGN CHECKED :			
DRAFTING CHECKED :			
CADFILE : \\21854.008-RW-01.dwg			
APPROVED :			
A Construction Issue	AJL	12.12.13	
2 Cesspit location	AJL	1.09.13	
1 Design Report Issue	CCD	7.7.13	
REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE	

NOTES :	
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.	
2. 2010 As-built Shear and Subsoil drain key supplied by WOODS, reference data "P3-SHEAR KEY UNDERCUTS 3D TRIANGLES.dwg"	
3. P3 base drawing supplied by WOODS, reference data "millwater P3 Base_25 July 2013 2.dwg", dated July 2013	
REFERENCE :	


**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering  
Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

DRAWING STATUS: CONSTRUCTION ISSUE


CLIENT, PROJECT		WFH PROPERTIES
MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE		STAGE 1 & 2 RETAINING WALLS
Overall Layout Plan		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.
1:2500	21854.008-RW-01	A





I:\21854\21854.008 - predinct 3\workingmaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-RW-04\_06.dwg, 04/26/06/2013 9:26:55 a.m., jatg, 1:1



WALL 1 LONGITUDINAL SECTION  
SCALE 1: 1000 (H), 1:200 (V)



WALL 2 LONGITUDINAL SECTION  
SCALE 1: 1000 (H), 1:200 (V)



				DESIGNED :	CCD	May. 13
				DRAWN :	JATG	May. 13
				DESIGN CHECKED :		
				DRAFTING CHECKED :		
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-RW-04_06.dwg		
				APPROVED :		
				NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
0	Design Report Issue			This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved		
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED		

NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
2. Retaining wall Section taken from WOODS drawing, reference data "millwater P3 Ret Walls 2.dwg", dated June 2013
REFERENCE :

**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz


DRAWING STATUS: DESIGN REPORT ISSUE		
CLIENT, PROJECT	WFH PROPERTIES MILLWATER PRECINCT 3	
TITLE	STAGE 1 & 2 RETAINING WALLS Retaining Walls Longsection (Sheet 1 of 3)	
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.
AS SHOWN	21854.008-RW-04	0







I:\21854\21854.008 - precinct 3\workingmaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-RW-07\_08.dwg, 07, 26/06/2013 9:26:59 a.m., jatg, 1:1



TYPICAL DETAIL - TIMBER POLE RETAINING WALL (TP)

SCALE 1:50

Refer to table A






TABLE A: TIMBER POLE DETAIL TABLE

Timber Wall Type	Pole Details							Foundation Material type
	Retained height (m)	Min. embedment (m)	Pole Length (m)	Pole Size (SED mm dia)	Pole Density	Pole Spacing (m)	Min Concrete Encasement Diameter (mm)	
TP1	0 - 1.0	1.1	2.1	150	High	1.0	300	Engineered Fill
TP2	1.0 - 1.5	2.1	3.6	200	High	1.0	350	
TP3	1.5 - 2.0	3.4	5.4	250	High	1.0	400	
TP4	0 - 1.0	2.0	3.0	150	High	1.0	300	Colluvium
TP5	1.0 - 1.5	3.9	5.4	225	High	1.0	375	
TP6	1.5 - 2.0	5.0	7.0	300	High	1.0	450	

NOTE

- All poles shall be sourced from the same region and documentation shall be provided supporting this
- For each pole size, 10% of all poles shall be tested in accordance with the specification.



DRAWING STATUS: DESIGN REPORT ISSUE

				DESIGNED :	CCD	May.13	<b>NOTES :</b> 1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise. 2. Wall setout to be provided by WOODS 3. Small end diameter to be placed at top of wall. 4. All cut surfaces to be treated with ensile or similar approved timber sealant.
				DRAWN :	JATG	May.13	
				DESIGN CHECKED :			
				DRAFTING CHECKED :			
				CADFILE : \\21854.008-RW-07_08.dwg			
				APPROVED :			
				<b>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</b>			
0	Design Report Issue			This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved			<b>REFERENCE :</b>
REVISION DESCRIPTION		BY	DATE	COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED			

**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

CLIENT, PROJECT		
WFH PROPERTIES		
MILLWATER PRECINCT 3		
TITLE		
STAGE 1 & 2 RETAINING WALLS		
Typical Timber Pole Retaining Wall Detail		
SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)	DWG. No.	REV.
AS SHOWN	21854.008-RW-07	0



## **Appendix B: Contractors Certificates**



## SIXTH SCHEDULE

## FORM OF PRODUCER STATEMENT - CONSTRUCTION

ISSUED BY: HOPPER CONSTRUCTION LIMITED  
(Contractor)

TO: WFH PROPERTIES LIMITED  
(Principal)

IN RESPECT OF: PRECINCT 3 - STAGE 1A MILLWATER DEVELOPMENT  
(Description of Contract Works)

AT: LOT 2 DP 467806, Bankside Rd, SILVERDALE  
(Address)

Hopper Construction Ltd has contracted to WFH PROPERTIES LTD  
(Contractor) (Principal)

to carry out and complete certain building works in accordance with a contract, titled PRECINCT 3 STAGE 1A CIVIL WORKS CONTRACT 33301-01 (the contract")  
(Project)

I GUY JONES a duly authorized representative of Hopper Construction Ltd  
(Duly Authorized Agent) (Contractor)

believe on reasonable grounds that Hopper Construction Ltd has carried out  
and completed (Contractor)



All



Part only as specified in the attached particulars of the building works in accordance with the contract.

Guy Jones  
(Signature of Authorized Agent on behalf of)

Date: 25-2-2014

GUY JONES  
Manager / Director  
Hopper Construction Ltd  
(Contractor)

17 FORGE RD, SILVERDALE  
(Address)



## **Appendix C:        NZS 3604:2011 Expansive Soils**



## **NZS 3604:2011 Expansive Soils**

Expansive soils tend to be moderately to highly plastic clays that undergo appreciable volume change upon changes in moisture content. Technically, they are defined in NZS 3604:2011 as those soils having a liquid limit of more than 50% and a linear shrinkage of more than 15%. Where soils are quite silty or sandy, shrink and swell is less of a problem, due to the lower clay contents.

Building damage resulting from expansive soil movement can range from relatively minor brick veneer cracking and internal cracking on wall corners and wall ceiling corners with attendant door and windows jamming, through to extensive cracking of foundation block framework, extensive internal visual cracking and significant warping of building frames. Damage is dependent on building construction and materials and is rarely of structural concern.

NZS 3604:2011 "Timber Framed Buildings" defines good ground as follows:

*"Any soil or rock capable of permanently withstanding an ultimate bearing capacity of 300 kPa (i.e. an allowable bearing pressure of 100 kPa using a factor of safety of 3.0), but excludes:*

- a) Potentially compressible ground such as topsoil, soft soils such as clay which can be moulded easily in the fingers, and uncompacted loose gravel which contains obvious voids;*
- b) Expansive soils being those that have a liquid limit of more than 50% when tested in accordance with NZS 4402 Test 2.2, and a linear shrinkage of more than 15% when tested in accordance with NZS 4402 Test 2.6, and*
- c) Any ground which could foreseeably experience movement of 25 mm or greater for any reason including one or a combination of: land instability, ground creep, subsidence, seasonal swelling and shrinking, frost heave, changing ground water level, erosion, dissolution of soil in water, and effects of tree roots."*

Foundations on expansive soils are outside the scope of NZS 3604:2011 as an acceptable solution to the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC). Specific engineering design of foundation elements is involved where expansive soils are present with a recommendation that AS 2870:2011 is used for building design. While not mandatory, AS 2870 designs will allow for a non-specific design foundation to be used without resorting to further ongoing investigation or design.

This geotechnical completion report has classified the soils present on this subdivision to be in Site Class M as per the requirements of AS 2870:2011. Descriptions of the various site classes, together with characteristic surface ground movements are outlined below.



Allowing for some correlation with NZS 3604, the various site classes applicable to NZ conditions are considered to be:

Characteristic Surface Movements	Site Class	Description
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 mm</li> </ul> <p>(Note NZS 3604:2011 assumes movement of 25 mm as part of underlying design.)</p>	Class A (sand) and/or Class S (Silts) Equivalent to NZS 3604:2011 "Good Ground" sites	Poor to slightly expansive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 mm – 40 mm</li> </ul>	Class M	Moderately expansive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 mm – 60 mm</li> </ul>	Class H1	Highly expansive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60 mm – 75mm</li> </ul>	Class H2	Highly expansive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &gt; 75 mm</li> </ul>	Class E	Extremely expansive

AS 2870 uses a range of factors to assess characteristic soil movement including:

- i. Building distress due to ground movement visible on adjacent structures,
- ii. Known soil properties and site specific testing to determine the shrink / swell index of a soil (Test 7.1.1 in AS 1289 – Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes).

AS 2870 is based on defining soil types into various hazard classes based on expected surface movement and depth of desiccation that could occur. It then applies various foundation designs and embedment depths based on the form of building construction (slab on ground, strip footing, stiffened raft, stiffened slab with deep edge beams etc). AS2870 uses more reinforcing steel than NZ designs generally would to create stiffer foundations that are better able to tolerate ground movement.

The Australian approach also regards expansive soil to a considerable extent being a home owner maintenance issue and significant emphasis is put into ensuring that people understand the influence that trees and dry summers etc may have on foundation performance. See Appendix D.



**Appendix D:**

**CSIRO – BTF18 – Foundation Maintenance  
and Footing Performance: A Homeowners  
Guide**



# Foundation Maintenance and Footing Performance: A Homeowner's Guide



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 perpendes).

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





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

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

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

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

#### Condensation

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

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

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

#### The garden

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

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

#### Existing trees

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

#### Information on trees, plants and shrubs

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

#### Excavation

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

#### Remediation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Distributed by

CSIRO PUBLISHING PO Box 1139, Collingwood 3066, Australia

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

Email: publishing.sales@csiro.au

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



## **Appendix E:            Post Earthworks Investigations**

- **21854.008 - S1 - 101            Stage 1 Post Earthworks Investigation Plan**
- **21854.008 - S1 - 102            Stage 1 Topsoil Depths Plan**
- **Soil Expansion Test Results**
- **Post Earthworks Investigation Borehole Logs**



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-S-101.dwg, 101, 12/02/2014 2:12:30 p.m., agl, 1:1



#### NOTES :

1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
2. Coordinate Datum: Mt Eden 2000.
3. Contours are provided by Woods Ltd. Ref drawing entitled, "P3-3D Contours\_Final Surface\_Original Surface\_Cutfill".

0	First Issue		
REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE
DESIGNED :		AJL	Dec.13
DRAWN :		AGI	Dec.13
DESIGN CHECKED :			
DRAFTING CHECKED :			
REFERENCE :			

CADFILE : \\21854.008-S-101.dwg

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved  
COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED



**Tonkin & Taylor**

Environmental and Engineering Consultants  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

**WFH  
PROPERTIES LTD**

MILLWATER SUBDIVISION  
PRECINCT 3, STAGE 1

GEOTECHNICAL  
COMPLETION REPORT

Post Earthworks  
Investigation Plan

SCALES (AT A3 SIZE)  
1:2500

DWG. No. 21854.008-S1-101 REV. 0

RAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT



L:\21854\21854.008 - Precinct 3\WorkingMaterial\CAD\GCR CAD\21854.008-S-102.dwg, 102, 13/01/2014 10:48:30 a.m., agl, 1:1



- NOTES :
1. All dimensions are in millimetres unless noted otherwise.
  2. Coordinate Datum: Mt Eden 2000.
  3. Contours are provided by Woods Ltd. Ref drawing entitled, "P3-3D Contours\_Final Surface\_Original Surface\_Cutfill".

0	First Issue	BY	DATE
REVISION DESCRIPTION		JKK	Jan.14
DESIGNED :		AGI	Jan.14
DRAWN :			
DESIGN CHECKED :			
DRAFTING CHECKED :			
REFERENCE :			

CADFILE : \\21854.008-S-102.dwg  
APPROVED :  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**  
This drawing is not to be used for construction purposes unless signed as approved  
COPYRIGHT ON THIS DRAWING IS RESERVED

**Tonkin & Taylor**  
Environmental and Engineering Consultancy  
105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland  
Tel. (09) 355 6000 Fax. (09) 307 0265  
www.tonkin.co.nz

**WFH PROPERTIES LTD**


MILLWATER SUBDIVISION  
PRECINCT 3, STAGE 1

GEOTECHNICAL  
COMPLETION REPORT

Topsoil Depths  
Plan

RAWING STATUS: COMPLETION REPORT  
DWG. No. 21854.008-S1-102  
REV. 0





**GEOTECHNICS**

Site: Millwater Precinct 3 - Stage 1, Silverdale

Test Method Used: AS 1289.7.1.1 - 2003 Determination of the Shrink - Swell Index

**Your Job No: 21854.008**

**Our Job No: 616223.000**

Form No.:

Form Date:

[illegible]

## SUMMARY OF SHRINK - SWELL TEST RESULTS

Sample ID	E1	E1	E2	E2	E4	E4	E5	E5
DEPTH	(m)	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5
INITIAL SAMPLE PARAMETERS	Initial Water Content (%)	24.1	25.8	20.2	25.3	24.7	28.4	48.3
	Bulk Density (t/m³)	1.96	1.94	1.99	1.94	1.93	1.90	1.68
	Dry Density (t/m³)	1.58	1.54	1.65	1.55	1.55	1.48	1.13
	Solid Density (assumed) (t/m³)	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.65
	Air Voids (%)	3.4	3.0	5.4	3.7	4.6	3.2	2.5
SWELL TEST	Final Water Content (%)	25.1	26.6	20.9	26.3	25.3	29.2	49.0
	Swelling Strain (%)	0.12	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.28	0.02
	Initial Water Content (%)	20.8	18.3	21.4	18.3	26.1	25.1	43.1
SHRINKAGE TEST	Estimated Shrinkage Limit (%)	7.4	5.3	6.7	6.8	8.3	7.5	18.3
	Shrinkage Strain (%)	3.2	1.7	2.4	2.4	3.5	2.7	6.8
	Cracking	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack
SHRINK - SWELL INDEX		1.8	1.0	1.3	1.4	2.0	1.6	3.8

**TEST REMARKS:**

- 1) The duration of the swell tests were less than 24 hours because the change in swell rate was not significant after this time.
- 2) All the swell tests were carried out under a pressure of 85 kPa.

Entered by: ST

Date: 3/2/14

Checked by:

47

Date: 3/2/14





Site: Millwater Precinct 3 - Stage 1, Silverdale

Test Method Used: AS 1289.7.1.1 - 2003 Determination of the Shrink - Swell Index

**Your Job No: 21854.008**

**Our Job No: 616223.000**

Form No.:

Form Date:

FLA • Paving the Way for a New President • 31

## SUMMARY OF SHRINK - SWELL TEST RESULTS

Sample ID	E7	E7	E8	E8	E9	E9	E10	E10	
DEPTH	(m)								
INITIAL SAMPLE PARAMETERS	Initial Water Content (%)	30.1	23.0	16.3	15.6	29.4	27.4	27.5	20.2
	Bulk Density (t/m³)	1.87	1.94	2.09	2.08	1.88	1.89	1.90	2.00
	Dry Density (t/m³)	1.44	1.58	1.80	1.80	1.45	1.49	1.49	1.67
	Solid Density (assumed) (t/m³)	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70
SWELL TEST	Air Voids (%)	3.5	5.2	4.2	5.4	3.7	4.2	3.6	4.6
	Final Water Content (%)	30.6	23.6	17.0	16.3	29.9	27.7	28.1	21.0
	Swelling Strain (%)	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01
SHRINKAGE TEST	Initial Water Content (%)	18.7	24.0	26.5	16.5	32.0	20.5	23.1	26.5
	Estimated Shrinkage Limit (%)	6.0	11.0	7.4	6.1	11.3	7.6	6.3	14.0
	Shrinkage Strain (%)	1.4	4.5	3.3	1.4	4.8	3.3	2.2	5.6
SHRINK - SWELL INDEX	Cracking	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack	Big Crack
	(%)	0.8	2.5	1.9	0.8	2.6	1.8	1.2	3.1

## TEST REMARKS:

- 1) The duration of the swell tests were less than 24 hours because the change in swell rate was not significant after this time.
- 2) All the swell tests were carried out under a pressure of 85 kPa.

Entered by: ST


Date: 3/2/14

Checked by:

44

Date:





## TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA01

Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater				LOCATION: P3 Stage 1				JOB No: 614089.026														
CO-ORDINATES:				DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger				HOLE STARTED: 12/12/13														
R.L.:				DRILL METHOD: HA				HOLE FINISHED: 12/12/13														
DATUM:				DRILL FLUID: N/A				DRILLED BY: HWF														
				LOGGED BY: HWF				CHECKED: JKK														
GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																		
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.				FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.	
						100	HAND AUGER															TOPSOIL.
									• 196/78kPa						D/M	VSt						Clayey SILT; grey and brown. Non-plastic.
									• 196/82kPa		0.5											0.5
									• 144/82kPa		1.0			M/W	St							Clayey SILT; orangey brown with some grey, to clayey SILT; brown and grey. Non-plastic.
									• 177/131kPa					M	VSt							1.0
									• 196/45kPa		1.5											Light brown with light grey streaks.
									• 196/98kPa		2.0			D								SILT, with some clay; grey and light grey and orange. Non-plastic.
									• 196/85kPa					M								2.0
									• UTP		2.5			D	H							SILT; grey. Non-plastic.
																						END OF HAND AUGER AT 2.4m.
											2.5											2.5
											3.0											3.0
											3.5											3.5
											4											




# BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA02  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

[illegible]





## TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA03  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater		LOCATION: P3 Stage 1		JOB No: 614089.026															
CO-ORDINATES:		DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger		HOLE STARTED: 12/12/13															
R.L.:		DRILL METHOD: HA		HOLE FINISHED: 12/12/13															
DATUM:		DRILL FLUID: N/A		DRILLED BY: HWF															
GEOLOGICAL		ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION		CHECKED: JKK															
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSION STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.	
			100	HAND AUGER															TOPSOIL.
						• 106/41kPa			0.5			M	St						Clayey SILT; dark orange brown. Non-plastic.
						• 98/42kPa													
						• 82/36kPa			1.0										Light orangey brown.
						• 160/45kPa													
						• 164/62kPa			1.5										
						• 180/65kPa						D	VSt						Whitish grey.
						• UTP			2.0										SILT, with some fine sand; grey. Non-plastic.
																			END OF HAND AUGER AT 2.2m.
									2.5										Unable to auger further.
									3.0										
									3.5										
									4										



# BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA04  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

[illegible]



# BOREHOLE LOG


BOREHOLE No:HA05

Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater				LOCATION: P3 Stage 1				JOB No: 614089.026			
CO-ORDINATES:				DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger				HOLE STARTED: 12/12/13			
R.L.:				DRILL METHOD: HA				HOLE FINISHED: 12/12/13			
DATUM:				DRILL FLUID: N/A				LOGGED BY: HWF		CHECKED: JKK	
GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION							
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.				FLUID LOSS WATER CORE RECOVERY (%) METHOD CASING TESTS SAMPLES R.L. (m) DEPTH (m) GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa) COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa) DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour. ROCK DESCRIPTION Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components. Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.					
				100 HAND AUGER	• 196/65kPa • 114/32kPa • 154/45kPa • UTP	0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL MOISTURE / WEATHERING CONDITION STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa) COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa) DEFECT SPACING (mm)	TOPSOIL.			
								Clayey SILT; greyish brown. Non-plastic.			
								Mottled grey and orange.			
								SILT; grey. Non-plastic.			
							END OF HAND AUGER AT 1.1m.				





## TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD


## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA06  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater				LOCATION: P3 Stage 1				JOB No: 614089.026														
CO-ORDINATES:				DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger				HOLE STARTED: 12/12/13														
R.L.:				DRILL METHOD: HA				HOLE FINISHED: 12/12/13														
DATUM:				DRILL FLUID: N/A				DRILLED BY: HWF														
				LOGGED BY: HWF				CHECKED: JKK														
GEOLOGICAL				ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																		
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.				FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.	
						100	HAND AUGER		• 196/78kPa			0.5			D	VS <sub>t</sub>						TOPSOIL.
									• 101/29kPa								St					Clayey SILT; mottled brown and orange. Non-plastic.
									• 49/19kPa			1.0			M	F						Grey.
									• 196/32kPa						D	VS <sub>t</sub>						SILT; grey. Non-plastic.
									• UTP			1.5										END OF HAND AUGER AT 1.3m.
												2.0										
												2.5										
												3.0										
												3.5										
												4										





TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA07  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater			LOCATION: P3 Stage 1			JOB No: 614089.026														
CO-ORDINATES:			DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger			HOLE STARTED: 6/1/14														
R.L.:			DRILL METHOD: HA			HOLE FINISHED: 6/1/14														
DATUM:			DRILL FLUID: N/A			DRILLED BY: HWF														
						LOGGED BY: HWF														
						CHECKED: JKK														
GEOLOGICAL			ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																	
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.			FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
					100	HAND AUGER		• 147/59kPa			0.5			D	St					TOPSOIL.
								• 196/68kPa							VSl					Clayey SILT; orangey brown with some grey. Non-plastic.
								• 147/16kPa			1.0			M	St					Grey. Dark brown with some grey.
								• UTP												Sandy SILT; grey. Non-plastic.
																				END OF HAND AUGER AT 1.2m.
											1.5									
											2.0									
											2.5									
											3.0									
											3.5									
											4									




# BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA08  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

[illegible]





## TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG


BOREHOLE No:HA-09

Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater		LOCATION: P3 Stage 1		JOB No: 614089.026														
CO-ORDINATES:		DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger		HOLE STARTED: 7/1/14														
R.L.:		DRILL METHOD: HA		HOLE FINISHED: 7/1/14														
DATUM:		DRILL FLUID: N/A		DRILLED BY: HWF														
				LOGGED BY: HWF														
				CHECKED: JKK														
GEOLOGICAL		ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.		FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE WEATHERING CONDITION	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
				100	HAND AUGER													
							• 82/49kPa						M	St				TOPSOIL.
							• 196/65kPa			0.5			D	VSt				SILT, with some clay; whitish grey. Non-plastic.
							• 196/68kPa			1.0			M					Clayey SILT; mottled browns, greys and oranges. [Fill]
							• 164/19kPa											Mottled dark brown/grey.
							• 196/155kPa			1.5								Mottled browns, greys and oranges.
							• 196/62kPa											SILT; dark grey. Non-plastic.
							• 196/98kPa			2.0								
																		END OF HAND AUGER AT 2.1m.
										2.5								Too stiff to auger further.
										3.0								
										3.5								
										4								





## TONKIN &amp; TAYLOR LTD

## BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA10  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

PROJECT: Millwater		LOCATION: P3 Stage 1		JOB No: 614089.026														
CO-ORDINATES:		DRILL TYPE: 50mm Hand Auger		HOLE STARTED: 8/1/14														
R.L.:		DRILL METHOD: HA		HOLE FINISHED: 8/1/14														
DATUM:		DRILL FLUID: N/A		DRILLED BY: HWF														
				LOGGED BY: HWF														
				CHECKED: JKK														
GEOLOGICAL		ENGINEERING DESCRIPTION																
GEOLOGICAL UNIT, GENERIC NAME, ORIGIN, MINERAL COMPOSITION.	FLUID LOSS	WATER	CORE RECOVERY (%)	METHOD	CASING	TESTS	SAMPLES	R.L. (m)	DEPTH (m)	GRAPHIC LOG	CLASSIFICATION SYMBOL	MOISTURE CONDITION	WEATHERING	STRENGTH/DENSITY CLASSIFICATION	SHEAR STRENGTH (kPa)	COMPRESSION STRENGTH (MPa)	DEFECT SPACING (mm)	SOIL DESCRIPTION  Soil type, minor components, plasticity or particle size, colour.  ROCK DESCRIPTION  Substance: Rock type, particle size, colour, minor components.  Defects: Type, inclination, thickness, roughness, filling.
TOPSOIL.																		
Clayey SILT; mottled grey/brown/yellow. Non-plastic.																		
SILT, with some clay; dark grey. Non-plastic.																		
SILT; light grey. Non-plastic.																		
END OF HAND AUGER AT 2.7m.																		
Unable to auger further.																		



# BOREHOLE LOG

BOREHOLE No:HA11  
Hole Location: Refer site plan.

SHEET 1 OF 1

[illegible]