

# PRECINCT 2



## IMPORTANT NOTE

This plan was prepared to accompany an application to Rockhampton Regional Council and should not be used for any other purpose.

The dimensions and areas shown hereon are subject to field survey and also to the requirements of council and any other authority which may have requirements under any relevant legislation.

In particular, no reliance should be placed on the information on this plan for any financial dealings involving the land.

This note is an integral part of this plan.

client

**Edenbrook Land Pty Ltd**  
**A.C.N. 112 588 182**

project

**Edenbrook Estate**  
**Edenbrook Drive,**  
**Parkhurst**

plan of

**Reconfiguration Plan**  
**Stage 6**  
**(44 Lots + Balance)**

rdp

**Lot 255 on SP325466**

lga

**Rockhampton Regional Council**

issue	date	details	authorised
A	17-03-2022	Initial Issue	RJKF
B	4-04-2022	Layout amended	RJKF
C	10-05-2022	Layout amended	RJKF
D	23-06-2022	Lot 552 extended	RJKF

created



scale

**1:2000 @ A3**

sheet no.

**1 of 1**

plan no.

**8066-06-ROL**

datum

**AHD 2.5m Contours**

cad file


**8066-06-ROL-D**

issue

**D**

## LOCALITY DIAGRAM

1:20000




## ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

### APPROVED PLANS


These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

**Development Permit No.: D/81-2022**

**Dated: 7 July 2022**








CSG

capricorn\_survey\_group (cq)  
capricorn survey group (cq) plt  
132 victoria parade, rockhampton  
ph: 0749275199  
email: reception@csgcq.com.au  
SURVEY DATUM MGA2020-56  
LOT 255 ON SP325466

DRAWN	ASC	DATE	05/22
DESIGN	ASC	DATE	05/22
			
EDENBOOK DEVELOPMENTS			
EASTERN PRECINCT STAGES 1 - 6			
ROL ENGINEERING SUBMISSION			
ALLOTMENT LAYOUT & STAGING			
FILE NO G2201-02-ROL2.DWG			
JOB NO PRJ-0131			
SCALE 0 1:3000 HORZ. 60		AT A3 SIZE	
DRAWING NUMBER PRJ-0131-ROL2		ISSUE 3	SHEET NO 2



Scale Horizontal 1:2500 Vertical 1:1250 SITE SECTION A


ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

APPROVED PLANS

These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

Development Permit No.: D/81-2022

Dated: 7 July 2022



Scale Horizontal 1:2500 Vertical 1:1250 SITE SECTION B

CSG

capricorn survey group (cq)


capricorn survey group (cq) plt  
132 victoria parade, rockhampton  
ph: 0749275199  
email: reception@csgcq.com.au

SURVEY DATUM MGA2020-56  
LOT 255 ON SP325466

DRAWN	ASC	DATE	05/22
DESIGN	ASC	DATE	05/22
EDENBOOK DEVELOPMENTS			
EASTERN PRECINCT STAGES 1 -6			
ROL ENGINEERING SUBMISSION			
TYPICAL SITE SECTIONS			
POST BULK EARTHWORKS			
FILE NO G2201-02-ROL4.DWG			
JOB NO PRJ-0131			
SCALE 0 1:2500 HORZ. 50 AT 0 1:1250 VERT 25 A3 SIZE			
DRAWING NUMBER PRJ-0131-ROL5		ISSUE SHEET NO 3 5	

D:\Jobs Current\Edenbrook Precinct 2 (G2201-02)\Acad\Production\ROL06\_G2201-02-ROL6 (Services-2).dwg, ROL11-11, 21/05/2022 4:49:08 PM

06\_G2201-02-ROL6 (SERVICES-2).DWG LAST MODIFIED 21/May/2022



LEGEND SERVICES

W100

WATER 100φ

S150

SEWER 150φ

S300

TRUNK SEWER 300φ

E/C

ELECTRICITY/COMMS

ROAD DRAINAGE; UNDERGROUND PIPES; ROAD GULLY INLET PITS; & HEADWALL

ROADS; ROAD NAME & CULVERT CROSSING; EDGE FOOTPATH (DASHED); CONCRETE PATH (SHADED).

ALL EXISTING; CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION & FUTURE INDICATIVE SERVICES ARE SHOWN LILAC. ROADS UNDER CONSTRUCTION & FUTURE INDICATIVE ARE SHOWN GREYED.

CSG

capricorn\_survey\_group (cq)

capricorn survey group (cq) plt  
132 victoria parade, rockhampton  
ph: 0749275199  
email: reception@csgcq.com.au  
SURVEY DATUM MGA2020-56  
LOT 255 ON SP325466

PROVISION OF SEWER CONNECTION TO ADJACENT LANDS. LOCATION AND NUMBER TO BE CONFIRMED BY COUNCIL

DRAWN ASC DATE 05/22

DESIGN ASC DATE 05/22

EDENBOOK DEVELOPMENTS

EASTERN PRECINCT STAGES 1 -6

ROL ENGINEERING SUBMISSION

INDICATIVE SERVICES & ROAD LAYOUT STAGE 6

FILE NO G2201-02-ROL6.DWG

PRJ-0131

SCALE 0 1:250 HORZ. 25 AT A3 SIZE

DRAWING NUMBER PRJ-0131-ROL11

ISSUE SHEET NO 3 11

MCLAUGHLIN ST

982 (PT) P.U.L DRAINAGE CHANNEL

CONTOURS 2.5m FINISHED SURFACE POST BULK EARTHWORKS SURFACE



07. G2201-02-ROL7 WATER MANAGEMENT - FLOODING.DWG LAST MODIFIED 21/May/2022


D:\Jobs Current\Edenbrook Precinct 2 (G2201-02)\Acad\Production\ROL07. G2201-02-ROL7 (Water Management - Flooding).dwg. ROL 12-12, 21/05/2022 4:49:13 PM

**NOTES**  
FLOOD DEPTH RANGES AND INUNDATION EXTENTS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR THE ULTIMATE CATCHMENT DEVELOPMENT CASE. THIS IS AN EXTENSION OF THE THE PREVIOUS APPROVED FLOOD STUDY & INUNDATION MAPPING DONE FOR THE DOWNSTREAM EDENBROOK DRIVE UPGRADE WORKS AND OSCADIA POCKET DEVELOPMENT. THE CATCHMENT MODEL IS THE SAME AND THE 2D SURFACE MODEL HAS BEEN UPDATED TO INCLUDE THE EASTERN PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT AND THE ASSOCIATED CHANNEL ALONG MCLAUGHLIN STREET.

**MODELLING**  
1D/2D HYDRAULIC MODELING AS PER CURRENT AR&R 2019; AR&R RAINFALL 2016 IFD DATA & TEMPORAL PATTERNS; XPSTORM COMPUTER PACKAGE

- LAURENSEN ROUTING METHOD.
- PREDOMINANT LAND USAGE RESIDENTIAL.
- LOSS MODELS - UNIFORM LOSS & SEPARATE IMPERVIOUS AND PERVIOUS AREAS. PERVIOUS AREAS INITIAL LOSS 0mm, CONTINUING LOSS 2.5mm/hr; IMPERVIOUS AREA INITIAL & CONTINUING LOSS 0mm.

FOR THE NOMINATED AEP A RANGE OF STORM DURATIONS HAVE BEEN SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS, EACH STORM COMBINING THE PEAK FLOW FOR EACH ENSEMBLE HAVE BEEN STATISTICALLY ANALYSED AND THE WORST CASE PEAK MEDIAN FLOW HAS BEEN ADOPTED AS THE DESIGN FLOW.



\*\* ALL CATCHMENT FLOWS FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ON EASTERN SIDE OF MCLAUGHLIN STREET TO ENTER CHANNEL DOWNSTREAM OF SOMERDALE AVE CULVERT CROSSING \*\*

CULVERT CROSSING 3/2400x1200 RCBC (PRELIMINARY SIZING)

DRAINAGE CHANNEL

DIRECTION OF MAIN FLOWS

MCLAUGHLIN ST

WILLOWDALE DR

SOMERDALE AVE

PROPOSED EDENBROOK EASTERN PRECINCT

CULVERT CROSSING 5/3000x1500 RCBC

FIGTREE CL

JAKIAH AVE

BAYBREEZE AVE

FERNBANK AVE



CSG

capricorn survey group (cq)  
capricorn survey group (cq) plt  
132 victoria parade, rockhampton  
ph: 0749275199  
email: reception@csgcq.com.au  
SURVEY DATUM MGA2020-56  
LOT 255 ON SP325466

DRAWN	ASC	DATE	05/22
DESIGN	ASC	DATE	05/22
EDENBROOK DEVELOPMENTS			
EASTERN PRECINCT STAGES 1 -6			
ROL ENGINEERING SUBMISSION			
STORM WATER MANAGEMENT			
Q100 FLOOD INUNDATION AREA			
FILE NO G2201-02-ROL7.DWG			
JOB NO PRJ-0131			
SCALE 0 1:1500 HORIZ. 25 AT A3 SIZE			
DRAWING NUMBER PRJ-0131-ROL12			
ISSUE SHEET NO 3 12			

CONTOURS 2.5m FINISHED SURFACE POST BULK EARTHWORKS SURFACE

D:\Jobs Current\Edenbrook Precinct 2 (G2201-02)\Acad\Production\ROL08 G2201-02-ROL8 (Water Management - Quality) dwg. ROL13-13, 21/05/2022 4:49:14 PM 08 G2201-02-ROL8 (WATER MANAGEMENT - QUALITY)DWG LAST MODIFIED 21/May/2022



- PROPOSED STORM WATER TREATMENT METHODOLOGY SAME AS ADOPTED FOR PREVIOUS EDENBROOK STAGES 8 & 10 - "STREET TREE" CONCEPT WITH CONCENTRATED END OF LINE TREATMENT AREA
- BATTERS - GROUND COVER COMPRISING MIXTURE OF NATURAL GRASSES.
  - TREATMENT DETENTION BAYS - DENSE SHRUBS; HIGH UPTAKE TREES; LONG GRASSES; GROUND & CANOPY COVER "DENSE"; ROCK CENTRAL DRAINAGE STRIP WITH LONG GRASSES AND SELECTED SHRUBS. DEPTH 200mm-500m.
  - BUNDS - SELECTED HARDY LAWN TYPE GRASS; LOW LEVEL CREEPING SHRUBS; LONG GRASSES. HEIGHT 200mm-500mm.

**ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**APPROVED PLANS**

These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

**Development Permit No.: D/81-2022**

**Dated: 7 July 2022**

**CSG**

capricorn survey group (cq)  
capricorn survey group (cq) plt  
132 victoria parade, rockhampton  
ph: 0749275199  
email: reception@csgcq.com.au  
SURVEY DATUM MGA2020-56  
LOT 255 ON SP325466

DRAWN	ASC	DATE	05/22
DESIGN	ASC	DATE	05/22
EDENBROOK DEVELOPMENTS			
EASTERN PRECINCT STAGES 1 -6			
ROL ENGINEERING SUBMISSION			
STORM WATER MANAGEMENT			
QUALITY (INDICATIVE)			
FILE NO	G2201-02-ROL8.DWG		
JOB NO	PRJ-0131		
SCALE	0 1:250 HORZ. 25	AT	A3 SIZE
DRAWING NUMBER	PRJ-0131-ROL13	ISSUE	SHEET NO
		3	13

CONTOURS 2.5m FINISHED SURFACE POST BULK EARTHWORKS SURFACE





# **Douglas Partners**

*Geotechnics | Environment | Groundwater*

Report on  
Geotechnical Stability Assessment

**ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**APPROVED PLANS**

These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

**Development Permit No.: D/81-2022**

**Dated: 7 July 2022**

Proposed Subdivision  
Edenbrook Estate (Precinct 2)  
Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst

Prepared for  
Hartecs Group Pty Ltd

Project 213255.00  
May 2022

**Integrated Practical Solutions**



## Document History

### Document details

Project No.	213255.00	Document No.	R.001.RevA
Document title	Report on Geotechnical Stability Assessment Proposed Subdivision		
Site address	Edenbrook Estate (Precinct 2), Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst		
Report prepared for	Hartecs Group Pty Ltd		
File name	213255.00.R.001.RevA		


### Document status and review

Status	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Date issued
Revision 0	Michael-Davies-Hill	Brett Egen (RPEQ8597)	19 April 2022
Revision A	Michael-Davies-Hill	Brett Egen (RPEQ8597)	9 May 2022

### Distribution of copies

Status	Electronic	Paper	Issued to
Revision 0	1	-	dtoon@hartecs.com.au
Revision A	1	-	dtoon@hartecs.com.au

The undersigned, on behalf of Douglas Partners Pty Ltd, confirm that this document and all attached drawings, logs and test results have been checked and reviewed for errors, omissions and inaccuracies.

Signature	Date
Author	
Reviewer	 9 May 2022



## Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Site Description and Proposed Development .....	1
3. Published Data .....	3
3.1 Regional Geology .....	3
3.2 Topography .....	3
3.3 Steep Land.....	4
3.4 Previous Investigations .....	4
3.5 Aerial Photographs .....	5
4. Field Work .....	5
5. Comments .....	5
5.1 Slope Stability Risk Assessment .....	5
5.2 Geotechnical Constraints.....	6
5.2.1 Earthworks .....	6
5.2.2 Retaining Walls .....	8
5.2.3 Footing Design .....	9
5.2.4 Drainage.....	9
6. References .....	10
7. Limitations .....	10
 Appendix A: About This Report	
Appendix B: AGS Guidelines	

## Report on Geotechnical Stability Assessment

### Proposed Subdivision

### Edenbrook Estate (Precinct 2), Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst

---

## 1. Introduction

This report presents the results of a geotechnical stability assessment undertaken by Douglas Partners Pty Ltd (DP) for Precinct 2 as part of the Edenbrook Estate development on Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst.

The geotechnical assessment was undertaken at the request of Hartecs Group Pty Ltd on behalf of Edenbrook Developments in accordance with DP's proposal 213255.00.P.001 dated 17 February 2022.

The aim of the assessment was to assess the stability of the proposed development in accordance with the requirements of the Rockhampton Regional Council's (RCC) steep land overlay code. The assessment comprised the review of regional geology, previous investigation results, historical aerial photographs, and available online mapping; followed by a site walk-over inspection by a senior geotechnical engineer, stability assessment and reporting.

This report must be read in conjunction with the notes entitled "*About This Report*" in Appendix A along with any other attached explanatory notes and should be kept in its entirety without separation of individual pages or sections.

## 2. Site Description and Proposed Development


The development site is described as Lot 255 on SP325466, which encompasses both the northern and southern sides of Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst (refer to Figure 1).

It is understood that the proposed residential development will comprise approximately 500 to 600 residential lots ranging in size. Supporting infrastructure will include subdivisional roads, water, sewerage and stormwater.

It is further understood that the proposed earthworks for a portion of the overall site will consist of bulk excavations up to approximately 7 m in height along the ridgeline and spurs, and filling up to approximately 9 m in the low lying re-entrants between the spurs (refer to Figure 2); generally creating relatively flat and level building platforms, some locally increasing up to approximately 15%. It is anticipated that similar earthworks will be required for the remainder of the site.



**Figure 1: Site Location.**



**Figure 2: Proposed earthworks for a proportion of the overall site.**






### 3.3 Steep Land

RCC's Steep Land Overlay identifies land with a slope of 15% or greater as being land potentially susceptible to landslide. Reference to the steep land overlay map (Figure 4), typically the moderately sloping side slopes of the spurs, and steeply sloping re-entrants are identified as steep land.

It should be noted that the steep land overlay map is a broad scale indication of the potential landslide susceptibility based on topography alone, and does not consider other factors such as regional geology or evidence of past instability.



**Figure 4: RRC Steep Land Overlay.**

### 3.4 Previous Investigations

The drill logs from previous drilling carried out by CQ Drilling and Blasting Pty Ltd were provided by the client. The previous bores were typically drilled across the western part of the site. The drilling conditions are generally described as being “soft” to between 0.5 m and 2.0 m depth. The “soft” conditions are inferred to be typical of residual soils overlying extremely weathered material, with conditions becoming harder with depth and penetration into less weathered and subsequently stronger rock.

### 3.5 Aerial Photographs

Aerial photographs from 1956 to present were reviewed to assess for evidence of significant past instability.

The photos indicate no significant evidence of instability or changes in topography on the site.

## 4. Field Work

The field work was carried out on 16 March 2022 and comprised a walk-over inspection by a senior geotechnical engineer from DP in order to make an appraisal of the general condition of the site in regard to topography, drainage, vegetation cover, geology, erosion and slope stability.

During the site walk-over, topographical features specific to the site were noted, and ground slopes were measured using a hand-held inclinometer.

The exposed conditions on site generally indicate shallow residual soils overlying weathered siltstone, which is consistent with the above described geology and previous borehole drilling by others.

No obvious or significant scarps, naturally hummocky or visibly disturbed ground surface, or tension cracks were observed; which would usually indicate the presence of local or global instability. Any large trees on the slopes were also generally straight.

No signs of groundwater seepage (ie. surface 'springs') were observed at the time of inspection. Surface water from the slopes appear to be naturally diverted towards the re-entrants and typically drain to the north-east or south-west. Localised scour and erosion was noted in a drainage gully located in the south-western corner of the site.

## 5. Comments

### 5.1 Slope Stability Risk Assessment

The terminology of the Australian Geomechanics Society (AGS) Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management 2007 has been used in the descriptions of hazards and the qualitative assessment of likelihood, consequence and risk of slope instability. Terminology and risk matrix tables from the AGS Practice Note Guidelines are included in Appendix B.

A qualitative assessment of the likelihood, consequence and risk has been carried out for the site, based on the results of the site walk-over and experience in similar projects, provided that development of the site is carried out in accordance with good engineering practice for hillside developments and the recommendations within this report.



**Table 1: Slope Instability Risk Assessment to Property**

<b>Hazard</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Consequence to Property</b>	<b>Risk to Property</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Shallow failure in proposed fill or unsupported cuts	"Unlikely"	"Minor to Medium"	"Low"	The proposed fill is retained by engineered designed retaining walls, with long batters no steeper than 2H:1V
Shallow rotational or translational slide in residual soils	"Unlikely"	"Minor to Medium"	"Low"	The likelihood of a shallow failure through the residual soils is considered unlikely due to the overall strength of these materials and no evidence of previous movement.
Deep rotational failure in residual soils or weathered bedrock	"Rare"	"Major"	"Low"	The base geology is generally not adversely bedded or otherwise structured to be prone to deep instability.

Based on the results of the slope stability assessment, considering the geology of the site, relatively shallow depth to rock and the lack of evidence of any previous landslips, the risk to property and to properties adjacent to the site is considered to be "low". The AGS Guidelines suggest that a low level of risk is "usually acceptable" by regulators.

## 5.2 Geotechnical Constraints

The potential impacts on slope stability for the proposed development have been assessed, and the measures recommended below in particular with reference to the AGS guidelines on hillside constructions have been designed to mitigate those impacts.

### 5.2.1 Earthworks

Suitable unsurcharged temporary and permanent dry cut and fill batter slopes up to 3 m in height are presented in Table 2. Advice should be sought from DP for batter slopes greater than 3 m in height. Where groundwater seepage is encountered, batter slopes will need to be considerably flatter.

**Table 2: Batter Slopes (unsurcharged, up to 3 m in height)**

Material	Safe Batter Slope (H:V)	
	Short Term	Long Term
Controlled fill*, residual soils	1:1	2:1
Weathered rock	1:1	1.5:1

Notes: \* Depends on fill material type and level of compaction. Assumes clayey material compacted under 'Level 1' inspection and testing to minimum dry density ratio of 95% for Standard compaction.

Temporary excavations up to 1.5 m in depth may remain near vertical for short periods of time, provided that they remain dry at the time of construction and provided there are no loads, services, structures or traffic located within a distance from the crest equal to the batter height.

The above batter slopes are suggested with respect to slope stability only and do not allow for lateral stress relaxation which may result in movement of nearby in-ground services or shallow footings. If such services or footings are settlement sensitive, then the excavation may have to be positively supported.

Slopes may need to be flattened to 4H:1V or less, in order to allow vehicle access for maintenance of the slopes. It is recommended that all batters incorporate crest and toe drainage. The batters should also be covered with topsoil and vegetation (or similar) to provide long term erosion protection.

Long term cuts in very low strength (or stronger) rock is dependent upon the joint orientation within the rock mass. The above batter slopes are contingent upon geotechnical inspections during construction to verify that no adverse jointing and/or defects are present in the batter face. Steeper batters may be possible with the inclusion of passive nails/dowels, anchors and surface protection, but would be subject to detailed stability assessment.

It is recommended that where fill is to be placed over sloping ground, the slope should be benched to allow for the fill to be 'keyed' into the existing slope. These procedures will provide for greater stability of the fill and allow for adequate compaction to be achieved throughout the full depth of the fill. Filled batters should also be overfilled and then cut back to the required design batter angle in order to maximise compaction of the material in the batter faces.

Approved bulk fill should be placed in layers not exceeding 0.3 m 'loose' thickness, with each layer compacted to a minimum dry density ratio of 95% relative to Standard compaction. Where fill has a significant clay content, moisture content within the fill should be maintained within 2% of OMC during and after compaction. The upper 0.3 m of pavement subgrade and unbound pavement gravels should be compacted to a minimum dry density ratio of 100% relative to Standard compaction and to within the same moisture content range as given above.

Care should be taken not to use over-wet clayey soils as this can lead to problems associated with trafficability and workability. Clayey soils should also not be over-compacted (ie. not more than 102% Standard) or placed too dry of OMC, as this can lead to future swelling and softening with changes to moisture content or inundation from water.

Field density testing should be carried out to confirm the standard of compaction has been achieved and the placement moisture content. The frequency of testing should be carried out in accordance with AS 3798 (2007) and distributed reasonably evenly throughout the full depth and area of filling.

Level 1 inspection and testing of filling must be undertaken where the fill is to support buildings or pavements. It is also recommended that Level 1 inspection and testing be adopted for all trench backfill greater than 1.5 m deep in areas to support buildings or pavements as settlement of deep trench backfill can have significant impact on these works.

### 5.2.2 Retaining Walls

The design of flexible and rigid retaining walls could be undertaken using a triangular pressure distribution and the earth pressure parameters given in Table 3. Flexible walls are those which are free to rotate or tilt (such as cantilevered walls) and should be designed using an active ( $K_a$ ) earth pressure coefficient. Rigid walls are those which are restrained against rotation or tilt (ie. single anchored/propped walls) and should be designed using the at-rest earth pressure ( $K_o$ ).

Passive resistance ( $K_p$ ) at the toe of the wall should be ignored in the zone where future disturbance (eg. services trenches) could occur.

**Table 3: Earth Pressure Coefficients (non-sloping crest backfill)**

Material	Unit Weight (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )	Friction Angle (degrees)	Active $K_a$	At Rest $K_o$	Passive $K_p$
Controlled fill*, residual clay soils	19	26	0.40	0.55	2.5
Weathered rock	21	36	0.25	0.40	3.6

Notes: \* Depends on fill material type and level of compaction. Assumes clayey material compacted under 'Level 1' inspection and testing.

Allowance should be made for hydrostatic pressure build-up behind the retaining wall. It is recommended that all retaining walls be drained for full height in order to minimise hydrostatic pressure build-up behind the wall. Additional guidelines on wall drainage are provided in Appendix G of AS 4678 (2002).

Allowance for surcharge loads and sloping crest should also be made as appropriate. The effect of surcharge should be included by multiplying the vertical pressure developed by the surcharge by the appropriate lateral earth pressure coefficient as given in Table 3.

Preference should be given to adopting thin soil layers and using small hand-controlled compaction equipment during backfilling against retaining walls. This is in order to limit the stress applied to the walls during construction. Should heavy compaction be required, then wall stresses will be well in excess of  $K_o$  and temporary propping should be used.

Clayey backfill should not be placed too dry of optimum moisture content, as this can lead to increased future swelling with changes to moisture content or inundation from water creating additional load on the back of the wall.



It is recommended that factors of safety of 2 against overturning and sliding stability and 1.5 for global stability, be adopted in the design of all retaining walls.

For limit state design methods, the ultimate parameters provided above in Table 3 will need to be factored in accordance with AS 4678. Guidance on the selection of material strength partial factors is provided in Section 5.2 of AS 4678 and is dependent upon the nature and state of the insitu soils.

### **5.2.3 Footing Design**

Provided that earthworks is carried out in accordance with the recommendations in this report, it is considered that high level pad and/or strip footings founded in either controlled fill, competent residual soils or weathered rock may be adopted. Where the change in depth of fill is significant across a building platform (especially where there is cut to fill), the potential for differential movements should be noted, and if these are significant then piers through the fill and founding into natural should be adopted.

Slabs supported on high level footings should be stiffened to suit the expected ground surface movements due to potential soil reactivity. This should be confirmed following future site investigations on individual lots as required for building design.

'Pole' type houses are generally preferred on moderate to steeply sloping lots (if any), unless the buildings are benched into the hillslope.

Embedment required for retaining wall footings will be dependent on global stability checks as part of the retaining wall design.

All footing excavations should be inspected and tested by an experienced geotechnical to confirm bearing pressures prior to casting of concrete.

The above footing recommendations are considered to be the minimum requirements from a slope stability viewpoint and final footing design details will be dependent upon the extent of earthworks, proposed development loads and what is considered acceptable in terms of settlement and cost.

### **5.2.4 Drainage**

For subdivisional works, all stormwater collected on site should be prevented from discharging directly onto the slope or from ponding on the proposed building envelopes. All stormwater and surface water is to be directed via an approved stormwater containment system in a controlled manner to appropriate discharge points.

## 6. References

AGS. (2007). *Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management*. Australian Geomechanics, Volume 42, No 1: Australian Geomechanics Society, Landslide Taskforce, Landslide Practice Note Working Group.

AS 3798. (2007). *Guidelines on Earthworks for Commercial and Residential Developments*. Standards Australia.

AS 4678. (2002). *Earth-retaining structures*. Standards Australia.

## 7. Limitations

Douglas Partners Pty Ltd (DP) has prepared this report for Precinct 2 as part of the Edenbrook Estate, Edenbrook Drive, Parkhurst in accordance with DP's proposal 213255.00.P.001 dated 17 February 2022. This report is provided for the exclusive use of Hartecs Group Pty Ltd and Edenbrook Developments for this project only and for the purposes as described in the report. It should not be used by or relied upon for other projects or purposes on the same or other site or by a third party. Any party so relying upon this report beyond its exclusive use and purpose as stated above, and without the express written consent of DP, does so entirely at its own risk and without recourse to DP for any loss or damage. In preparing this report DP has necessarily relied upon information provided by the client and/or their agents.

DP's advice is based upon the conditions encountered during previous investigations and observed during the site walk-over. The accuracy of the advice provided by DP in this report may be affected by undetected variations in ground conditions across the site between and beyond the sampling and/or testing locations. The advice may also be limited by budget constraints imposed by others or by site accessibility.

The assessment of atypical safety hazards arising from this advice is restricted to the geotechnical components set out in this report and based on known project conditions and stated design advice and assumptions. While some recommendations for safe controls may be provided, detailed 'safety in design' assessment is outside the current scope of this report and requires additional project data and assessment.

This report must be read in conjunction with all of the attached and should be kept in its entirety without separation of individual pages or sections. DP cannot be held responsible for interpretations or conclusions made by others unless they are supported by an expressed statement, interpretation, outcome or conclusion stated in this report.

This report, or sections from this report, should not be used as part of a specification for a project, without review and agreement by DP. This is because this report has been written as advice and opinion rather than instructions for construction.

---

**Douglas Partners Pty Ltd**

---

## Appendix A

---

About This Report



# About this Report

# Douglas Partners



## Introduction

These notes have been provided to amplify DP's report in regard to classification methods, field procedures and the comments section. Not all are necessarily relevant to all reports.

DP's reports are based on information gained from limited subsurface excavations and sampling, supplemented by knowledge of local geology and experience. For this reason, they must be regarded as interpretive rather than factual documents, limited to some extent by the scope of information on which they rely.

## Copyright

This report is the property of Douglas Partners Pty Ltd. The report may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Conditions of Engagement for the commission supplied at the time of proposal. Unauthorised use of this report in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

## Borehole and Test Pit Logs

The borehole and test pit logs presented in this report are an engineering and/or geological interpretation of the subsurface conditions, and their reliability will depend to some extent on frequency of sampling and the method of drilling or excavation. Ideally, continuous undisturbed sampling or core drilling will provide the most reliable assessment, but this is not always practicable or possible to justify on economic grounds. In any case the boreholes and test pits represent only a very small sample of the total subsurface profile.

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

## Groundwater

Where groundwater levels are measured in boreholes there are several potential problems, namely:

- In low permeability soils groundwater may enter the hole very slowly or perhaps not at all during the time the hole is left open;

- A localised, perched water table may lead to an erroneous indication of the true water table;
- Water table levels will vary from time to time with seasons or recent weather changes. They may not be the same at the time of construction as are indicated in the report; and
- The use of water or mud as a drilling fluid will mask any groundwater inflow. Water has to be blown out of the hole and drilling mud must first be washed out of the hole if water measurements are to be made.

More reliable measurements can be made by installing standpipes which are read at intervals over several days, or perhaps weeks for low permeability soils. Piezometers, sealed in a particular stratum, may be advisable in low permeability soils or where there may be interference from a perched water table.

## Reports

The report has been prepared by qualified personnel, is based on the information obtained from field and laboratory testing, and has been undertaken to current engineering standards of interpretation and analysis. Where the report has been prepared for a specific design proposal, the information and interpretation may not be relevant if the design proposal is changed. If this happens, DP will be pleased to review the report and the sufficiency of the investigation work.

Every care is taken with the report as it relates to interpretation of subsurface conditions, discussion of geotechnical and environmental aspects, and recommendations or suggestions for design and construction. However, DP cannot always anticipate or assume responsibility for:

- Unexpected variations in ground conditions. The potential for this will depend partly on borehole or pit spacing and sampling frequency;
- Changes in policy or interpretations of policy by statutory authorities; or
- The actions of contractors responding to commercial pressures.

If these occur, DP will be pleased to assist with investigations or advice to resolve the matter.

# *About this Report*

## **Site Anomalies**

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

## **Information for Contractual Purposes**

Where information obtained from this report is provided for tendering purposes, it is recommended that all information, including the written report and discussion, be made available. In circumstances where the discussion or comments section is not relevant to the contractual situation, it may be appropriate to prepare a specially edited document. DP would be pleased to assist in this regard and/or to make additional report copies available for contract purposes at a nominal charge.

## **Site Inspection**

The company will always be pleased to provide engineering inspection services for geotechnical and environmental aspects of work to which this report is related. This could range from a site visit to confirm that conditions exposed are as expected, to full time engineering presence on site.

---

## **Appendix B**

---

AGS Guidelines



## PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

### APPENDIX C: – QUALITATIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR USE IN ASSESSING RISK TO PROPERTY (CONTINUED)

#### *QUALITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX – LEVEL OF RISK TO PROPERTY*

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

**Notes:** (5) For Cell A5, may be subdivided such that a consequence of less than 0.1% is Low Risk.

(6) When considering a risk assessment it must be clearly stated whether it is for existing conditions or with risk control measures which may not be implemented at the current time.

#### *RISK LEVEL IMPLICATIONS*

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

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

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

***QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD***

Approximate Annual Probability		Implied Indicative Landslide Recurrence Interval		Description	Descriptor	Level
Indicative Value	Notional Boundary					
$10^{-1}$	$5 \times 10^{-2}$	10 years	20 years	The event is expected to occur over the design life.	ALMOST CERTAIN	A
$10^{-2}$		100 years		The event will probably occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	LIKELY	B
$10^{-3}$	$5 \times 10^{-3}$	1000 years	200 years	The event could occur under adverse conditions over the design life.	POSSIBLE	C
$10^{-4}$	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	10,000 years	2000 years	The event might occur under very adverse circumstances over the design life.	UNLIKELY	D
$10^{-5}$	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	100,000 years	20,000 years	The event is conceivable but only under exceptional circumstances over the design life.	RARE	E
$10^{-6}$	$5 \times 10^{-6}$	1,000,000 years	200,000 years	The event is inconceivable or fanciful over the design life.	BARELY CREDIBLE	F

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

***QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCES TO PROPERTY***

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

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

# PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

## APPENDIX G - SOME GUIDELINES FOR HILLSIDE CONSTRUCTION

### GOOD ENGINEERING PRACTICE

### POOR ENGINEERING PRACTICE

#### ADVICE

GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	Obtain advice from a qualified, experienced geotechnical practitioner at early stage of planning and before site works.	Prepare detailed plan and start site works before geotechnical advice.
-------------------------	---	--

#### PLANNING

SITE PLANNING	Having obtained geotechnical advice, plan the development with the risk arising from the identified hazards and consequences in mind.	Plan development without regard for the Risk.
---------------	---	---

#### DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

HOUSE DESIGN	Use flexible structures which incorporate properly designed brickwork, timber or steel frames, timber or panel cladding. Consider use of split levels. Use decks for recreational areas where appropriate.	Floor plans which require extensive cutting and filling. Movement intolerant structures.
SITE CLEARING	Retain natural vegetation wherever practicable.	Indiscriminately clear the site.
ACCESS & DRIVEWAYS	Satisfy requirements below for cuts, fills, retaining walls and drainage. Council specifications for grades may need to be modified. Driveways and parking areas may need to be fully supported on piers.	Excavate and fill for site access before geotechnical advice.
EARTHWORKS	Retain natural contours wherever possible.	Indiscriminatory bulk earthworks.
CUTS	Minimise depth. Support with engineered retaining walls or batter to appropriate slope. Provide drainage measures and erosion control.	Large scale cuts and benching. Unsupported cuts. Ignore drainage requirements
FILLS	Minimise height. Strip vegetation and topsoil and key into natural slopes prior to filling. Use clean fill materials and compact to engineering standards. Batter to appropriate slope or support with engineered retaining wall. Provide surface drainage and appropriate subsurface drainage.	Loose or poorly compacted fill, which if it fails, may flow a considerable distance including onto property below. Block natural drainage lines. Fill over existing vegetation and topsoil. Include stumps, trees, vegetation, topsoil, boulders, building rubble etc in fill.
ROCK OUTCROPS & BOULDERS	Remove or stabilise boulders which may have unacceptable risk. Support rock faces where necessary.	Disturb or undercut detached blocks or boulders.
RETAINING WALLS	Engineer design to resist applied soil and water forces. Found on rock where practicable. Provide subsurface drainage within wall backfill and surface drainage on slope above. Construct wall as soon as possible after cut/fill operation.	Construct a structurally inadequate wall such as sandstone flagging, brick or unreinforced blockwork. Lack of subsurface drains and weepholes.
FOOTINGS	Found within rock where practicable. Use rows of piers or strip footings oriented up and down slope. Design for lateral creep pressures if necessary. Backfill footing excavations to exclude ingress of surface water.	Found on topsoil, loose fill, detached boulders or undercut cliffs.
SWIMMING POOLS	Engineer designed. Support on piers to rock where practicable. Provide with under-drainage and gravity drain outlet where practicable. Design for high soil pressures which may develop on uphill side whilst there may be little or no lateral support on downhill side.	
DRAINAGE		
SURFACE	Provide at tops of cut and fill slopes. Discharge to street drainage or natural water courses. Provide general falls to prevent blockage by siltation and incorporate silt traps. Line to minimise infiltration and make flexible where possible. Special structures to dissipate energy at changes of slope and/or direction.	Discharge at top of fills and cuts. Allow water to pond on bench areas.
SUBSURFACE	Provide filter around subsurface drain. Provide drain behind retaining walls. Use flexible pipelines with access for maintenance. Prevent inflow of surface water.	Discharge roof runoff into absorption trenches.
SEPTIC & SULLAGE	Usually requires pump-out or mains sewer systems; absorption trenches may be possible in some areas if risk is acceptable. Storage tanks should be water-tight and adequately founded.	Discharge sullage directly onto and into slopes. Use absorption trenches without consideration of landslide risk.
EROSION CONTROL & LANDSCAPING	Control erosion as this may lead to instability. Revegetate cleared area.	Failure to observe earthworks and drainage recommendations when landscaping.

#### DRAWINGS AND SITE VISITS DURING CONSTRUCTION


DRAWINGS	Building Application drawings should be viewed by geotechnical consultant	
SITE VISITS	Site Visits by consultant may be appropriate during construction/	

#### INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE BY OWNER

OWNER'S RESPONSIBILITY	Clean drainage systems; repair broken joints in drains and leaks in supply pipes. Where structural distress is evident see advice. If seepage observed, determine causes or seek advice on consequences.	
------------------------	--	--



## EXAMPLES OF **GOOD** HILLSIDE PRACTICE



## EXAMPLES OF **POOR** HILLSIDE PRACTICE

