GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

FOR THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS ON ERF 3420 ST FRANCIS BAY (THE ADMIRAL)

5 September 2022 (Rev 0)



Prepared by: OUTENIQUA GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES 18 CLYDE ST KNYSNA 6571



Prepared for: CHRYSTAL CHIMES PROPERTIES (PTY) LTD PORT HOME BUILDING PORT ST FRANCIS ST FRANCIS BAY

Ref No: 2022\Ntaba Holdings\Erf 3420 St Francis Bay (The Admiral)\Report\Geotechnical Report 5.9.2022 Rev0

Report review history:

Revision No	Date	Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
		l Paton Pr Sci Nat Pr Tech Eng	S Gallant BSc Geol	l Paton Pr Sci Nat Pr Tech Eng
0	5.9.2022	AN		M

Authors qualifications and affiliations:

lain Paton has post graduate degrees in Geology and Geotechnical Engineering and over 25 years' experience in the mining, energy and construction industries. Iain Paton is a registered geotechnical professional with the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) and the South African Council for Natural and Scientific Professions (SACNSP). Iain Paton is a member of the Geotechnical Division of the South African Institute of Civil Engineering (SAICE), South African Institute of Engineering and Environmental Geologists (SAIEG), the and the Institute of Municipal Engineering of South Africa (IMESA).

Declaration of independence:

The authors of this report are independent professional consultant with no vested interest in the project, other than remuneration for work associated with the compilation of this report.

General limitations:

- 1. The investigation has been conducted in accordance with generally accepted engineering practice, and the opinions and conclusions expressed in the report are made in good faith based on the information at hand at the time of the investigation.
- 2. The contents of this report are valid as of the date of preparation. However, changes in the condition of the site can occur over time as a result or either natural processes or human activity. In addition, advancements in the practice of geotechnical engineering and changes in applicable practice codes may affect the validity of this report. Consequently, this report should not be relied upon after an eclipsed period of one year without a review by this firm for verification of validity. This warranty is in lieu of all other warranties, either expressed or implied.
- 3. Unless otherwise stated, the investigation did not include any specialist studies, including but not limited to the evaluation or assessment of any potential environmental hazards or groundwater contamination that may be present.
- 4. The investigation is conducted within the constraints of the budget and time and therefore limited information was available. Although the confidence in the information is reasonably high, some variation in the geotechnical conditions should be expected during and after construction. The nature and extent of variations across the site may not become evident until construction. If variations then become apparent this could affect the proposed project, and it may be necessary to re-evaluate recommendations in this report. Therefore, it is recommended that Outeniqua Geotechnical Services is retained to provide specialist geotechnical engineering services during construction in order to observe compliance with the design concepts, specifications and recommendations and to allow design changes in the event that subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated prior to the start of construction. Any significant deviation from the expected geotechnical conditions should be brought to the author's attention for further investigation.
- 5. The assessment and interpretation of the geotechnical information and the design of structures and services and the management of risk is the responsibility of the appointed engineer.

Table	of	Contents

1.	Intro	pduction
	1.1	Background information1
	1.2	Scope of work1
	1.3	Available information2
2.	Site	description2
3.	Met	hods of investigation5
4.	Resu	Ilts of the site investigation5
	4.1	Regional geology5
	4.2	Local soil and rock types6
	4.3	Insitu tests9
	4.4	Lab tests
5.	Geo	technical assessment
	5.1	Terrain mapping10
	5.2	Bearing capacity and settlement
	5.3	Heave
	5.4	Groundwater11
	5.5	Surface drainage and soil permeability11
	5.6	Natural slope stability
	5.7	Excavation classification and stability
6.	Reco	ommendations
	6.1	Earthworks and civils12
	6.2	Foundations
7.	Con	clusions13

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Maps Appendix 2 – Soil profiles Appendix 3 – Lab test results Appendix 4 – Insitu test results

1. Introduction

1.1 Background information

A new group residential development, The Admiral, consisting of multi-storey apartment blocks with up to 4 levels, has been proposed on Erf 3420 St Francis Bay in the Eastern Cape Province (see locality map in **Figure 1**).

The site was investigated in order to determine the geology and geotechnical properties of the site for the design of new structures and civil engineering services.



Figure 1: Site locality map

1.2 Scope of work

The scope of work was to conduct a broad-scope geotechnical survey and the following methods were proposed and accepted by the client:

- Review all available geotechnical information on the area.
- Conduct a walk-over survey of the site to assess the terrain, surface processes and apparent geotechnical risks.
- Conduct subsurface investigations to determine soil/rock profile and groundwater conditions, consisting of:
 - 8x test pits, excavated with TLB/backhoe to max depth of 3m or refusal on rock/boulders.
- Log all test pits in accordance with South African standard methods (SAICE Guidelines for Soil and Rock logging in South Africa, 2002).
- Collect soil samples for testing at SANAS-accredited civil engineering laboratory in accordance with South African and/or American/British Standard methods (SANS or ASTM/BS).

- Conduct insitu tests as per South African Standard methods (SANS or TMH).
- Prepare a concise factual and interpretive report, written by a registered Engineering Geologist/Geotechnical Engineer (SACNASP/ECSA), containing all information from the investigation and including soil classifications and recommendations for the design of foundations for structures and civil services, as required in the scope of works.
- Discuss geotechnical data and recommendations with civil and structural designers as and when required.

1.3 Available information

The following information was available for consultation:

- 1:250 000 geological maps of the area, obtained from the Council for Geoscience;
- Topo-cadastral data for the area, obtained from the National Geospatial Institute (NGI).
- Aerial photos of the area, obtained from the NGI and Google Earth.
- Site development plans provided by the developer.
- In-house geotechnical database.

2. Site description

The proposed site was located close to Port St Francis harbour area, to the north of the site (see **Figure 2**). The proposed site was vacant at the time of the investigation and sloped very gently toward the north, although the northern edge of the site had clearly been artificially raised with a block retaining wall up to 5m high (see **Figures 3-4**). The vegetation on the site consisted of long grass, small shrubs and medium to large bushes along the southern and western boundary (See **Figures 3-6**). The ground conditions were generally dry but the surface was irregular in places, with some fairly large depressions (see **Figure 6**), indicating historical filling/dumping of soil and rubble. The site was easily accessible with vehicles from the entrance road on the eastern side of the site.

The site was located in an area with a temperate climate (Weinert N-value ~2-5) which experiences all-year rain. On average, the warmest month is January at 25° C, and the coolest month is July at 19°C. The average annual maximum temperature is 22°C and the average annual minimum temperature is 13°C.



Figure 2: Aerial photo map of the site



Figure 3: View of the site, looking to the west



Figure 4: View of the retaining wall along the northern boundary, looking to the west



Figure 5: View of the site, looking to the east



Figure 6: View of the western side of the site looking northwest (note hollow in foreground)

3. Methods of investigation

A walk-over survey of the site was conducted prior to a subsurface investigation. The subsurface investigation consisted of nine (9) randomly-spaced test pits across the site (See **Appendix 1** for a plan of the test positions). The test pits were excavated with a TLB to a maximum depth of approximately 3m or refusal. This exercise was conducted in order to investigate the near-surface geology and geotechnical nature of the site, including the soil profile and groundwater conditions. The soil profiles and photographs of the test pits were included in **Appendix 2** of this report.

Samples of insitu soils were collected from test pits for laboratory tests including Foundation Indicator (grading, Atterberg limits and moisture content), Modified AASHTO maximum dry density, optimum moisture content, CBR and Direct Shear. The tests were conducted at a SANAS-accredited civil engineering laboratories in accordance with standard test methods. See **Appendix 3** for details.

In situ dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP) tests were conducted at each of the test pit positions. The probes penetrated from ground level (GL) to a depth of $\sim 2m$ or refusal. Details of the tests were included in **Appendix 4** of this report.

An analysis of the information was then conducted to determine geotechnical parameters and recommendations were then formulated based on the available data.

4. Results of the site investigation

4.1 Regional geology

The regional geological maps indicated that the site was underlain by aeolian sand deposits of Quaternary age, which were unconformably underlain by quartzitic sandstone rock of the Skurweberg Formation of the Table Mountain Group which outcrop along the coastline (**Figure 7**).

Local observations on the site indicated some possible outcrops of calc-arenite (calcareous sandstone) on the southern boundary of the site (see **Figure 8**).

The geology of the area has been widely considered macro stable for urban development purposes with due consideration given to potential geotechnical constraints on a sitelevel.



Figure 7: Geological map of site



Figure 8: Possible outcrop of calcarenite rock on the site

4.2 Local soil and rock types

The test pits undertaken as part of this investigation indicated that the soil profile on the site generally consisted of a layer of uncontrolled fill soil & rubble, which was underlain by the insitu aeolian sands. The thickness of the fill material over the majority of the site was approximately 0.5-1.5m but increasing significantly along the western and northern boundary.

In test pits TP1, TP2 and TP4 (central and eastern side of site), soft calcrete rock and boulders was encountered below the insitu aeolian sand at depths ranging from 2.5m to

3m below surface. The TLB machine refused on this hard calcrete. In test pits TP3 and TP5, a gravel & cobble layer was encountered below the aeolian sand (alluvial or marine terrace gravel).

Visual and tactile observations in test pits indicated that the soil moisture contents were generally moist (normal) and no groundwater tables were encountered.

The soil profile was then broadly summarised as follows (note depth intervals were approximated and varied across the site):

- 0-1.5m: Moist, light-dark red brown, loose-medium dense, voided, SILTY GRAVELLY SAND, imported (fill with rubbish and rubble See **Figure 9**).
- 1.5-3.0m: Moist, light brown/yellow, medium dense to dense, intact, SILTY FINE SAND, aeolian. See **Figure 10**.
- >3.0m: Light brown, dense, GRAVELLY SAND, COBBLES & BOULDERS OR very soft rock CALCRETE rock. See **Figure 11**.

A summary of each of the test pit profiles has been provided in **Table 1**.

Test	Imported	Ins	situ (natural)	Total denth		
pos. No.	(fill)	Transported	ransported Residual		of test pit	Refusal?
TP1	0-900	900-2500	-	2500- 2800	2800	Yes
TP2	0-1000	1000-3000	-	3000- 3500	3500	Yes
TP3	0-1400	1400-3500	-	-	3500	No
TP4	0-1100	1100-2800	-	2800- 3500	3500	Yes
TP5	0-1500	1500-3700	-	-	3700	No
TP6	0-600	600-3000	-	-	3000	No
TP7	0-1000	1000-3300	-	-	3300	No
TP8	0-2200	2200-3800	-	-	3800	No
TP9	0-3150	3150-3600	-	-	3600	No

Table 1: Summary of test pit data (depths in mm)



Figure 9: Gravelly sandy fill material encountered below surface in all pits



Figure 10: Typical insitu aeolian silty sand encountered in the test pits



Figure 11: Boulders and calcrete/calcarenite rock encountered at the base of some pits

4.3 Insitu tests

DCP tests indicated potentially loose consistency of the uncontrolled fill (>40mm/blow), although several tests refused on coarse particles in the fill. The tests indicated that the underlying insitu aeolian sand was typically medium dense to dense (10-20mm/blow – refer to tests TP1, TP3 and TP6 which managed to penetrate the fill).

4.4 Lab tests

Representative samples of the natural/insitu soil types were collected for Foundation Indicator tests to determine the particle size distribution (grading) and Atterberg limits. The results of the Foundation Indicator tests were summarised in **Table 2**.

The particle size analysis indicated the dominance of fine sand particles with minor nonplastic fines. The soils were classified into the following groups under the Unified Soil Classification (USC) system:

- SP Poorly graded sands.
- SM Silty sands.

Test Pit	Sample Depth	Atterberg Limits			Pa	rticle /	Analysis	МС *	PE * *	USC * * *	
No	No (mm)		LL	LS	Clay	Silt	Sand	Gravel			
TP1	900-2500	NP	NP	0	1	5	94	0	10.8	Low	SP-SM
TP2	1500-3000	NP	NP	0	0	1	98	1	6.0	Low	SP
TP3	2100-3500	NP	NP	0	1	4	70	25	5.5	Low	SP
TP4	1700-2800	NP	NP	0	0	0	100	0	5.1	Low	SP
TP6	1500-3000	NP	NP	0	1	1	98	0	4.8	Low	SP

Table 2: Summary of Foundation Indicator test results

* Insitu Moisture Content ** Potential Expansiveness *** Unified Soil Classification

Representative samples were collected for Modified AASHTO density, CBR & Road Indicator tests to determine the potential of the material for structural fill purposes and/or for subgrade fill in road pavement design. The results of the tests were summarised in **Table 3**.

Test Pit	Sample Depth	CBR at					Swell	PI	GM	MDD/	TRH14
No (mm)	(mm)	100%	98%	95%	93%	90%	(70)	(70)		ONIC	
TP1	0-900	43	32	20	15	10	0.0	NP	1.71	1986/8.1	G7
TP2	0-1000	64	46	28	20	12	0.0	NP	1.76	1930/8.8	G7
TP4	1700- 2800	28	24	18	15	12	0.0	NP	1.12	1788/10.3	G7
TP6	1500- 3000	55	44	31	25	18	0.0	NP	1.00	1748/14.1	G7
TP7	1700- 3300	33	25	16	12	8	0.0	NP	1.02	1750/13.0	G9

 Table 3: Summary of Mod/CBR/Indicator test results

The tests indicated that the fill material and insitu aeolian sands have low to marginal CBR values (i.e. typically G7-9 class according to TRH14 guidelines), but may be useful for general fill purposes in low structural-loading applications such as behind retaining walls, on platforms, below and around foundations and below surface bed floors. Further recommendations were provided in **Chapter 6**.

5. Geotechnical assessment

5.1 Terrain mapping

Geotechnical mapping is used to classify "terrains" or areas according to the dominant soil types and geotechnical constraints in each area. Each terrain is then classified according to the standard residential site class designations provided under SANS10400-H, which are discussed in the following chapters. The mapping was presented in **Figure 12**.

Due to the broadly consistent profile and conditions, the entire site was mapped as "Terrain 1" which included potentially highly compressible soils (S2) and uncontrolled fill material (P).

5.2 Bearing capacity and settlement

Observations made in test pits and analysis of test results indicated potentially highly compressible uncontrolled fill material (S2/P class) with variable thickness ranging from

0.5m to >3.0m which was underlain by generally medium dense sandy soil with a maximum safe bearing capacity in the order of 100-150kPa with an estimated 5-10mm potential settlement (S1 class). The proposed 3 or 4-storey buildings would therefore have to be founded at greater depth (on deep foundations) or on engineered soil mattress (soil improvement and/or replacement).

5.3 Heave

The investigations indicated no clay on the site.

5.4 Groundwater

Groundwater was not encountered in any of the test pits.

5.5 Surface drainage and soil permeability

The site had a positive gradient fall towards the north and the insitu soils had a medium to high permeability (estimated at $8x10^{-3}$ m/s).

5.6 Natural slope stability

No slope stability issues were identified or expected from the site. The existing retaining wall along the northern boundary appeared to be in good condition.



Figure 12: Geotechnical Map

5.7 Excavation classification and stability

Excavations to a depth of approximately 3m were classified as "Soft" in terms of

SABS1200D. Excavations below 3m on the eastern side of the site were classified as "hard" requiring power-assisted tools, such as hydraulic rock breakers. "Hard excavations on the western side were expected at depths below 4m, but this would have to be confirmed by drilling.

Sidewalls of excavations in sandy overburden were expected to be highly unstable at angles greater than 45° in the short term and 26° in the medium to long term.

6. Recommendations

The design of structures and civil services is the responsibility of the appointed civil and structural engineers. The recommendations contained herein are provided as a guideline only and do not supersede any applicable standards, codes, or project specifications.

The following recommendations are based on limited information gained from the site investigation, and although the confidence in the information is high, variation in ground conditions may occur between information points. All geotechnical information should be confirmed during construction and if necessary, additional investigations may have to be commissioned before construction commences to finalise structural designs. Any significant variations should be brought to the attention of the authors for comment or further recommendations. It is recommended that the structural engineer discuss his/her conceptual design with the geotechnical specialist to ensure that any calculations and recommendations are in line with current information.

6.1 Earthworks and civils

Civil works should be designed and constructed in accordance with SABS 1200 and/or any site-specific specifications provided by the civil engineer.

Some minor bush clearing, including removal of some scattered small trees, and earthworks will be required to clear site in preparation for construction. It is recommended that 150mm of organic-rich topsoil is stripped from below surface on the development areas (roads, platforms, etc) and stockpiled separately on site for landscaping purposes or carted away. Tree roots should also be grubbed from these areas. Any localised depressions (that may also contain wet soils) encountered during site clearance should be excavated and backfilled if necessary with suitable compacted fill to reinstate ground to the required levels. Fill material containing deleterious materials such as rubbish or large boulders, blocks of rubble should be cut to spoil.

Insitu soil material obtained from excavations for road box cuts, foundations and services trenches should be stockpiled for low-loading structural applications such as platforming, roadbed filling, general filling over pipe cradles and against foundations. Soil containing high organic content (typically dark brown topsoil) should be cut to spoil or as directed by the engineer.

Caution should be taken when working near the existing retaining wall on the northern side of the site, as excavations may disturb any reinforcement behind the wall or cause a surcharge loading on the wall.

Recommendations for roadway design include the cutting of the roadbed to the required line and level, followed by compaction of the road bed to 100% MDD to identify soft spots, which should be removed and replaced with suitable imported compactable fill,

such as G7 or G9. The recommended road layerworks for light traffic include 150mm of G6/7 SSG (compacted to 93%MDD), followed by 150-180mm G4/5 subbase (compacted to 95%MDD), followed by 150-180mm G1/2 base course and HMA, or alternatively 60mm concrete or clay brick pavers.

Good site landscaping and a piped underground stormwater management system is recommended to collect, divert and control the discharge of stormwater from structures, hard surfaces and roads to prevent excessive ingress into subsoils or erosion on site, which could affect the stability of structures and roads, causing settlement or other stability problems.

6.2 Foundations

Foundations for structures should be designed and constructed in accordance with SANS 10400-H or any site-specific specification issued by the structural engineers.

Site testing indicates the presence of potentially problematic soils, mainly including deposits of uncontrolled fill (possibly up to 4m thick in places), which could result in settlement of structures if improperly founded on this material. The impact of this is the requirement for mitigation measures, possibly involving significant excavation and replacement of unsuitable soil with engineered fill (e.g. imported material or stabilised soil ex-insitu), or deep foundations (e.g. piles). The recommended method for multi-storey structures (i.e. 3-4 storey) is bored cast insitu pile foundations (e.g. temporary cased rota piles), socketed through boulder horizons and into the underlying bedrock at depths to be determined by further investigations (e.g. drilling).

Detached Type 1 masonry buildings (single/double storey with foundation pressure less than 150kPa) can be founded on a raft foundation a recompacted soil mattress, the thickness of which can be determined on site depending on applied loads. The soil mattress can consist of recompacted insitu soils or suitable existing fill, possibly with basal geogrid reinforcement. Allowance should also be made for imported of some high-quality fill materials for final layerworks, such as G5 crushed rock, or any other materials to facilitate preparation of the final founding medium. At-grade concrete slabs/surface beds should be supported on suitable fill, compacted to 95%MDD and reinforced with steel mesh.

7. Conclusions

The site is generally considered <u>suitable</u> for the proposed development but there are some geotechnical constraints expected which may incur significant additional costs to mitigate. Some preliminary recommendations have been provided for consideration by the design engineers, but further investigations may be required. Appendix 1

Maps



St. Francis Bay

SEAL BAY **NATURE RESERVE** Seal Bay

Santareme Bay

Cape St. Francis

....

Cape St. Francis Lighthouse

















Appendix 2

Test pit profiles

				G	eotechnic	cal Soil	Profile	:
		- \ /	Client:	Ntaba Holdings				
	UII		Project:	Erf 3420 (The Admiral)				
			Area:	St Francis Bay				
UEL	JIECHI	NICAL SERVICES	Date:	02.08.2022				
			Excavator:		Dum emple Com	- Deve et al and a		
	TP 1	Datum: NGL Co-	ords: 25 Y001	3654 X3784261	Dynamic Con	ne Penetrome	ter (DCP)	Photo of Test Pit
	(0 to 000)	Moist light brown medium of	lense intact CP		0 +	-	+	
0	(0 10 900)	imported (fill)		AVELET STETT SAND,	<u> </u>			the second second
		MOD/CBR/Indicator			-500			A NUMBER OF STREET
A - 500								
- 1/1/6	(900 to 2500)	Moist, dark brown, medium o	lense, intact, SIL	TY SAND, transported.	-1000			A
- 1000					-1000		E F	
		Foundation Indicator			1500	5	(III	
- 1500					-1500		pth	A Section of the sect
В						ካ ፡ ፡	De	
- 2000					-2000			
2000								
					-2500 +			
C 2500	(2500 to 2800)	Light brown, highly weathere	d, slightly fractur	ed, very soft rock,				
		CALCARENITE/CALCRETE.			-3000			C
L 3000					0 20	0 40 60	80 100	
		Refusal on Calcarenite/Ca	lcrete hardpan	@ 2800mm		(mm/Blow)		
			order DE VOO1	2400 22704240	Dunamia Can		tor (DCD)	Dhata of Toot Dit
	TP 2	Key to symbols:	mnle taken	Groundwater		le Perleti offie		
	(0 to 1000)	Moist, light brown, medium c	lense to dense, in	tact. SILTY GRAVELLY				
	(0 10 1000)	SAND & BOULDERS, impor	ted (fill)		500			A
		MOD/CBR/Indicator			-300			A CARLEN AND A CARLEN
1000					-1000			A AND
P 1000	(1000 to 1500)	Moist, dark brown, medium o	lense, intact, SIL	TY SAND, transported.				B
- 1500		Moist light vollow dama-	toot CILTV CAN) transported	-1500		lin line	A Change and a second
Constant Sector	(1500 to 3000)	Foundation Indicator	tact, SILIY SANI	, transported.	-2000		L (m	and in the state of the
- 2000		Foundation Indicator			2000		epth	
C _ 2500					-2500 +		Ŏ	C
4 30 -					• • • • •			
- 3000	(3000 to 3500)	Light yellow to light yellow or	range, highly wea	thered, slightly fractured,	-3000			
D _ 3500		very soft rock, CALCARENI1	E/CALCRETE.		-3500			
0000								
4000					-4000			
		Sidewalls Unstable Refusal @ 3500mm on cal	crete hardnan/	rock	0 20) 40 60	80 100	Determine
		No Water				(mm/Blow)		A little start and a little start









Appendix 3

Lab test data



L Malgraff (Member) For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

2. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Technical Director of Outeniqua Lab.

3. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.

4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable.



L Malgraff (Member) For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

2. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Technical Director of Outeniqua Lab.

3. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.

4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable.



Allylight

L Malgraff (Member) For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

2. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Technical Director of Outeniqua Lab.

3. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.

4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable.



All years

L Malgraff (Member) For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

2. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Technical Director of Outeniqua Lab.

3. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.

4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable.



L Malgraff (Member) For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

2. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Technical Director of Outeniqua Lab.

3. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.

4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable.

			R-CBR-1-8 Feb-2
Registration No. 2009/	230653/23	.0 00.	+sana
Materials Testin	g Laboratory		Testing Labora
ENIQUA 170 Sidwell Avenue	, Sidwell, Port Elizabeth : PC) Box 3186, George Indu	ustria, 6536
Tel: 041 4512464	: Fax: 041 4534959 : e-	mail: luwayne@outeniq	ualab.co.za T0619
Outeniqua Geotechini	cal Services cc	Project : Nta	ba Holdings - Erf 3420 - St.Francis Bay
stomer : Po Box 964		Date Received : 04/	08/22
Knysna		Date Reported : 09/	09/22
0570 antion: I Paton - 0827827703		No. of Pages : 1/3	50/22
	TES		
CALIFORNIA BEAI	RING RATIO - (SANS 30	01 Method GR1.PR	5*.GR10.GR20.GR30.GR40)
	Material Inc	licators	16289
Sample Position (SV)	TP 1	TP 2	Siave Analysis
Depth (mm)	0-900	0-1000	
Sample No	16289	16291	2 80
ള Source	Test Pit	Test Pit	
	Light Brown	Light Brown	9 40 40
tă ă ⊂ Soil Type	Gravelly Silty Sand	Silty Gravelly Sand with	n Boulders j 20
≥ △ Classification	Unknown	Unknown	
Max. Stone size in hole (mm)			0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0 Siava Siza
75.0mm	100	79	51646 5126
ල 63.0mm	100	79	CBR Chart
.50.0mm	100	79	100
ଜ୍ଞ <u>37.5mm</u>	100	//	
Ψ 20.0mm	100	75	<u> </u>
5 20.0mm	99	74	8
E 14.0000	97		
8 3.00mm	70	62	
0.425mm	56	55	Compaction (%)
0.075mm	31	7 1	16291
0.0701111	Soil Mortar &	Constants	
Grading Modulus	1,71	1,76	
Coarse Sand (%)	20	11	S 80
Fine Sand (%)	76	78	E 60
Silt & Clay (%)	4	12	<u>ق</u> و 40
Liquid Limit (%)	NP	NP	5 20
Plasticity Index (%)	NP	NP	
Linear Shrinkage (%)	0,0	0,0	0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0 Sieve Size
Max Dry Density (ka/m ³)	CBR / Density	Relationsnip	
Ont Moisture Content (%)	81	80	CBR Chart
Mould Moisture Con (%)	81	87	
2 @100% Mod AASHTO	99.7	100.0	
Swell (%)	0.00	0.00	
• 100% NRB	95.7	95.6	
X Swell (%)	0,00	0,00	
8 100% Proctor	90,2	90,6	90 92 94 96 98 100 102
لَّهُ Swell (%)	0,00	0,00	Compaction (%)
@ 100% Mod AASHTO	43	64	• 16289 • 16291
	32	46	Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
@ 95% Mod AASHTO	20	28	
@ 93% Mod AASHTO	15	20	<u>9</u> 450 - Slippery <u>5</u> 400 -
@ 90% Mod AASHTO	10	12	350 - Good 300 - Good (May be Dusty)
Insitu Moisture Content (%)		und Dy The Matarial	9 200 - Materials Ravels
	Soli Classification Achiev	Ved By The Material	
			0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 45
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Grading Coefficient (Gc)
		1/10-17	

· Specimens delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

• *Non Accredited Test Method.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright © 2014 Lieweiyn Heatnicotte. All Kights Keserved.

Tor Outerliqua Lab EC CC.

The opinion column is an interpretation of the direct comparison between the quoted specification and the single test sample results obtained. The compliant (f) and uncertain (Ú) opinion indicators are based on an approximate 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

The uncertain (Ú) indicates that the test result is either equal to or is above / below the specified limit by a margin less than the measurement uncertainty; it is therefore not possible to state compliant (P) or non compliant (j) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Members of Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.
While every care is taken to ensure the correctnees of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab EC cc nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.



Luwayne Malgraff **Technical Signatory** For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

				223		R-CBR-1-8 Feb-21
	Registration No. 2009/2	230653/23				+sanas
	Materials Testing	gLaboratory				
ENI	UUA 170 Sidwell Avenue,	Sidwell, Port Eliz	abeth : PO B	ox 3186, George	Industria, 65	536
LAB	Tel: 041 4512464 :	Fax: 041 45349	959 : e-ma	il: luwayne@out	eniqualab.co	.za T0619
	Outeniqua Geotechini	cal Services cc		Project :	Ntaba Holdir	ngs - Erf 3420 - St.Francis Bay
tom	Po Box 964			Date Received :	04/08/22	
stori	Knysna			Date Reported :	09/09/22	
	6570			Req. Number :	1438/22	
entio	on : I Paton - 0827827793			No. of Pages :	2/3	
	CALIFORNIA BEAF	<u>RING RATIO - (</u>	<u>TEST R</u> SANS 3001	<u>EPORT</u> Method GR1	,PR5*,GR1	<u>0,GR20,GR30,GR40)</u>
		N	laterial Indica	itors		16294
San	nple Position (SV)	TP 4		TP 6		Sieve Analysis
Dep	oth (mm)	1700-2800		1500-3000		
San	nple No	16294		16295		<u></u>
<u>s</u> .	Source	Test	Pit	Test	Pit	§ 60
, ria	읕 _ Colour	Light Brown - Light	Yellow Orange	Light Yellow - I	Light Brown	b 40
ate	ິຊິ ັ Soil Type	Gravelly Silf	ty Sand	Silty S	and	
2 (→ Classification	Unkno	wn	Unkno	own	<u>ه</u>
Max	k. Stone size in hole (mm)					0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0
	75.0mm	100		100		Sieve Size
0	63.0mm	100		100		CBR Chart
ŝ	50.0mm	100		100		
ass	37.5mm	99		100		
۵.	28.0mm	98		100		8
ge	20.0mm	98		100		S 10 1
nta	14.0mm	97		100		
Se	5.00mm	96		99		
e	2.00mm	95		99		92 94 96 98 100 102
ш	0.425mm	93		99		compaction (76)
	0.075mm	0,4		2,2		16295
		Soi	I Mortar & Co	nstants	I	Sieve Analysis
Gra	ding Modulus	1,12		1,00		
	arse Sand (%)	2		1		80
FINE	e Sand (%)	97		97		
SIIT	& Clay (%)					§ 40
	JIG LIMIT (%)					Š 20
rias	Sucity Index (%)				┨───┤──	
	sai Sillinkaye (%)		/ Density Pol	U,U ationship		0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0 Sieve Size
	Max Dry Density (ka/m ³)	1788		17/12	1	-
۵	Opt Moisture Content (%)	10.3		14 1	┨───┤──	CBR Chart
ō	Mould Moisture Con (%)	10.3		14.0	┨───┤──	
2	@100% Mod AASHTO	100.8		100.0	<u> </u>	
	Swell (%)	0,00		0.00	┨──┤─	
В	100% NRB	96.6		95.4	┨───┼──	
ЧК	Swell (%)	0.00		0,00	1	
2	100% Proctor	93.0		91.9		90 92 94 96 98 100 102
μ	Swell (%)	0.00		0.00	1 +	Compaction (%)
	@ 100% Mod AASHTO	28		55	1	• 16294 • 16295
~	@ 98% Mod AASHTO	24		44	1 1	
Ë	@ 95% Mod AASHTO	18		31	1 +	S50 S00 Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
S	@ 93% Mod AASHTO	15		25	1 1	Slippery
	@ 90% Mod AASHTO	12		18	1 1	9 350 Good
In	situ Moisture Content (%)				1	250 Erodible (May be Dusty) 4 250 Materials Ravels
		Soil Classificat	ion Achieved	By The Material	• 1	
	TRH 14:	G7 SSG		G7 SSG		Ravels and Corrugates
	AASTHO System	A-3 / A-2-4		A-3 / A-2-4	1	0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 48
	Unified System	SP	1	SP	1	Grading Coefficient (Gc)

· Specimens delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

• *Non Accredited Test Method.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright © 2014 Lieweiyn Heatnicotte. All Kights Keserved.

Tor Outerliqua Lab EC CC.

The opinion column is an interpretation of the direct comparison between the quoted specification and the single test sample results obtained. The compliant (f) and uncertain (Ú) opinion indicators are based on an approximate 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

The uncertain (Ú) indicates that the test result is either equal to or is above / below the specified limit by a margin less than the measurement uncertainty; it is therefore not possible to state compliant (P) or non compliant (j) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Members of Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.
While every care is taken to ensure the correctnees of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab EC cc nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

Luwayne Malgraff **Technical Signatory** For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

					R-CBR-1-8 Feb-21
Registration No. 20	009/230653/23				+ sanas
Materials Tes	ting Laboratory				Testing Laborate
ENIQUA 170 Sidwell Aven	ue, Sidwell, Port Eliz	zabeth : PO B	ox 3186, George	Industria, 653	36
LAB Tel: 041 4512464	4 : Fax: 041 4534	959 : e-ma	ail: luwayne@oute	eniqualab.co.:	za T0619
Outeniqua Geotec	hinical Services cc		Project :	Ntaba Holding	gs - Erf 3420 - St.Francis Bay
stomer Po Box 964			Date Received :	04/08/22	
Knysna			Date Reported :	09/09/22	
6570			Req. Number :	1438/22	
ention : I Paton - 0827827	793		No. of Pages :	3/3	
		TEST F	<u>REPORT</u>	DR5* CR10	GR20 GR30 GR40)
	<u>ARINO RANO</u>	Alterial Indica	ators		16296
Sample Position (SV)	TP 7				Siovo Analysis
Depth (mm)	1700-3300				
Sample No	16296				<u>න</u> 80
o .Ω Source	Test	Pit			is e 60
Colour	Light Brown - I	_ight Yellow			
	Gravellv Si	Ity Sand			
	Unknr) wn			
Max. Stone size in hole (mn	n)				0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0
75.0mm	100				Sieve Size
_ 63.0mm	100				
.º 50.0mm	100				
ິຊິ 37.5mm	100				
ິ 28.0mm	100				
ති 20.0mm	100				й 10 •
ହୁଁ 14.0mm	100				
ଞ୍ଚ 5.00mm	99				
a 2.00mm	99				90 92 94 96 98 100 102
۵. 425mm	98				Compaction (%)
0.075mm	1,4				
	So	il Mortar & Co	onstants		Sieve Analysis
Grading Modulus	1,02				
Coarse Sand (%)	1				
Fine Sand (%)	98				a 60
Silt & Clay (%)	1				8 40 40
Liquid Limit (%)	NP				20
Linear Shrinkaga (%)	NP				
Linear Shinkage (%)	0,0	2 / Donsity Po	lationship		0,0 0,1 1,0 10,0 100,0 Sieve Size
Max Dry Density (ka/m					
Ont Moisture Content (%) 13.0			┨──┤─┤	CBR Chart
Q Mould Moisture Con (°	(b) 13.2	1 +	+	┨──┤─┤	
2 00% Mod AASHTO	90,2	1 +	+	┨───┤──┤	(%)
Swell (%)	0.00			┨───┤──┤	38
D 100% NRB	95.9				ö
Swell (%)	0.00	1 +			
8 100% Proctor	91.5		1		1 0 2
Šwell (%)	0.00				Compaction (%)
@ 100% Mod AASHTC	33	1	1	1	• 16296
✔ @ 98% Mod AASHTO	25	1	1	1	
@ 95% Mod AASHTO	16	1 1	1	1	Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
@ 93% Mod AASHTO	12		1		S 450 Slippery
@ 90% Mod AASHTO	8		1		b 350 Good
Insitu Moisture Content (%	6)	1			250 - Erodible (May be Dusty) 200 - Materials
	Soil Classifica	tion Achieved	By The Material	•	Be 150 - Good
TRH 14:	G9 Subgrade				50 - Ravels and Corrugates
AASTHO System	A-3 / A-2-4				0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 48
Unified System	SP				Grading Coefficient (Gc)

· Specimens delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

• *Non Accredited Test Method.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.
1. The opinion column is an interpretation of the direct comparison between the quoted specification and the single test sample results obtained. The compliant (P), non compliant (i) and uncertain (U) opinion indicators are based on an approximate 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.
2. The uncertain (U) indicates that the test result is either equal to or is above / below the specified limit by a margin less than the measurement uncertainty; it is therefore not possible to state compliant (P) or non compliant (I) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.
3. This report (with attachments) is the correct record of all measurements made, and may not be reproduced other than with full written approval from the Members of Outeniqua Lab EC cc.
4. Measuring Equipment, traceable to National Standards is used where applicable. Results reported in this Test Report relate only to the items tested and are an indication only of the sample provided and/or taken.
5. While every care is taken to ensure the correctneess of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab EC cc nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

Luwayne Malgraff **Technical Signatory** For Outeniqua Lab EC cc.

Appendix 4

DCP test data



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

or for any cons



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

3. While every care is taken to ensure the correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any errorneous conclusions drawn therefrom

quence thereof. or for any cons



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

3. While every care is taken to ensure the correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any errorneous conclusions drawn therefrom

quence thereof. or for any con



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

3. While every care is taken to ensure the correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any errorneous conclusions drawn therefrom

quence thereof. or for any con



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

3. While every care is taken to ensure the correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab nor its employees shall be liable in any way whatever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any errorneous conclusions drawn therefrom

quence thereof. or for any cons



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

or for any cons



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

or for any cons



I Paton (Member) For Outeniqua Geotech. Services cc. Technical Signatory

Appendix 5 Calculations