

Report No. 3546

MICHAEL PAVLAKIS & ASSOCIATES cc Consulting Geotechnical Engineers

Raadgewende Geotegniese Ingenieurs ck 2000/040227/23

October 2017



257 Barry Hertzog Avenue Emmarentia 2195 Johannesburg Republic Of South Africa P.O. Box 84298, Greenside 2034 Tel : (011) 888-7232 Telefax : (011) 888 7428 e-mail : mpavlaki@iafrica.com



MICHAEL PAVLAKIS & ASSOCIATES cc

Consulting Geotechnical Engineers Raadgew ende Geotegniese Ingenieurs ck 2000/040227/23 257 Barry Hertzog Avenue mmarentia 2195 Johannesburg RSA P.O. Box 84298, Greenside 2034 Telephone : (011) 888-7232 Telefax : (011) 888-7428 e-mail : mpavlaki@iafrica.com

> 3546/MP/ndl 10 October 2017

LTE Consulting Belvedere Place Building 1 5 Englin Rd <u>SUNNINGHILL</u> 2191

For the attention of Mr. S. Maharaj

Dear Sir,

REPORT TO LTE CONSULTING ON A DOLOMITIC STABILITY AND GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSIONS TO SPRINGS FRESH PRODUCE MARKET

We have pleasure in submitting this preliminary report for the above-mentioned project.

We trust that this will meet your requirements in this matter.

Yours faithfully, MICHAEL PAVLAKIS & ASSOCIATES

DR. M. PAVLAKIS



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM

PAGE NO

2. INFORMATION SUPPLIED 1 3. SITE DESCRIPTION 2 4. THE STRUCTURES 2 5. SITE GEOLOGY 2 6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION 2 6.1 DESKTOP STUDY 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROU	I. INI	RODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE	1
3. SITE DESCRIPTION. 2 4. THE STRUCTURES 2 5. SITE GEOLOGY. 2 6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION 2 6.1 DESKTOP STUDY. 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE. 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	2. INF	FORMATION SUPPLIED	1
4. THE STRUCTURES 2 5. SITE GEOLOGY 2 6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION 2 6.1 DESKTOP STUDY 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITC STABILITY OF SITE 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	3. SIT	E DESCRIPTION	2
5. SITE GEOLOGY 2 6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION 2 6.1 DESKTOP STUDY 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS. 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING. 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE. 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS. 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17	4. TH	E STRUCTURES	2
6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION 2 6.1 DESKTOP STUDY 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17 10.9 SUBFACE WATER 17	5. SIT	E GEOLOGY	2
6.1 DESKTOP STUDY. 2 6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE. 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES. 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	6. DO	LOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION	2
6.2 FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING 3 6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE 4 6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	6.1	DESKTOP STUDY	2
6.3 DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE	6.2	FIELD EXPLORATORY WORK: DEEP DRILLING	3
6.4 DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE 4 7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	6.3	DOLOMITIC STABILITY OF SITE	4
7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 5 7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES 5 7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	6.4	DOLOMITIC DESIGNATION OF SITE	4
7.1 EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES	7 NE	AB SUBFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION	5
7.2 SUBSOIL CONDITIONS 5 7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	71	EXPLORATORY TRIAL HOLES	5
7.3 GROUND WATER CONDITIONS. 6 8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	7.2	Subsoil Conditions	5
8. LABORATORY TESTING 6 9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17			_
9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 11 10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	7.3	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS	6
10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS 12 10.1 EARTHWORKS 12 10.2 FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS 13 10.3 GROUND FLOORS 16 10.4 ROADS AND PARKING 16 10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE 16 10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17	7.3 8. LA	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS BORATORY TESTING	6 6
10.1EARTHWORKS1210.2FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS1310.3GROUND FLOORS1610.4ROADS AND PARKING1610.5WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE1610.6INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER1610.7EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION1710.8STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS1710.9SURFACE WATER1710.9SURFACE WATER17	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS BORATORY TESTING SCUSSION OF RESULTS	6 6 1
10.2FOUNDATION DESIGN: MAIN BUILDINGS1310.3GROUND FLOORS1610.4ROADS AND PARKING1610.5WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE1610.6INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER1610.7EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION1710.8STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS1710.9SURFACE WATER1710.0CONTINUES TO TOTOTO TO TOTOTO TO TOTOTO TO TOTOTO TO	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS BORATORY TESTING	6 6 1 2
10.3GROUND FLOORS1610.4ROADS AND PARKING.1610.5WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE.1610.6INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER1610.7EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION1710.8STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS1710.9SURFACE WATER1710.0CONTINUES TO TOTOLOGY17	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS BORATORY TESTING	6 6 1 2
10.4ROADS AND PARKING	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2	GROUND WATER CONDITIONSBORATORY TESTING	6 1 2 3
10.5 WATER BEARING SERVICES AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3	GROUND WATER CONDITIONSBORATORY TESTING	6 6 1 2 3 6
10.6 INFLUENCE OF GROUND WATER 16 10.7 Excavation Classification 17 10.8 Stability of Excavations 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.0 Operations 17	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4	GROUND WATER CONDITIONSBORATORY TESTING	6 1 2 3 6 6
10.7 EXCAVATION CLASSIFICATION 17 10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS 17 10.9 SURFACE WATER 17 10.10 Operative of Table 100 17	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.5	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS	6 6 1 2 3 6 6 6
10.8 STABILITY OF EXCAVATIONS	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.5 10.6	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS	6 6 1 2 3 6 6 6 6
IU.9 SUKFACE WAIEK	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.5 10.6 10.7	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS	6 1 2 3 6 6 6 7
	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.5 10.6 10.7 10.8	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS	6 1 2 3 6 6 6 7 7
10.10 GENERAL	7.3 8. LA 9. DIS 10. DE 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.5 10.6 10.7 10.8 10.9 10.10	GROUND WATER CONDITIONS BORATORY TESTING	6 1 2 3 6 6 6 7 7 7

APPENDIX A - BOREHOLES DRILLED PREVIOUSLY NORTH OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.

TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP	1
GEOLOGICAL SETTING	2
SITE PLAN	B (A + B)
BOREHOLE PROFILES	4 - 6
TRIAL HOLE PROFILES	7 - 27
PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION & ATTERBERG LIMIT TESTS	28 - 48
OEDOMETER COLLAPSE & SWELL TESTS	49 - 60
MODIFIED AASHTO COMPACTION AND CBR	61 - 69



Michael Pavlakis and Associates - Consulting Geotechnical Engineers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE NO.

Table 1: Summary Of Borehole Data	4
Table 2: Summary Of Borehole Data	4
Table 3: Depths Of Ground Water Seepage And Ground Water Standing Within Trial Holes	6
Table 4: Summary Of Results Of Index Tests	7
Table 4: Summary Of Results Of Index Tests (Continued)	8
Table 5: Summary Of Results Of Oedometer Tests On Undisturbed Block Samples	9
Table 6: Summary Of Results Of Oedometer Tests On Compacted Soils	9
Table 7: Summary Of Mod Aashto Compaction And Cbr Tests	10
Table 8: Summary Of Bulk Density Tests	10
Table 9: Summary Of Conductivity And Ph Tests	11
Table 10: Anticipated Founding Levels At Various Trial Hole Positions	14





REPORT TO LTE CONSULTING ON A DOLOMITIC STABILITY AND GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSIONS TO SPRINGS FRESH PRODUCE MARKET

Project Ref No. 3546 - 10 October 2017

1. INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 1.1 Michael Pavlakis & Associates were appointed by LTE Consulting to carry out a Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed extensions to the existing Springs Fresh Produce Market.
- 1.2 The purpose of the investigation was to establish the subsoil and founding conditions within the site and provide recommendations for the design of the building foundations and earthworks.
- 1.3 Because the site is underlain by dolomitic formations at depth, it was also deemed necessary that a basic dolomite investigation be carried out to confirm the results at the planning stage, which had suggested that the dolomites are present at depths well in excess of 70 m and are covered by a protective non-dolomitic cover of Karoo shale and intrusive rocks.
- 1.4 The initial exploratory work was carried out in February 2017, and comprised the drilling of 3 deep boreholes, while the near-surface investigation was carried out in June 2017. A preliminary report was issued on the 30th June 2017.
- 1.5 Following the completion of the laboratory testing program, we now have the pleasure of submitting this final report with design recommendations.

2. INFORMATION SUPPLIED

- 2.1 During the course of the investigation the following information was provided by LTE Consulting:
 - 2.1.1 A set of undated drawings (PDF) prepared by Liefa Architects and titled:
 - Springs Fresh Produce Market Option B (Plan)
 - Springs Fresh Produce Market Sections
 - Springs Fresh Produce Market Elevations.
 - 2.1.2 An Auto-Cad drawing with drawing number 16-015-02-01, titled Springs Fresh Produce Market, "LAYOUT", received 29.05.2017
 - 2.1.3 Drawing No. 16-015-00-01 titled Springs Fresh Produce Market dated 25/07/2017 showing a revised layout of the project.



- 2.2 The following additional information on previous work carried out was obtained:
 - 2.2.1 A report titled: "Springs Stadsraad, Springs nasional Varsproduktemark, 'n Geotegniese verslag oor die bodemtoestande met die oog op strukturele en plaveisel uitbreiding aan die suiderlike kant van die marksaal", carried out by AMB, dated April 1996.
 - 2.2.2 A report titled: "Dolomite Stability Investigation of Springs Fresh Produce market, Springs, by GeoBuro, dated January 2016

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The site is situated immediately to the east of the existing development and comprises even terrain sloping gently towards the south and covered by grass. The southern-most section is covered by tall veld grass and is close the railway line.

4. THE STRUCTURES

- 4.1 The extensions will amount to virtually doubling the existing market facilities.
- 4.2 The new Market and Agro Processing structures comprise 11,3 m high and 20 m wide buildings with an arched structural steel roof truss, supported on concrete columns, with brick infill / dividing walls some 8 m high above floor level.
- 4.3 New shops are to be constructed to the north of the new Market comprising 4 m high band load bearing brickwork structures.
- 4.4 To the east of the new Market and Agro Processing buildings, additional smaller structures are to be constructed including new stores, electrical rooms, waste plants, and storage facilities. All of these are deemed to be single storey loadbearing brickwork structures.

5. <u>SITE GEOLOGY</u>

- 5.1 Published geological maps indicate that the site is underlain by the dolomites of the Chuniespoort Group, Transvaal Supergroup. These are shown to be overlain by shales of the Karoo Supergroup.
- 5.2 The results of drilling work also indicated that the above-mentioned formations have been intruded by a dolerite sill and, in the case of borehole BH.A2, some quartzite, probably of the Witwatersrand Group.

6. DOLOMITE STABILITY INVESTIGATION

- 6.1 <u>Desktop Study</u>
 - 6.1.1 The results of a desktop study showed that the thickness of the non-dolomitic strata overlying the dolomites that underlie the site at depth is likely to be of the order of 70 m or more.
 - 6.1.2 The results of drilling work carried out within the northern section of the existing Springs fresh produce market, referenced BH.A1 and BH.A2 on the attached site plan, Figure 2, showed that non-dolomitic formations are present down to the depth of 60 m.



Ref. 3546 - Report To LTE Consulting Engineers On A Dolomitic Stability And Geotechnical Investigation For The Proposed
Extensions To Springs Fresh Produce Market - 10 October 2017

6.2 Field Exploratory Work: Deep Drilling

6.2.1 In order to establish the deep subsoil conditions and dolomitic stability of the site to be occupied by the proposed market extensions, 3 boreholes, referenced BH.1 - BH.3, were drilled to cover the site. Their position is shown on the attached satellite image, Figure (i) and 3(a) and the Site Plan, Figure 3 (b). The chip samples recovered were subsequently logged in detail and the results are shown in the borehole logs, Figures 4 - 6.



Figure. (i): Satellite Image Showing Positions of Boreholes and Trial Holes

- 6.2.2 The boreholes indicated that non dolomitic formations are present down to the maximum depth drilled of 60 m. The results of the drilling work, together with these obtained from the drilling of the previous borehole, are summarised in Table 1 below.
- 6.2.3 The ground water table is shallow, present at the depths of 2,8 4,2 m. These depths are similar to the ground water levels observed within the exploratory trial holes, reviewed in Section 7.



Ref. 3546 - Report To LTE Consulting Engineers On A Dolomitic Stability And Geotechnical Investigation For The Proposed Extensions To Springs Fresh Produce Market - 10 October 2017

BH.No	Transported m	Shale m	Dolerite m	Quartzite m	Wad m	Cavities m	Dolomite Bedrock m	Air Loss m	Samples Loss m	Ground Water Rest Depth, m
BH.P1	-	0-11 30-60	11-30	-	-	-	>60	-	-	4.2
BH.P2	-	0-11	11-53	53-60	-	-	>60	-	-	3.4
BH.1	0-2	2-12	12-60	-	-	-	>60	S 21-22	-	3.6
BH.2	0-2	2-14 33-60	14-33	-	-	-	>60	-	-	2.8
BH.3	0-1	1-4	4-60	-	-	-	>60	S 31-41 M 42-43	-	Mud

TABLE 1: Summary of Borehole Data

S = Slight M= Medium

6.3 Dolomitic Stability of Site

- 6.3.1 A total of 5 boreholes covering the site of the proposed extensions indicated that presence of non-dolomitic formations, namely Karoo shale, dolerite intrusion and some quartzite, down to the depth of 60 m below existing ground surface.
- 6.3.2 Taking into account that the area is situated in a non-dewatered compartment it is considered that it is associated with a low risk of any size sinkhole/subsidence occurring under conditions of both continuous water ingress and water table drawdown and is thus assigned an Inherent Hazard Class of IHC 1//1.

6.4 Dolomitic Designation of Site

6.4.1 In terms of the proposed usage of the site and the provisions of SANS 1936-1, the site is assigned a dolomitic designation "non dolomitic". The conditions for development are indicated in Table 2 below.

Dolomitic Zone	Dolomitic Designation	Conditions for Development as per SANS 1936-1
Entire area for Market Extensions	Non-Dolomitic (But D2 for Implementation of Precautionary Measures)	Due to the presence of dolomite at depth, it is recommended that general precautionary measures, in accordance with the requirements of SANS 1936- 3, that are intended to prevent the concentrated ingress of water into the ground, are required. The measures to be taken should correspond to D2 Dolomitic Designation.

TABLE 2: Summary of Borehole Data

6.4.2 All precautionary requirements relating to D2 designation, as indicated in SANS 1936-3 must be implemented.



7. NEAR SURFACE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

7.1 <u>Exploratory Trial Holes</u>

- 7.1.1 The near-surface field exploratory work was carried out during the period from 1-2 June 2017, and comprised the excavation, detailed examination and sampling of 21 exploratory trial holes at the positions referenced TH.1 – TH.21 and on the attached site plan Figure 3. A powerful Sumitomo excavator was used for this purpose.
- 7.1.2 It should be noted that the trial holes were excavated in accordance with the original project layout, which has since changed.
- 7.1.3 Each of the holes was examined in detail immediately after excavation and the resulting trial hole logs are shown in Figures 7 27 of this report.

7.2 <u>Subsoil Conditions</u>

- 7.2.1 Transported Soils Topsoil & Hillwash
 - a) The entire site is underlain by a 0,2 0,3 m thick grey brown loose clayey silty sand, topsoil, containing abundant roots.
 - b) A generally orange brown clayey/silty sand, Hillwash, follows below and extends to depths varying from 0,7 - 1,9 m below existing ground surface, but mostly within the 1,2 - 1,6 m range. This soil is generally of loose or loose to medium dense consistency and is associated with high compressibility and significant collapse potential.
- 7.2.2 Slightly Ferruginised Hillwash
 - a) The incompetent hillwash is underlain by similar clayey/silty sands containing ferruginous nodules and are deemed to have undergone variable, but generally moderate ferruginisation. This layer varies in consistency from loose to medium dense and is occasionally more gravelly and medium dense to dense. It is thus, also, deemed to be a generally incompetent founding medium except for lightly loaded structures. It was found to be present at depths of 1,0 m or less within trial holes TH.4, 6, 8 10, 16 18 and 20 21. Within the remaining trial holes it is generally present at the depths of mostly 1,3-1,9 m.

7.2.3 <u>Ferricrete</u>

- a) The above-mentioned mostly incompetent soil horizons are followed by a competent ferricrete of mostly dense to very dense consistency. The ferricrete comprises mostly dark orange brown, reddish brown and maroon cemented and ferruginised clayey/gravelly silty sands becoming more clayey with depth.
- b) Depths to the competent ferricrete layer vary mostly within the 1,5 2,5 m depth range.

7.2.4 <u>Reworked/Residual Dolerite</u>

a) Where the ferricrete could be penetrated it was found that it is underlain by generally stiff to very stiff clayey silty sand and sandy/silty clays deriving mostly from the in-situ decomposition and subsequent reworking of dolerite

and shale rocks. The clayey soils extended to the bottom of the trial holes at the depth of 3,6 - 4,5 m below existing ground surface.

- 7.3 **Ground Water Conditions**
 - 7.3.1 A shallow ground water table is present throughout the site at depths varying mostly within the 3,8 - 4,0 m depth range. These are in broad agreement with standing water levels measured within boreholes BH.1 - BH.3 of 2,8 - 3,6 m. Ground water depths at the individual trial hole positions are listed in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3: Depths of Ground Water Seepage and Ground Water Standing within Trial Holes.

Trial	Hole	Depth of C					
Hole No	Depth, m	Seepage	Standing	Comment			
TH.1	1.70	-	-	-			
TH.2	1.80	-	-	-			
TH.3	1.60	-	-	-			
TH.4	3.90	-	3.90	-			
TH.5	4.40	-	- 4.05				
TH.6	3.40	-	• -				
TH.7	4.50	-	- 4.40				
TH.8	4.30	3.80	4.25	Slow seepage			
TH.9	4.35	- 4.25		-			
TH.10	3.00	-	-	-			
TH.11	4.40	-	4.00	-			
TH.12	4.30	-	4.05	-			
TH.13	4.00	-	3.80	-			
TH.14	3.60	-	-	-			
TH.15	4.00	-	3.20	-			
TH.16	4.10	3.90	4.05	Slow seepage			
TH.17	4.40	-	3.95	-			
TH.18	3.90	3.40	3.60	Moderate			
TH.19	3.70	-	3.55	-			
TH.20	3.80	-	-	-			
TH.21	4.00	-	3.90	-			

7.3.2 It is noted that the auger holes drilled at the southern section of the existing development some 20 years ago showed water seepage depth of 1,2 - 2,0 m, which is shallower than those observed in this investigation. It appears, therefore, that the ground water table may have dropped slightly over this period.

8. LABORATORY TESTING

Particle Size Distribution & Atterberg Limit tests, Oedometer Collapse and Swell tests, 8.1 Modified AASHTO Compaction and CBR tests and Bulk Density and pH & Conductivity tests were carried out on representative soil samples. The results of the tests are shown in Appendix B and are summarised in Tables 4 to 9 of this report.

HOLE NO	DEPTH m	SOIL TYPE & ORIGIN	LL	PI	LS	%< 425u	(PI) ws	%< 2u	G.M.	UCS	PE
TH.1	0.50-1.10	Abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand. Partly ferruginised hillwash.	39	14	6.5	42	6	13	1.70	SC	L
	0.30-0.70	Silty Sand. Hillwash.	25	10	4.5	88	9	14	0.67	SC	L
TH.2	0.70-1.40	Abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand.	35	12	5.5	39	5	10	1.83	SC	L
	0.20-0.80	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	30	12	5.5	75	9	25	0.90	CL	L
TH.3	0.90-1.40	Gravelly clayey silty sand. Hillwash with gravels.	31	13	6	43	6	13	1.70	SC	L
	0.20-1.20	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	29	12	6	86	11	29	0.59	CL	L
	0.90-1.10	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	29	12	6	91	11	32	0.50	CL	L
TH.4	1.90-2.20	Clayey sandy silt with abundant ferruginous nodules. Weakly ferruginised hillwash.	34	15	6.5	62	9	18	1.17	SC	L/M
	3.10-3.40	Gravelly clayey sand with abundant ferruginous nodules. Moderately ferruginised residual shale.	34	16	6.5	48	8	11	1.66	SC	L
	1.00-1.20	Gravelly silty sand. Slightly ferruginised hillwash.	36	16	7	45	7	11	1.69	SC	L
TH.5	1.40-1.60	Clayey sandy silt. Possibly residual dolerite with ferruginous nodules.	37	18	8	65	11	20	1.15	SC	L/M
	2.30-2.50	Clayey silt. Possible residual dolerite.	37	14	6.5	89	12	12	0.46	CL	М
TH.6	1.20-1.40	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	33	13	6.5	88	12	33	0.51	CL	М
ТН 7	3.20-3.60	Silty clay. Possibly residual dolerite.	51	20	8.5	88	18	45	0.43	MH	М
	4.10-4.40	Clayey silt. Possibly residual dolerite.	52	18	8	95	17	45	0.23	ΜН	М
TH.8	0.80-1.10	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	31	9	4.5	90	8	23	0.47	CL	L
TH.9	4.00-4.35	Sandy silty clay. Residual dolerite.	42	21	8.5	81	17	38	0.71	CL	М
TH.10	1.40-1.70	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash with gravels.	32	15	6.5	56	8	13	1.32	SC	L
	2.20-2.60	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	34	13	6	47	6	12	1.63	SC	L
	0.80-1.10	Abundant gravels in silty sand. Possibly ferruginous hillwash.	35	9	4.5	38	3	8	1.92	SC	L
TH.11	1.50-1.70	Gravelly clayey silty sand. Possibly partially ferruginised slightly reworked residual dolerite.	35	12	5.5	63	7	15	1.24	SC	L
	2.30-2.70	Silty sand. Possibly residual dolerite.	31	12	5.5	84	10	14	0.73	SC	L
NOTE :	LL PI LS	= LIQUID LIMIT = PLASTICITY INDEX = LINEAR SHRINKAGE	G.I UC PE	M S	= (= L = F	GRADING JNIFIED (POTENTIA	G MODU CLASSIF AL EXPA	LUS FICATIO ANSIVEI	N SYSTE	EM	

TABLE 4: Summary of Results of Index Tests

POTENTIAL EXPANSIVENESS



HOLE NO	DEPTH m	SOIL TYPE & ORIGIN	LL	PI	LS	%< 425μ	(PI) ws	%< 2μ	G.M.	UCS	PE
	0.20-0.80	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	28	9	4.5	71	6	21	1.02	SC	L
	0.45-0.60	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	27	10	4.5	89	8	32	0.53	CL	L
TH.12	1.50-2.50	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	32	13	6	48	6	9	1.65	SC	L
	3.40-3.60	Sandy silt. Possible residual dolerite.	28	14	5.5	89	13	18	0.74	SC	М
TH.13	2.85-3.10	Clayey silty gravel. Weak ferricrete.	37	17	8	76	13	30	0.81	CL	М
	0.45-0.90	Gravelly silty sand. Slightly gravelly hillwash.	36	13	6	56	7	18	1.34	SC	L
TH.14	1.90-2.20	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	36	14	6.5	59	8	19	1.24	SC	L
	2.90-3.30	Silty clay. Possibly residual dolerite.	44	22	9.5	90	20	42	0.46	CL	М
	0.80-1.10	Gravelly silty sand. Fine colluvium.	35	15	6.5	41	6	13	1.80	SC	L
TH.15	1.70-2.10	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	34	18	7.5	37	7	13	1.91	SC	L
	2.80-3.10	Clayey sandy silt. Possibly residual dolerite.	40	20	8.5	48	10	18	1.67	SC	L
	1.00-1.30	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	31	8	4.5	77	6	19	0.82	ML	L
TH.16	1.70-2.05	Mixture of Clayey silty sand with abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules. Hillwash and ferruginised hillwash.	31	11	5	71	7	17	1.01	CL	L
	2.70-3.10	Gravelly clayey sand. Ferricrete.	29	11	5.5	49	5	13	1.58	SC	L
	3.30-3.70	Gravelly sandy clay. Ferricrete.	40	16	6.5	32	5	15	2.08	SC	L
	1.00-1.30	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash with gravels.	32	12	5.5	73	9	19	0.95	CL	L
TH.17	1.70-3.00	Gravelly silty sand. Ferruginised hillwash.	37	16	7.5	52	8	16	1.25	SC	L
	3.50-3.80	Clayey sandy silt. Possible residual dolerite.	39	16	7.5	77	13	31	0.81	CL	М
TH.18	2.20-2.40	Sandy gravel. Ferruginised Hillwash.	34	14	6	43	6	13	1.76	SC	L
	3.20-3.40	Clayey sandy gravel. Ferricrete.	35	15	6.5	62	10	25	1.26	SC	L
TH.19	1.00-1.70	Sandy slit. Possible residual shale.	36	12	6	70	8	21	1.02	ML	L
	2.10-2.40	residual shale.	37	17	8	79	13	34	0.75	CL	L/M
TH.20	1.50-1.80	ferruginous nodules in silty sand. Weakly ferruginised fine colluvium.	38	13	6	31	4	7	2.07	SC	L
TH 21	1.05-2.30	Abundant ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand. Ferruginised hillwash.	34	10	5	29	3	7	2.15	SC	L
111.21	1.20-1.80	Abundant ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand. Ferruginised hillwash.	31	9	3.5	34	3	8	1.98	SC	L
NOTE :	LL PI LS	= LIQUID LIMIT = PLASTICITY INDEX = LINEAR SHRINKAGE	G.I UC PE	M ⊧ S ⊧	= (= L = F	GRADING JNIFIED (POTENTIA	G MODU CLASSIF	LUS ICATIO	N SYSTE NESS	EM	

TABLE 4: Summary of Results of Index Tests (continued)



Michael Pavlakis and Associates - Consulting Geotechnical Engineers

HOLE NO.	DEPTH m	SOIL TYPE AND ORIGIN	₽d kg/m³	NMC %	e0	Sr %	P₀ kPa	Ps kPa	Ce	Cc	% COLL @ 50 kPa	% Swell @ 10 kPa
TH.4	0.90-1.10	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	1372	20.2	0.953	57	50	-	0.200	0.415	3.69	-
TH.5	2.30-2.50	Clayey silt. Possible residual dolerite.	1493	25.5	0.774	87	70	-	0.012	0.098	-	-
TH.6	1.20-1.40	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	1385	20.5	0.945	57	50	-	0.130	0.392	2.62	-
TH.7	4.10-4.40	Clayey silt. Possibly residual dolerite.	1376	36.6	0.926	105		95	0.013	0.066	-	0.78
TH.8	0.80-1.10	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	1487	21.1	0.811	70	85	-	0.064	0.259	0.72	-
TH.12	0.45-0.60	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	1357	16.6	0.963	46	60	-	0.126	0.415	2.45	-
TH.13	2.65-3.10	Clayey silty gravel. Weak ferricrete.	1756	19.2	0.509	100	55	-	0.010	0.040	-	-
TH.16	1.00-1.30	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	1486	18.9	0.754	65	80	-	0.082	0.296	1.43	-
TH.16	1.70-2.05	Mixture of Clayey silty sand with abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules. Hillwash and ferruginised hillwash.	1557	20.6	0.678	79	85	-	0.023	0.219	0.20	-
N	OTE :	RAL DRY RAL MOIS EE OF SA BURDEN	DENSIT STURE C ATURATI PRESSI	Y ONTENT ON JRE	Pc Ce Cc ME	= = =	PREC EXPA VIRGI CONS	ONSOLII NSION IN N COMP STRAINEI	DATION F IDEX RESSION D MODUL	PRESSUR I INDEX .US	E	

TABLE 5: Summary of Results of Oedometer Tests on Undisturbed Block Samples

Ps

ρd

Sr

P0

NMC

=

OVERBURDEN PRESSURE SWELL PRESSURE

TABLE 6: Summary of Results of Oedometer Tests on Compacted Soils

HOLE NO.	DEPTH m	SOIL ORIGIN	₽ kg/m³	NMC %	SG	eo	Sr %	P _c kPa	ME 10kPa- 200kPa (MPa)	Ce	Cc
тц и	0.20-1.20	Hillwash Compacted to 93% Mod AASHTO	1689	15	2.667	0.579	70	220	9.1	0.009	0.246
1H.4	0.20-1.20	Hillwash Compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO	1755	15	2.677	0.520	77	225	8.8	0.010	0.206
TU 10	0.20-0.80	Hillwash Compacted to 93% Mod AASHTO	1797	14	2.679	0.485	79	125	3.8	0.013	0.176
10.12	0.20-0.80	Hillwash Compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO	1842	15	2.679	0.449	91	215	8.3	0.009	0.160
TH.21	1.20-1.80	Ferr. Hillwash Compacted to 93% Mod AASHTO	1933	9	2.677	0.462	52	218	7.5	0.016	0.173
	1.20-1.80	Ferr. Hillwash Compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO	1978	10	2.677	0.428	60	255	8.0	0.010	0.166

PC =

Ce =

Cc =

ME =

NOTE :

NATURAL DRY DENSITY = NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT = = DEGREE OF SATURATION = OVERBURDEN PRESSURE

PRECONSOLIDATION PRESSURE

EXPANSION INDEX

VIRGIN COMPRESSION INDEX

CONSTRAINED MODULUS (UNCORRECTED)

HOLE	DEPTH	SOIL TYPE AND ORIGIN	(ρ _d) max	OMC %	Max Swell	C	of	TRH.14 Class		
NO.			kg/m³	/0	%	90%	93%	95%	98%	
TH.1	0.50-1.10	Abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand. Partly ferruginised hillwash.	1871	11.7	0.2	11	14	17	22	G8
	0.30-0.70	Silty Sand. Hillwash.	1853	12.5	0.3	3.4	5.2	6.9	11	G10
TH.2	0.70-1.40	Abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand.	1914	11.1	0.2	16	27	38	62	G6
	0.20-0.80	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	1843	13.5	0.3	5.8	7.8	9.4	13	G9
TH.3	0.90-1.40	Gravelly clayey silty sand. Hillwash with gravels.	1846	12.2	0.3	13	17	19	24	G7
TH.4	0.20-1.20	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	1825	15.5	0.4	6	7.9	9.4	12	G9
TH.10	2.20-2.60	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	2002	11.6	0.2	5.9	9	12	18	G9
TH.12	0.20-0.80	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	1913	15.1	0.2	8	12	15	23	G8
TH.21	1.20-1.80	Abundant ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand. Ferruginised hillwash.	2082	9.8	0.2	14	22	32	53	G7

TABLE 7: Summary of Mod AASHTO Compaction and CBR Tests

NOTE :

(ρd) max = MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY CBR = CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO OPTIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT

TABLE 8: Summary of Bulk Density Tests

OMC =

HOLE NO.	DEPTH, m	SOIL TYPE & ORIGIN	MOISTURE CONTENT %	DRY DENSITY kg/m ³	BULK DENSITY kg/m ³
	0.90-1.10	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	17.7	1344	1582
TH.4	3.10-3.40	Gravelly clayey sand with abundant ferruginous nodules. Moderately ferruginised residual shale.	12.4	2055	2310
TH.5	2.30-2.50	Clayey silt. Possible residual dolerite.	26	1487	1874
TH.6	1.20-1.40	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	19.4	1328	1586
TH.7	4.10-4.40	Clayey silt. Possibly residual dolerite.	31	1426	1868
TH.12	0.45-0.60	Clayey sandy silt. Hillwash.	16.9	1402	1639
	1.50-2.50	Gravelly silty sand. Ferricrete.	13.9	1963	2236
TH.13	2.85-3.10	Clayey silty gravel. Weak ferricrete.	16	1777	2061
TH.16	1.00-1.30	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	20.4	1379	1660
	1.70-2.05	Mixture of Clayey silty sand with abundant gravels and ferruginous nodules. Hillwash and ferruginised hillwash.	20.7	1574	1900

HOLE NO.	DEPTH m	SOIL TYPE & ORIGIN	pH Value	Conductivity mS/cm
TH.4	0.90-1.10	Clayey silty sand. Hillwash.	5.8	0.0183
	3.10-3.40	Gravelly clayey sand with abundant ferruginous nodules. Moderately ferruginised residual shale.	12.4	0.0090
TH.7	4.10-4.40	Clayey silt. Possibly residual dolerite.	6.4	0.0249
TH.12	3.40-3.60	Sandy silt. Possible residual dolerite.		0.0060
TH.16	3.30-3.70	Gravelly sandy clay. Ferricrete.		0.0105
TH.17	3.50-3.80	Clayey sandy silt. Possible residual dolerite.	6.7	0.0110
TH.18	3.20-3.40	Clayey sandy gravel. Ferricrete.	6.9	0.0162

TABLE 9: Summary of Conductivity and pH Tests

9. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Dolomitic Stability Of Site 9.1

- 9.1.1 The drilling of 3 deep boreholes at the site of the proposed extensions to supplement 2 deep boreholes that had been drilled previously at the northern section of the existing development revealed that no dolomitic formations are present down to the depth of a least 60m below existing ground surface.
- 9.1.2 Taking into account that the site is situated in a non-dewatered compartment, it has been assigned an Inherent Hazard Class of "Non-Dolomitic".
- 9.1.3 However, cognizance will have to be taken of the fact that dolomites are still underlying the site, albeit at great depths, and therefore, some precautions will have to be taken to prevent concentrated water ingress into the ground. The implementation of precautions corresponding to a D2 Dolomitic Designation, according SANS 1936:2012 is recommended.

9.2 Near-Surface Founding Conditions

The near-surface investigation, comprising the excavation detailed examination and sampling of 21 trial holes down to a maximum depth of 4.50 m, and the results of extensive laboratory testing on representative soil samples indicate the following:

- Below a 0,2 0,3 m thick topsoil, containing vegetable matter, the site is underlain 9.2.1 by an orange brown clayey silty sand, hillwash down to the depths of 0,7 - 1,9 m but mostly within the 1,2 - 1,6 m range. The hillwash was found to be a low density, partly saturated soil of relatively moderate plasticity, but of significant compressibility and collapse potential. Collapse tests indicated that it undergoes collapse settlements varying mostly from 1,40% to 3,70% at the moderate effective stress of 50 kPa and that, beyond this stress level, it is associated with a high compression index of mostly within the 0.20 - 0.40 range. It is evident. therefore, that this soil is unsuitable for supporting significant foundation loads, including heavily loaded floors. Some form of foundation treatment is, therefore, required to be carried out to protect the structure from detrimental total and differential settlements.
- 9.2.2 The lower section of the hillwash has been ferruginised and comprises abundant ferruginous nodules in a clayey/silty sand matrix. This is deemed to be somewhat



more competent and mostly of firm or medium dense consistency and of moderate plasticity. However, it is occasionally soft and incompetent.

- 9.2.3 <u>The dense or very dense ferricrete</u>, which is present within most of the site within the depth range of 1,1 2,8 m, but mostly within the 1,4 2,4 m range, is deemed to be a competent founding medium and can support significant foundation loads with little consequent deformation. It's thickness, however, is limited and frequently relatively thin. In these areas foundation stresses will be required to be reduced to suit the underlying less competent soils. The latter comprise mostly clayey/sandy silts, residual dolerite or shale which vary in consistency from "firm" to "very stiff". These have also been found to be of significant plasticity and of medium swelling/shrinkage potential. The thickness of these clayey soils has not been established as they extend beyond the limit of reach of the excavator.
- 9.2.4 Information from deep drilling carried out at the immediate vicinity of the market, indicates that the clayey horizons can extend to large depths, of the order of 4,0-12 m or more and can be of high plasticity and high swelling/shrinkage potential. Their effect on the stability of the proposed structure is, however, likely to be small due to the mitigating effects of the high ground water table and the presence of the hard ferricrete.
- 9.2.5 <u>Ground water</u> was encountered within the trial holes at depths varying from 3,4 4,4 m below existing ground surface. The 3 deep boreholes drilled within the site, however, within which the ground water was allowed to stabilize for at least 24 hours, the ground water table level was slightly shallower varying from 2,8 3,6 m in two of the 3 boreholes.
- 9.2.6 Modified AASHTO Compaction and CBR tests carried out on representative samples of near surface soils indicate the following
 - a) The near surface clayey silty sand, hillwash, constitutes a low quality fill and classifies as mostly a G9 material, and occasionally, G10, in terms of TRH.14.
 - b) The ferruginised hillwash (abundant ferruginous nodules in clayey silty sand matrix) has been found to be more competent and classifies as a G7 G6 material.
- 9.2.7 Oedometer tests carried out on compacted specimens of the near surface hillwash soils at degrees of compaction of 93 95% Mod AASHTO dry density at optimum moisture content indicated that their compressibility at the compacted state is improved with the Constraint Modulus varying mostly within the 8 9 MPa range. Further analyses of the results, however, suggested that the Constrained Modulus is improved to an average of 10 and 15 MPa corresponding to degrees of compaction of 93% and 95%, respectively, or greater values.

10. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 <u>Earthworks</u>
 - 10.1.1 Before any earthworks operations are carried out, the upper 150 mm section of the topsoil should be stripped to spoil, or to stockpile if needed for landscaping purposes.
 - 10.1.2 Due to the relatively heavily loaded floors and the load imposed by the fill to be placed to raise floor levels to at least 1,0 m above natural ground, the incompetent

hillwash covering the entire site will be required to be treated in order to limit the settlement and consequential cracking of the ground floors. This can be achieved either by;

- a) The in-situ densification of the hillwash soils by impact rolling from the surface (or alternatively, by rapid impact compaction) or
- b) By the removal of the incompetent soils, and their re-compaction to a minimum of 93% Mod AASHTO dry density, at optimum moisture content (O.M.C.).
- 10.1.3 Impact rolling can be decided upon only after an appropriate in-situ testing programme, involving impact rolling test strips and measuring the resulting densification and improvement in compressibility, has been carried out.
- 10.1.4 Before proceeding with any dynamic compaction (impact rolling or rapid impact compaction), the possible effects of the resulting vibrations on existing structures must be considered.
- 10.1.5 The fill required to be placed over the compacted hillwash to raise the floor levels 1m above existing ground surfaces, should comprise minimum G6 quality fill, compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO dry density at O.M.C in maximum 150 mm thick layers.

10.2 Foundation Design: Main Buildings

- 10.2.1 Column Foundations: Pad Footings
 - a) Heavily loaded columns should be supported on normal pad footings taken through the fill and compacted hillwash, and supported on the dense ferricrete present mostly at the depths of 1,3 - 2,5 m with an average of 1,9 m below existing ground surface. A maximum allowable foundation bearing pressure of 250 kPa can be used for foundation design purposes with a minimum foundation width of 1,2 m. The permissible bearing pressure has been reduced to allow for the fact that the ferricrete is often thin and underlain by less competent soils.
 - b) Within certain areas where the ferricrete is not present the foundations can be supported on top of the dense and dense to very dense residual dolerite.
 - c) Within trial hole TH.5 no ferricrete nor competent residual dolerite was encountered. Instead a firm clayey silt, residual dolerite is present below 1,7 m extending to the depth of 4,4 m. This horizon was found to be relatively compressible and considered unsuitable to support heavily loaded foundations.

The following foundation treatment should be carried in this and similar areas:

- i. The foundation should be designed on the basis of a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 150 kPa.
- ii. The foundation excavation should be at least 1,5 x the footing width and should be extended to the depth below the underside of the footing of 1,5 times the footing width.
- iii. The excavation below the underside of the footing should then be backfilled with G5 quality gravel fill, placed in 150 m thick layers and compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO dry density at optimum moisture content.

- iv. The footing can then be constructed centrally on top of the compacted engineered fill.
- d) The conditions encountered within trial hole TH.5 are anomalous, and do not correlate with any of the surrounding trial holes. Because it is possible for similar conditions to occur anywhere within the site it will, therefore, be necessary for a geotechnical engineer to inspect and approve of all foundation excavations prior to casting of concrete.
- e) Depths of founding corresponding to the positions of the various trial holes, are listed in Table 10.

		Heavily Loaded Structures		
TH. No.	Fonding Medium	Founding Depth (m below GL)	Allowable Bearing Pressure (kPa)	
TH.4	Ferricrete	2.30	250	
TH.5	Engineered fill under foundations to 1 Engineered Fill. allowable bearing pressure of 150 kP		ler foundations to 1,5x signed using maximum pressure of 150 kPa.	
TH.6		2.50	250	
TH.7		1.10	250	
TH.8	Ferricrete	1.95	200	
TH.9		1.95	250	
TH.10		1.90	250	
TH.11	Residual dolerite.	1.80	250	
TH.12		1.50	250	
TH.13	Forviorete	1.50	250	
TH.14		1.30	200	
TH.15		1.60	200	
TH.16		2.30	250	
TH.17	remciele	2.20	150	
TH.18		2.40	250	
TH.19		2.80	250	
TH.20		2.00	200	
TH.21		2.30	250	

TABLE 10: Anticipated Founding Levels at Various Trial Hole Positions

10.2.2 Wall Foundations: Strip Footings and/or Ground Beams

- a) If, as indicated in Section 10.1 (Earthworks) the incompetent hillwash soils underlying the site are densified by in-situ dynamic compaction and the fill to raise floor levels to 1,0 m above ground has been constructed as indicated in Section 10.1.5, it will be possible to support the up to 7,5 m high brick walls on reinforced concrete strip footings founded within the engineered fill at nominal depths (0,6 m below top of floor level).
- b) Under these conditions the footings can be designed using a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 100 kPa with a minimum foundation width of 0,8 m. The walls should be provided with joints at suitable spacings to increase their flexibility.

c) If the natural ground is not densified, or, if deemed to be more economical, the brick walls can be supported on ground beams spanning in between columns. If the latter are far apart intermediate supports can be added. These should be designed as pad footings or piers founded within the dense ferricrete and designed as per the recommendations of Section 10.2.1.

10.2.3 Loading Bay Foundations

- a) The loading bay retaining walls should be supported within the in-situ densified or otherwise densified soils at the minimum depth of 0,6 m. A maximum allowable bearing pressure of 75 MPa can be used for design purposes with a minimum foundation width of 0,60 m.
- b) If the near-surface incompetent soils are not densified it will be necessary for the walls to be extended down to the medium dense ferruginous gravel present within the depth range of 0,5 – 1,0 m below existing ground surface within trial holes TH.4, 6, 8 - 10, 16 - 18, 20 and 21 and 1,05 - 1,95 m within the remaining trial holes.

10.2.4 Single Storey Structures

For smaller single storey lightly loaded structures which are constructed at ground level it may be possible to construct the foundations at nominal depths within the compacted hillwash soils and designed using a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 150 kPa instead of extending into the ferricrete. In this case the following excavation and replacement procedure should be followed.

- The foundation trenches should be excavated to a width of 1.5 times the footing width and to a depth <u>below underside of footings</u> also equal to 1.5 times the footing width.
- Approved engineered fill of at least G6 quality should then be placed within the trench, in maximum 150 mm thick layers and compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO dry density at optimum moisture content (OMC), up to the underside of footing level.
- The proposed building can be supported on minimum 750 mm wide strip footings constructed centrally within the trench and designed using a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 100 kPa.

Loading bay retaining walls can be supported within the compacted hillwash soils using a maximum allowable edge pressure of 100 kPa.

10.2.5 Potential Clay Heave/Shrinkage Movements

- a) This investigation has showed that the reworked/residual soils underlying the site and, occasionally, the ferricrete itself, are significant plasticity and can be of significant swell/shrinkage potential.
- b) The clays under the ferricrete are generally present at depths of mostly 2,5 -4,0 m and are close to or below the ground water table. Because of this, and the protective action of the ferricrete, it is considered unlikely that any significant heave movements will be generated from these clays. Should the ground water drop, however, and the clay is allowed to dry out, significant clay shrinkage and consequent foundations and floor settlements and consequent distress can occur.

c) In areas where the ferruginous soils are not present (TH.5) some moderate heave is possible, of the order of 15 mm taking into account the clayey soils marginally classify of being of medium potential expansiveness (although no heave was experienced in an oedometer test or an undisturbed black sample).

10.3 Ground Floors

- 10.3.1 Ground floors will be required to be designed to support heavy imposed stacking/storage loads as well as wheel loads from forklift trucks. Floor elevations will be approximately 1,0 m above existing ground surface.
- 10.3.2 In order to ensure long term stability it will be necessary to density all near-surface hillwash soils underlying the site, as indicated in Section 10.1.2 and to subsequently place minimum G6 quality fill compacted to 95% Mod AASHTO dry density at optimum moisture content as indicated in section 10.1.5.
- 10.3.3 The layerworks immediately below the floor will be dependent on the manner of the design of the floor and nature and magnitude of applied loads.
- 10.3.4 Particular attention should be paid to the design of the floor supporting large fridges. Taking into account the relatively shallow ground water table and the possibility that it can rise further, a suitably designed insulation should be provided under all fridges in order to prevent the freezing of the possibly saturated ground and consequent large heave of the floors that is likely to occur.

10.4 Roads and Parking

- 10.4.1 All roads and parking should be designed bearing in mind the presence of the near surface hillwash soils which classify mostly as G9, and occasionally G10 quality materials in terms of TRH.14.
- 10.4.2 For long term stability it is considered advisable to densify these soils with impact rolling, as recommended for the remaining site.
- 10.5 <u>Water Bearing Services and Stormwater Drainage</u>
 - 10.5.1 All water bearing infrastructure and provisions for stormwater drainage should be designed in accordance with the provisions of SANS 1936 for a D2 dolomitic designation of the site.
 - 10.5.2 The entire area should be provided with suitable surface drainage to ensure the speedy disposal of stormwater away from it as per SANS 1936.

10.6 Influence Of Ground Water

- 10.6.1 A shallow ground water table was observed to be present with the trial holes at depths varying mostly within the 3,8 4,0 m depth range. The deep boreholes, however, showed that after 24 h the ground water table rises to 2,6 3,8 m.
- 10.6.2 It should be noted that it is possible for a perched ground water table to develop on top of the relatively shallow ferruginised horizons and possibly even over the compacted hillwash horizon overlying it if densified during periods of prolonged rainfall.
- 10.6.3 Structures should be provided with suitable waterproofing to avoid damage due to moisture rising into the buildings. All fridges to be provided with suitable insulation as discussed in Section 10.3.5.

10.7 Excavation Classification

- 10.7.1 All excavations are classified as "soft" sown to the depths of 1,5 2,5 m where the dense to very dense ferricrete is present.
- 10.7.2 Excavations within the ferricrete can classify as "intermediate" in areas where the ferricrete is well cemented and very dense.
- 10.7.3 Excavation conditions below the ferricrete are classified as "soft".

10.8 Stability of Excavations

10.8.1 Excavations for foundations and pipeline trenches are expected to be stable in the short term. Nevertheless, all excavations will be required to be evaluated for stability and all precautions are required to be taken to ensure safe working conditions at all times.

10.9 Surface Water

- 10.9.1 Adequate storm water drainage as well as a minimum 1,5 wide apron slab along the perimeter of the structures should be allowed for to ensure no water is allowed to pond close to the building.
- 10.10 Stability of Trenches
 - 10.10.1 All trenches excavated to the depth of about 1,50 to 2,0 m are expected to be stable when cut vertical for short periods. It should be noted if trenches are left open for long periods of time, sidewall collapse may occur. In these cases, the trenches should be adequately sloped back and proper stability evaluations and supervision should be carried out, depending on their depth.
 - 10.10.2 The trenches should at all times remain dry, and adequate care must be taken to avoid any surface water flow into the trenches during rainy periods.
- 10.11 General
 - 10.11.1 The relatively shallow ground water table present with the site has a protective influence on the dolomitic stability of the development. For these reasons, the ground water table should be kept at constant levels by avoiding pumping from boreholes, both within the site as well as from surrounding ones.
 - 10.11.2 Due to significant variations in subsoil conditions it is necessary that all foundation excavations be inspected and approval by a geotechnical engineer before blinding.
 - 10.11.3 Strict compaction control is required during earthworks to ensure compliance with specifications.

MICHAEL PAVLAKIS AND ASSOCIATES

Consulting Geotechnical Engineers

257 Barry Hertzog Ave <u>EMMARENTIA</u> JOHANNESBURG 2195 Tel: (011) 888-7232 Fax: (011) 888-7428 E-mail: mpavlaki@iafrica.com
































MICHAEL PAVLAKIS Hole No. & ASSOCIATES TRIAL HOLE PROFILE **TH.9** Consulting Geotechnical Engineers Raadgewende Geotegniese Ingenieurs Tel.(011) 888-7232 * Fax (011) 888-7428 DEPTH, m 0.00 Slightly moist, grey brown, loose, CLAYEY SILTY SAND with 0.25 abundant roots. Topsoil. Moist, dark reddish brown, loose, very CLAYEY SILTY SAND with fine roots and occasional brown pockets. Hillwash. 1.05 Abundant, 2 - 5 mm well rounded, loose, FERRUGINOUS 1.25 NODULES in matrix of dark reddish brown CLAYEY SILTY SAND as above with fine roots. Moist, dark reddish brown, loose to medium dense, 5 - 20 mm ferruginous nodules in matrix of dark reddish brown, CLAYEY 1.95 SILTY SAND. Slightly ferruginised hillwash.. Slightly moist, dark reddish brown, mottled bluish grey and yellow, weakly cemented, weak ferruginised, dense, CLAYEY SILTY SAND or sandy silt. Ferricrete. Becomes well ferruginised and very dense below 2,90 m. Scattered angular gravels (+-2 - 5 mm) between 2,80 - 3,30 m. 10 mm rounded gravel at 3,30 m. 4.00 4.00 4.25 Moist, reddish orange brown, stiff, shattered SANDY/SILTY CLAY. ▼ Residual dolerite. 4.35 4.32 NOTES 1. Bottom of hole at 4,35 m. 2. Near refusal of Sumitomo excavator. Very slow penetration rates. 2. Ground water standing at 4,25 m. Dwg. No. LTE CONSULTING **Disturbed Sample** 3546/15 Geotechnical Investigation For Ground Water Standing The Proposed New Upgrades To Fig. No. 15 Springs Fresh Produce Market












































































































APPENDIX 'A'

BOREHOLES DRILLED PREVIOUSLY NORTH OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS

SPRINGS FRESH PRODUCE MARKET

	X= X2904878	Y= Y00	57689 Z=	1641.00 n	nasl	
	Project no: Project name: Date drilled: Date profiled:	8631-15 Springs Fresh Produc 2015-11-25 2015-12-01	e Market	Client Drill contrac Driller: BH NO:	ctor:	Hlanganani Consulting Engineers Hennie Erwee William BH1
Ĕ						
netr rate min:s	Penetration rate seconds/m	Formation	Vation masl	mbol	lip size mm II depth (m)	DESCRIPTION
Pe		R SP CA		ŝ	ς μ	
0 . 22	60 120 180 240 3 0	1.0	1.0 164			
0 . 22	ľ	1.0	2.0 1639	0 11111111111		Dark reddish brown sandy clay: Residual shale, 100%
0:51		1.0	3.0 1638	8.0 : : : : : : :	<2	sandy clay.
1:31	7	0.1 0.9	4.0 163	7.0 : : : : : : :	4	ł.0
2:46		1.0	5.0 1630	6.0		
0:45		1.0	6.0 163	5.0		
0:55	1	1.0	······································	4.0		
1: 2]	1.0	8.0 1633	3.0	<2	Rea brown to yellow brown clay; Residual shale. 100% clay.
0:48	[1.0	9.0	2.0		
1: 5		1.0	10.0 163	.0		
2:11		1.0	<u>11.0</u> 1630	0.0	11	.0
0:47		1.0	12.0 1629	9.0		
0:46		1.0	13.0 1628	8.0		
0:40		1.0	14.0 162	7.0		Red brown clay with yellow white with fine blac
0:28		1.0	15.0 1620	\$.0	<5	speckles, highly weathered, sub-rounded syenite; Residual syenite. 80% clay, 20% syenite.
0:27		1.0	<u>16.0</u> 1629	5.0		
0:29		1.0	<u>17.0</u> 1624	ŀ.O		
0:34		1.0	18.0 1623	3.0	18	3.0
0:33		1.0	<u>19.0</u> 1622	2.0		
0:23		1.0	<u>20.0</u> 162	.0 +++++++ 		
0.34		1.0	21.0 1620			
0:37	1	1.0	23.0 1618			
0:42	ור	1.0	24.0 1612	7.0 +++++++		Red brown to yellow clay with red brown with fine black spoeckles, medium to hiahly weathered, sub-
0:41	ו ו	1.0	25.0 1610	5.0	<5	angular syenite; Weathered syenite. 65% clay, 35%
0:43		1.0	26.0 161	5.0 +++++		syenite.
0:39		1.0	27.0 1614	4.0		
1:4	1	0.1 0.9	28.0 1613	3.0 +++++++		
1:34		1.0	29.0 1612	2.0		
1:33		1.0	30.0 161	.0 ++++++	30	0.0
1	_			1		

Notes:

Notes (continue):

1. Water encountered at 12m. Water rest level at 4,2m.

2. No sample and no air loss.

3. Water used during drilling between 8-29m.

4. Hammer rate generally regular, except between 3-4m and 27-28m where it was irregular.

	X= X2904878	Y= Y0057689	Z=	1641.00 ma	asl	
	Project no: Project name: Date drilled: Date profiled:	8631-15 Spring Fresh Produce Market 2015-11-25 2015-12-01		Client Drill contract Driller: BH NO:	or:	Hlanganani Consulting Engineers Hennie Erwee William BH1 (cont)
E,						
enetr rate min:s	Penetration rate seconds/m	Formation 0 H H UP A V	EPTH m levation masl	ymbol hio size mm	ill depth (m)	DESCRIPTION
ă				ທີ່ບ	õ	
1:41	60 120 180 240 3 0	1.0	31.0 1610.0			•
1:38		1.0	32.0 1609.0			
1:7		1.0	33.0 1608.0			
0:41		0.9 0.1	34.0 1607.0			
0:49		1.0	35.0 1606.0	<4	2	Yellow brown clay; Residual shale. 100% clay.
0:56		1.0	36.0 1605.0			
1:14	4	0.1 0.9	37.0 1604.0			
0:50	6	1.0	38.0 1603.0			
1:7		0.1 0.9	39.0 1602.0		39.0	0
1: 2	│╎┖┓╶┤	1.0	40.0 1601.0			
2:10		1.0	41.0 1600.0			
1:11		1.0	42.0 1599.0			
1 : 23	5	1.0	43.0 1598.0			
2:2	4	1.0	44.0 1597.0			
1:41	│ ├ ┍┚ ── │	1.0	45.0 1596.0			
1:22	5	1.0	46.0 1595.0			
2: 7		1.0	47.0 1594.0			
1:31	5	1.0	48.0 1593.0			
2:24		1.0	49.0 1592.0	<	2	Red brown to brown clay; Residual shale. 100% clav.
1 . 52		1.0	51 0 1591.0			
1:24		1.0	52.0 1589.0			
2 : 17		1.0	53.0 1588.0			
1:10		1.0	54.0 1587.0			
1: 1		1.0	55.0 1586.0			
1:9		1.0	56.0 1585.0			
1:29		1.0	57.0 1584.0			
1:6		1.0	58.0 1583.0			
1:23	1	1.0	59.0 1582.0			
1:42		1.0	60.0 1581.0		60.0	D

Notes:

Notes (continue):

1. No water encountered.

2. No air and no sample loss.

3. No water used during drilling.

4. Hammer rate generally regular except between 33-34m, 36-37m and 38-39m where it was irregular.

	X= X2904937	Y= Y 00	57782 Z=	1641.00 masl	
	Project no: Project name: Date drilled: Date profiled:	8631-15 Springs Fresh Produc 2015-11-25 2015-12-01	e Market	Client Drill contractor: Driller: BH NO:	Hlanganani Consulting Engineers Hennie Erwee William BH2
m/a					
Penetr rate min:s	Penetration rate seconds/m	Formation H HIP3 LJS N AVP0	Air loss Eevation mast	Symbol Chip size mm	(ម) អ្នក ទ រដ្ឋ
	50 120 180 240 3 0				
0:49		1.0	1.0 164	0.0	
0:22		1.0	2.0 163	<2	Dark reddish brown clay; Residual shale. 100% clay.
1.38		1.0	4.0 163	7.0	40
1:29	11 1	1.0	5.0 163	5.0	+.U
1:14		1.0	6.0 163	5.0	
2:8		1.0	7.0 163	4.0	
0:36		1.0	8.0 163	3.0	Red brown clay; Residual shale. 100% clay.
0:34		1.0	9.0	2.0	
0:40		1.0	10.0 163	1.0	
0:37		1.0	11.0	0.0	11.0
0:39		1.0	12.0	9.0	
0:57		1.0	13.0	3.0	
0:42		1.0	14.0 162	7.0	
0:41		1.0	<u>15.0</u> 1620	5.0	
0:40	5	1.0	<u>16.0</u> 162	5.0	
1:13	¹	0.1 0.9	<u>17.0</u> 1624	4.0	
0:46		1.0	<u>18.0</u> 162	3.0	
0:39	1	1.0	19.0 162	2.0	
0 : 58		1.0	20.0 162	<2	Yellow brown clay; Residual shale/Syenite. 100% clay.
0:50	 (1.0	22.0 161	9.0	
0:42		1.0	23.0 161	3.0	
0:31		1.0	24.0 161	7.0	
0:45		1.0	<u>1111111111111111111111111111111111111</u>	5.0	
0:46		1.0	26.0 161	5.0	
0:45		1.0	27.0 161	4.0	
0:35	[1.0	28.0 1613	3.0	
0:57		1.0	29.0 1612	2.0	
0:35		1.0	30.0 161	1.0	
1					

Notes:

Notes (continue):

Water rest level at 3,4m.

2. No sample and no air loss.

3. Water used during drilling between 13-30m.

4. Hammer rate generally regular, except between 2-3m and 16-17m where it was irregular.

	X= X2904937	Y= Y005	57782	Z=	1641.00	mas	il i	
	Project no: Project name: Date drilled: Date profiled:	8631-15 Spring Fresh Produce 2015-11-25 2015-12-01	Market		Client Drill contra Driller: BH NO:	acto	r:	Hlanganani Consulting Engineers Hennie Erwee William BH2 (cont)
Ę								
Penetr rate min:s	Penetration rate seconds/m	Formation Sound Notes Symbol Notes Symbol	E HLABO	Elevation masl	Symbol	Chip size mm	Drill depth (m)	DESCRIPTION
0:58	4D 12O 18O 24O 30	1.0	<u>31.0</u>	1610.0		<2		Yellow brown clay; Residual shale/Syenite. 100% clay.
1:19		0.3 0.7	32.0	1609.0			32.0)
1:47		1.0	33.0	1608.0				
1: 3	1	1.0	34.0	1607.0				
1 : 29 1 : 10		1.0	35.0	1606.0 1605.0				
1:46		1.0	37.0	1604.0		~5		Yellow brown clay with yellow white with fine black
1: 7		1.0	38.0	1603.0		~5		syenite; Weathered syenite. 80% clay, 20% syenite.
1: 2		1.0 39.0 1602.0						
1: 0		1.0	40.0	1601.0				
1:14		1.0	41.0	1600.0				
1: 7		1.0	42.0	1599.0			42.0)
1:10		1.0	43.0	1598.0				
1:20	6	1.0	44.0	1597.0	++++++			
1:50		1.0	45.0	1596.0	NMMMMM			
1:32		1.0	46.0	1595.0	++++++			
1:55		1.0	47.0	1594.0	NNNNNN	_		Yellow brown to red brown silty clay with yellow brown with fine black speckles, medium to highly weathered, angular syenite; Weathered syenite. 70% silty clay, 30% syenite.
1:52		1.0	48.0	1593.0	++++++	<5		
2:13		0.3 0.7	49.0	1592.0	INMMMMM			
1:34		1.0	50.0	1591.0	++++++			
2: 2		0.1 0.9	51.0	1590.0	NNNNNN			
2:17		1.0	52.0	1589.0	+++++++			
2:6		1.0	53.0	1588.0			53.0	
1:13		0.9 0.1	54.0	1587.0				
0:49		1.0	55.0	1586.0				
1 . 55	1	0.1.0.9	56.0	1585.0		<20		Dark grey silt and dark grey and white, slightly to medium weathered, angular quartzite; Weathered
1 . 10	1	1.0	57.0	1583.0				quartzite. 50% silt, 50% quartzite.
1 . 13		1.0	59.0	1582.0				
1:41	1	1.0	60.0	1581.0			60.0)
1			23.0					

Notes:

Notes (continue):

1. Water encountered at 30m.

2. No air and no sample loss.

3. water used during drilling between 42-55m .

4. Hammer rate generally regular except between 48-49m, 50-51m, 53-54m and 56-57m where it was irregular.