GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

PROPOSED NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 91 OF MATJIESFONTIEN 304, KEURBOOMSTRAND, PLETTENBERG BAY

8 March 2023 (Rev 0)



Prepared by: OUTENIQUA GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES 23 CLYDE ST KNYSNA 6571



Prepared for: FAMILIE ROUX EINDOMME (PTY) LTD PO BOX 12670 QUEENSWOOD 0121

Ref No: 2022\Poise\Report\Geotechnical Report 8.3.2023 Rev0

Report review history:

Revision No	Date	Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
	0.0.0000	l Paton Pr Sci Nat Pr Tech Eng	S Ntanzi BSc Geology	l Paton Pr Sci Nat Pr Tech Eng
0	8.3.2023	AL		M

Authors qualifications and affiliations:

Iain Paton has postgraduate degrees in Geology and Geotechnical Engineering and has over 25 years' experience in the mining, energy and construction industries. Iain Paton is a registered 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 South African Institute of Engineering and Environmental Geologists (SAIEG), the Geotechnical Division of the South African Institute of Civil Engineering (SAICE) and the Institute of Municipal Engineering of South Africa (IMESA).

Declaration of independence:

The author of this report is 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. Ir	troduction1
1.1	Background information1
1.2	Scope of work1
1.3	Available information2
2. Si	te description2
3. N	lethods of investigation4
4. R	esults of the site investigation4
4.1	Regional geology4
4.2	Local soil and rock types5
4.3	Laboratory tests6
4.4	Insitu tests7
5. G	eotechnical assessment
5.1	Site classification
5.2	Bearing capacity and settlement of structures9
5.3	Heave9
5.4	Groundwater and site drainage9
5.5	Slopes
5.6	Excavations10
5.7	Natural construction materials10
6. R	ecommendations
6.1	Earthworks and structural foundations10
6.2	Site drainage11
6.3	Roads11
7. C	onclusions

List of Appendices

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

1. Introduction

1.1 Background information

A new residential development has been proposed on Portion 91 Of Matjiesfontien 304, Keurboomstrand, Plettenberg Bay. Refer to locality map in **Figure 1**. Outeniqua Geotechnical Services was appointed by the developer to conduct a broad-scope geotechnical investigation of the site. The proposed development consisted of new dwellings, internal access roads and bulk services. The physical and geotechnical nature of the site was investigated in order to facilitate the civil engineering design and project planning.



Figure 1: Locality map

1.2 Scope of work

The scope of work was to conduct a broad-scope geotechnical investigation in accordance with the SAICE Code of Practice for Site Investigations, including the following:

Desk Study:

• A desk-top review of all available information of the location, topography and geology of the site.

Site Work:

- A site reconnaissance survey to assess the general terrain and any obvious geotechnical risks associated with development of the site;
- A subsurface investigation including the excavation and profiling of a limited

number of test pits across the site with a TLB/Backactor to a depth of 2-3m or shallower refusal, to obtain an indication of the expected geotechnical conditions;

- The collection and packaging of soil samples for laboratory testing, including:
 - Foundation Indicator tests determine gradings, Atterberg limits and potential expansiveness.
 - Modified AASHTO density, CBR & Indicator tests to determine the compaction/strength properties.
- Insitu testing, including dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP).

Professional assessment & reporting:

The assessment of data by a geotechnical engineering professional, and the preparation of a concise factual and interpretive report recommendations for:

- Foundation design for structures (including founding depths, estimated allowable safe bearing pressures).
- Any other precautions to be taken with regards to the geotechnical conditions for the proposed development.

1.3 Available information

The following maps & plans were available for consultation:

- A site locality map, provided by the developer.
- 1: 250 000 Geological Series 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.

2. Site description

The proposed site was located on semi-rural land in close proximity to the up-market residential area of Keurboomstrand. At the time of the investigation the site was easily accessible from the existing municipal road along the southern boundary of the site. See **Figure 2**. The site was largely vacant but was being used as a horse-riding facility with several temporary stable structures. The topography was broadly characterised by very gently sloping ground on the southern portion of the site (the proposed development portion) with an average gradient of ~1:50, and a steep northern portion (not intended for development). The ground surface on the development portion was covered in patchy short grass and a few scattered bushes and trees. The northern slopes were densely vegetated with indigenous bush (see **Figure 3 & 4**). The climate of the area was typically wet with a Weinert Climatic N-value of 2.



Figure 2: Aerial photo map



Figure 3: View of the southern portion of the site looking south-east



Figure 4: View of the site looking north-west

3. Methods of investigation

An initial site walk-over of the site was conducted to assess the site terrain, topographic features and any obvious geotechnical issues. This was followed by a subsurface investigation consisting of several test pits, which were excavated random fashion across the site using a TLB/Backactor. This exercise was aimed at gathering geotechnical information regarding the nature of the ground conditions (soil moisture, texture, consistency, groundwater levels, etc.). The soil profiles and photographs of the test pits were included in **Appendix 2** of this report.

Representative samples of different soil types were collected from test pits for Foundation Indicator tests and Mod/CBR/Indicator tests. The tests were performed at a SANAS-Accredited laboratory (Outeniqua Lab), in accordance with the TMH1 and ASTM methods. Details of the tests were included in **Appendix 3** of this report.

In situ dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP) tests were conducted at each test pit position from NGL to a maximum depth of 2-4m or shallower refusal. Details of the tests were included in **Appendix 4** of this report.

4. Results of the site investigation

4.1 Regional geology

The official geological mapping of the area indicated that the lower/southern portion of the site was underlain by estuarine/alluvial sand deposits of Quaternary age (yellow on map in **Figure 5**) which overlie sandstone and conglomerate of the Enon Formation (red/orange on map) of the Uitenhage Group on the northern slopes. The Enon Formation then overlies shale of the Gydo Formation and sandstone and shale of Baviaanskloof Formation which outcrop along the Keurboomstrand road to the east of the site. No major geological faults were mapped in the vicinity of the site and the risk of seismic activity was low. The geology was generally considered macro stable for development purposes with due consideration paid to local geotechnical constraints.



Figure 5: Geological map of site

4.2 Local soil and rock types

The soil profile was broadly consistent across the site, and dominated by estuarine sandy soil (see **Figure 6**). The profile broadly included a sporadic upper horizon of imported fill soil (disturbed or dumped soil), underlain by an insitu topsoil horizon, consisting of silty sand, roots and organic humus, which was underlain by unconsolidated to semi consolidated sand with scattered marine shell fragments. At TP5, a pedogenic calcrete hardpan layer (very soft rock) was encountered just below the topsoil horizon (see **Figure 7**). The calcrete was highly to completely weathered in places to a sandy gravel, angular cobbles and/or small boulders. A summary of the soil profiles was provided in **Table 1**.



Figure 6: Typical sandy soil types encountered in test pits



Figure 7: Calcrete hardpan layer encountered in test pit TP5

Test		Soil		Einal danth				
pos. No.	Imported (fill)	Transported	Pedogenic	Residual	Rock	of test pit	Refusal	
TP1	0-300	2000	-	-	-	2000	None	
TP2	0-800	800-2600	-	-	-	2600	None	
TP3	-	0-1700	-	-	-	1700	None	
TP4	-	0-2600	-	-	-	1800	None	
TP5	-	0-400 & 700-2500	400-700	-	-	2500	None	
TP11	0-400	400-900	-	-	-	3000	None	

 Table 1: Test pit summary - Soil horizon thickness (in mm)

4.3 Laboratory tests

Representative samples of different soil horizons were collected for Foundation Indicator tests in order to determine their basic geotechnical properties, estimate potential expansivity and evaluate their suitability as founding mediums. Abbreviated results of the tests were shown in **Table 2**.

The tests indicated that all the soil was dominated by fine granular soils (silty sands). All samples were non-plastic and the potential expansiveness was therefore zero. Some samples showed a measurable clay content but since the soils were non-plastic this was deemed to be from non-clay colloids, possibly including calcium carbonate. The samples tested were classified into the following categories under the Universal Soil Classification system as ML (Inorganic silts, non-plastic silts) and SM (Silty sands).

The results of the Foundation Indicator tests were summarised in Table 2.

 Table 2: Summary of Foundation Indicator test results

Test	Sample	Atterberg Limits			Pa	article Ar	nalysis (MC*	DE**	USC		
No	(mm)	PI	LL	LS	Clay	Silt	Sand	Gravel	MC **	PE	***	
TP2	1500-2200	NP	NP	NP	16	21	63	0	1.5	NP	ML	
TP4	800-2600	NP	NP	NP	12	13	75	0	3.2	NP	SM	
TP5	700-2500	NP	NP	NP	14	42	44	0	10.7	NP	ML	

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

Representative samples of insitu soils were collected for Modified AASHTO density, CBR and Road Indicator tests to determine the potential for general filling under and around structures and in roadbeds. The results of the tests were summarised in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Summary of Mod. AASHTO, CBR & Road Indicator test results

Test	Sample			CBR at			Swell	PI			COLTO
No No	Depth (mm)	100 %	98 %	95%	93 %	90 %	(%)	(%)	GM	мдд омс	Class
TP2	500-2000	12	10	9	8	6	0	NP	1.4	1669/11.6	G8
TP3	0-700	20	14	8	6	3	0	NP	1.0	1751/12.2	G9
TP4	800-2600	17	14	11	9	7	0	NP	1.22	1614/11.2	G8

The test results indicated that the insitu material was dominated by silty fine sand with marginal strength properties but was generally suitable as bulk filling under and around structures or for road subgrade fill. Recommendations were given in **Chapter 6**.

4.4 Insitu tests

In situ penetration tests (DCP) indicated significant variation in the consistency of the soil in the upper 0.7m of the profile, but consistently dense conditions below this level.

Test		0-1 m		1-2m				2-3m		3-4m		
No	DN	Con	φ′°	DN	Con	φ′°	DN	Con	φ′°	DN	Con	φ′°
1	40	L	28	29	MD	30	n/a	-	-	n/a	-	-
2	25	MD	32	21	MD	32	n/a	-	-	n/a	-	-
3	33	MD	30	31	MD	30	n/a	-	-	n/a	-	-
4	34	MD	30	26	MD	32	20	MD	33	11	D	
5	40	L	28	10	D	36	n/a	-	-	n/a	-	-
6	45	L	28	22	MD	32	n/a	-	-	n/a	-	-
7	27	MD	32	24	MD	32	11	D		23	MD	32
8	42	L	28	26	MD	32	20	MD	33	16	D	34
9	52	L	28	25	MD	32	21	MD	32	23	MD	32
10	38	MD	30	21	MD	32	14	D	35	16	D	34

 Table 4:
 Summary of DCP tests

*DN – Max penetration rate

DCP tests indicated a general improvement in density and bearing capacity with increasing

Con - Consistency

depth with some minor variations. The tests confirmed that shallow foundations would be generally suitable but good compaction would be required to mitigate settlement, particularly in the foundation influence zone within a depth range of up to 2m below NGL.

5. Geotechnical assessment

5.1 Site classification

The site was mapped according to the site class designations provided in SANS10400-H (refer to **Table 5**). Due to the broadly consistent conditions observed in the investigation, the majority of the proposed development footprint area was mapped as a single geotechnical terrain with the site class designation of **S1** (potentially compressible sandy soils). Minor superficial deposits of uncontrolled fill (**P**) were also mapped as indicated in **Figure 8**.



Figure 8: Geotechnical map

 Table 4: SANS 10400-H Geotechnical site class designations

1	2	3	4	5
Typical founding material	Nature of founding material	Expected range of total soil movements	Assumed differential movement	Site class designation
		mm	% of total	
Rock (excluding mud rocks which might exhibit swelling to some depth)	Stable	Negligible	_	R
Fine-grained soils with moderate to very high plasticity (clays, silty clays, clayey silts and sandy clays)	Expansive soils	< 7,5 7,5 to 15 15 to 30 > 30	50 50 50 50	H H1 H2 H3
Silty sands, clayey sands, sands, sands, sandy and gravelly soils	Compressible and potentially collapsible soils	< 5 5 to 10 > 10	75 75 75	C 1 62
Fine-grained soils (clayey silts and clayey sands of low plasticity), sands, sandy and gravelly soils	Compressible soils	< 10 10 to 20 > 20	50 50 50	> S S1 S2
Contaminated soils ^a , controlled fill, dolomite land, landslip, landfill, marshy areas, mine waste fill, mining subsidence reclaimed areas, uncontrolled fill, very soft silts/silty clays	Variable	Variable		P ^b

5.2 Bearing capacity and settlement of structures

Observations made during the site investigations and analysis of test results indicated that the natural soils at normal shallow levels (0.5-1m) was dominated by potentially compressible fine sand. The soil would require improvement (compaction) to safely support type 1 residential structures on conventional shallow spread foundations with typical bearing pressures of up to 150kPa. Beyond this maximum typical load, the depth of improvement or type of foundation would require further consideration.

Other geotechnical constraints which could affect earthworks or foundations, such as uncontrolled fill, surface water bodies and ground water were also identified. Earthworks and foundation design recommendations were provided in **Chapter 6**.

5.3 Heave

The soil profile was not expected to display any significant expansivity and no special measures would be required to cater for heave.

5.4 Groundwater and site drainage

The fine sandy soil conditions generally had moderate permeability and drainage characteristics, but surface water was expected to accumulate temporarily after heavy rainfall events. A surface water body, fed by a perennial spring, was also identified at the base of the slope on the eastern side of the site. Groundwater was identified in test pits on the southern (lower) side of the site (TP1 & TP5) at an average depth of 2m. Seepage and run-off from the slopes to the north were therefore expected to have an influence on the engineering design. Groundwater was also expected to affect deep excavations (>1.5m below NGL) in some areas.

5.5 Slopes

No slope stability problems were observed on the steep slopes above (to the north) of the proposed development area. The maximum gradient of the slopes was estimated from contour data at 1:1.5. The slopes were covered in dense vegetation and generally inaccessible for detailed inspection but according to the geological map, the slopes were underlain by dense conglomerate and sandstone of the Enon Formation, which was well exposed in near-vertical road cuttings to the northwest of the site. The slopes had been enjoying a state of general stability for many years and this was deemed to be due to the stable underlying geology and was therefore not considered to present a significant risk to the site.

5.6 Excavations

All excavations to 2m were provisionally classified as "Soft" in terms of SABS1200D, and easily excavatable by hand or with light machinery (TLB). Sidewalls of temporary excavations (trenches) were expected to be highly unstable, even for short periods, due to the loose sandy soil types.

5.7 Natural construction materials

The sandy soils that were encountered in test pits were classified as G8-9 and were deemed to be potentially suitable as general structural fill material under foundations and floors or behind retaining walls, when placed and compacted to the engineer's specifications.

6. Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on limited information gained from the site investigation and although the confidence in the information is high, significant variation is likely to occur between information points. All geotechnical information should be verified during construction and any significant variations should be brought to the attention of the geotechnical engineer for comment or further recommendations. It is recommended that the structural & civil engineers discuss their designs with the geotechnical engineer to ensure that the designs are compatible with the expected geotechnical conditions.

6.1 Earthworks and structural foundations

Earthworks should be designed and constructed in accordance with SABS 1200D and/or any site-specific specifications provided by the civil engineer. Foundations should be designed and constructed in accordance with SANS 10400-H or as specified by the structural engineer.

To clear and prepare site for earthworks and construction, it was recommended that at least 150mm of topsoil and vegetation cover be removed from the footprint area. Large roots be grubbed and platform levels established by cutting and/or filling with insitu soil obtained from site. Bulk fill should be compacted to minimum 93%MDD. Low retaining walls may be required in some areas, depending on site levels. The insitu sandy soils were generally suitable for use as general fill on platforms, in roadbeds and as trench backfill. Any organic matter or unsuitable soil should be removed from potential fill material.

Unsuitable ground conditions exposed during earthworks should be referred to the engineer for further investigation and consideration on appropriate action.

The recommended foundation system for the proposed single/double storey residential structures included the following:

- a. RC strips/bases clear and level site to PL, excavate trenches to PL-1m, wet and compact base of trench with 6 passes of mechanical rammer, such that DCP penetrates at less than 30mm/blow to a depth of 1m below the base of the excavation, backfill the trench to PL-0.7m (recommended final founding level) in layers with compacted sand ex-insitu to 100%MDD or <20mm/blow of DCP. Limit bearing pressures to max 150kPa. Alternatively, excavate trenches to PL-0.7m, compact base of trench such that DCP penetrates at less than 30mm/blow and limit bearing pressures to 100kPa.</p>
- b. Raft foundations on a compacted insitu platform excavate ~0.6m of insitu soils below entire platform area, compact base of excavation with roller, replace compacted soil in layers back up to platform level such that DCP penetrates at <30mm/blow, construct light raft foundation with max bearing pressures of 75kPa.</p>

Additional measures can be considered for heavier structures.

Regular supervision by the structural engineer was highly recommended to ensure suitable founding conditions.

6.2 Site drainage

The design and construction of storm water drainage should be carried out in accordance with SABS 1200LE, COLTO, The Red Book or other applicable standards, as determined by the civil engineer.

Consideration should be paid to stormwater drainage due to the low gradient on the site and the likelihood of stormwater accumulating on surface after heavy downpours. Stormwater from roofs can generally be handled in gutters, downpipes and open channels or underground pipes, with suitable discharge locations on the southern side of the site. A well designed road layout can assist in management of stormwater run-off from site, with minor flood events being accommodated within the road prism with raised barrier kerbs and/or side channels.

Allowances should be made for stormwater handling from slopes above the site (including continual seepage at/near spring area).

6.3 Roads

It is recommended that road layerworks, including G4-G6 subbase and G1-G4 base layers (for asphalt-sealed roads) be imported from local commercial quarries. The insitu sandy soil can be used for roadbed and SSG layerworks in lightly trafficked internal estate roads.

7. Conclusions

The investigations have indicated that the site was potentially suitable for the proposed development but there were some moderate geotechnical constraints which required consideration in the structural design. Some preliminary recommendations were provided but all geotechnical information should be verified during construction.

Appendix 1

Maps







Marine and estuarine terrace gravel and sand, partly calcareous Mariene en estuariese terrasgruis en sand, gedeeltelik kalkhoudend

Enon and similar younger deposits Enon en soortgelyke jonger afsettings

Gydo

Baviaanskloof

Kouga

Tchando

Cedarberg

Peninsula

Conglomerate, sandstone, siltstone, clay Konglomeraat, sandsteen, sliksteen, klei

Shale, siltstone Skalie, sliksteen

Feldspathic sandstone Veldspatiese sandsteen

subordinate shale ondergeskikte skalie

Brownish-weathering sandstone, fine to coarse grained; shale Bruinerig-verwerende sandsteen, fyn- tot grofkorrelrig; skalie

Shale, arenaceous shale Skalie, sanderige skalie

Whitish-weathering quartz sandstone, medium to coarse grained, quartzitic and massive Witterig- verwerende kwartssandsteen, middel- tot grofkorrelrig, kwartsities en massief

Whitish-weathering quartz sandstone, medium to coarse grained, quartzitic, feldspathic near top, profusely cross-bedded,

Witterig-verwerende kwartssandsteen, middel- tot grofkorrelrig, kwartsities, veldspaties naby bokant, sterk kruisgelaagd,

Appendix 2

Test pit profiles

Appendix 3

Lab test data

· Specimen delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

Ruaan Lesch Technical Signatory For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

1. 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 Directors of Outeniqua Lab.

- 2. 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.
- 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 erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

· Specimen delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

Ruaan Lesch Technical Signatory For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

1. 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 Directors of Outeniqua Lab.

- 2. 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.
- 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 erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

· Specimen delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

Ruaan Lesch Technical Signatory For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

Copyright © 2014 Llewelyn Heathcote. All Rights Reserved.

1. 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 Directors of Outeniqua Lab.

- 2. 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.
- 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 erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequence thereof.

-					w) +d		<u>R-CBR-1-8</u> May-19
-				רנ	<u>y)</u> Lla.		1.canac
	Registration No. 95/077	42/07					Sallas
	Materials Testing	Laboratory					Testing Laborator
ENIC	1UA 6 Mirrorball Street, G	eorge : PO B	ox 3186, (Geo	rge Industria, 653	36	
LAB-	Tel: 044 8743274 :	Fax: 044 87457	/79 : e	-mai	il: llewelyn@oute	niqualab.co.	za T0347
	Outeniqua Geotechnic	al Services			Project :	Portion 91 of	Matjiesfontein 304 - Keurbooms
- 4	P O Box 964				Date Received :	08/02/2023	·
storn	Knysna				Date Reported :	22/02/2023	
	6570				Req. Number :	0322/23	
entic	on : Iain Paton				No. of Pages :	1/3	
			TES	ST R	EPORT		
		CAL	IFORNI	AB	EARING RATIO	<u>0</u>	
San	nple Position (SV)	TP1	COLT	0:		1	85880
Dep	th (mm)	500-2000	00.00				Sieve Analyzis
San	nple No	85880	G8 55	G			
(0	Source	In-sit	u		·I		2 80
ial		Dark Yellowis	h Orange	ŕ			
iter	Soil Type	San	d				в
Σa		Proposor	- 1 (G7)				
		Material	ndicatora		ANS 2001 Mother		
	75 mm	100		<u>, - (3</u> 			
	63 mm	100	<u> </u>	pinio		┟────┤	Sieve Size
ğ	50 mm	100	───	<u> </u> °			
ŝŝir	27.5 mm	100	 				CBR Chart
as	37.5 mm	100		<u> </u>			
е	20 mm	100					
ag	20 mm	100				!	
ent	14 mm	100		<u> </u>			
õ	5 mm	100		<u> </u>			
Ре	2 mm	100		<u> </u>			
	0.425 mm	56		<u> </u>			92 94 96 98 100 102 Compaction (%)
	0.075 mm	3.4					,
		Material I	ndicators	<u>; - (S</u>	ANS 3001 Method	I PR5)	
Gra	ding Modulus	1.40	0.75 - 2.70	↓			Sieve Analysis
Coa	rse Sand Soil-Mortar (%)	43					5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
		Atterberg	j Limits -		NS 3001 Method C	iR10)	
Liqu	lid Limit (%)	Undetermined		Ļ			e ^m 60
Plas	sticity Index (%)		≤ 12	↓			40
Line	ear Shrinkage (%)	NP					20 20
		Material Strength	- (SANS 3	5001	Method GR30,GR4	0 - SCALPED)	o
þ	IVIAX Dry Density (kg/m ³)	1669	───	—			0.0 0.1 1.0 10.0 100.0 Sieve Size
Δ	Optimum Moisture Content (%)	11.6	 	_			
	Noula Moisture Content (%)	11.8	───	—			CBR Chart
Α	Relative Compaction (%)	100.0		<u> </u>			
	Swell (%)	0.0	_ ≤ 1.5	↓ ✓			
в	Relative Compaction (%)	95.6	I				%)
	Swell (%)	0.0	 	—			8
С	Relative Compaction (%)	92.5	 	_			
-	Swell (%)	0.0	 				
	@100% Max Dry Density	12	<u> </u>				Compaction (%)
≌	@98% Max Dry Density	10	L	_			
B	@95% Max Dry Density	9		<u> </u>			• 85880
-	@93% Max Dry Density	8	<u>≥</u> 10	*			Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
	@90% Max Dry Density	6					6 500 - Stanson
			Mate	rial	Condition		300 300 1 300 1 1 1 1 1 1
In	situ Moisture Content (%)						TO 350 Good Q 300 (May be Dusty)
		Soil Clas	sification	<u>ו Ac</u>	nieved By The Ma	terial	D 200 Erodible D 200 Materials Ravels
	COLTO:	G8 SSG		<u> </u>			Sec. 150 Good
	AASHTO System	A-3 / A-2-4	L	\square			50 1 Ravels and Corrugates
	Unified System	SW					0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 48
			4				Crading Co-History (Co)

Ruaan Lesch

Technical Signatory

For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

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 (<), non compliant (×) and uncertain (*) opinion indicators are based on an approximate 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

Director:

95% level or contidence 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 Director of Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.
 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 correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd 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.

^{2.} The uncertain (*) 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 (×) or non compliant (×) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

-							R-CBR-1-8 May-19
		QUAL		רנ	<u>y)</u> Lla.		1.00000
	Registration No. 95/07	742/07					Sallas
	Materials Testing	J Laboratory		_			Testing Laborate
ENI	10A 6 Mirrorball Street, C	Seorge : PO B	ox 3186, (Geo	rge Industria, 653	6	700.47
LAD-	Tel: 044 8743274 :	Fax: 044 87457	779 : e	-mai	il: llewelyn@oute	niqualab.co.	za 10347
	Outeniqua Geotechnic	al Services			Project :	Portion 91 of I	Matjiesfontein 304 - Keurbooms
stom	P O Box 964				Date Received :	08/02/2023	
5.011	Knysna				Date Reported :	22/02/2023	
	6570				Req. Number :	0322/23	
entic	on : Iain Paton				No. of Pages :	2/3	
			<u>TES</u>	<u>5T R</u>	<u>EPORT</u>		
		<u>CAL</u>	<u>IFORNI.</u>	<u>A B</u>	EARING RATIO	<u>כ</u>	
San	nple Position (SV)	TP3	COLT	0:			85882
Dep	oth (mm)	0-700	G9				Sieve Analysis
San	nple No	85882	Subgra	Ide			
S	5 Source	In-sit	tu				P 80
jaj		Dark G	irev				
ater	Soil Type	Silty S:	and				
Σ	O Classification	Pronoser	1 (G9)				
		Material I	ndicators	- (S	ANS 3001 Method	GR1)	ž ²⁰
	75 mm	100		- (5) - 5			0.0 0.1 1.0 10.0 100.0
	63 mm	100	1	hiniqC			Sieve Size
ng	50 mm	100	†	Ť			
SSI	37.5 mm	100					CBR Chart
Ба	28 mm	100		-			
ge	20 mm	100	-				8
Įąć	14 mm	100					й ¹⁰
Sen	5 mm	100	-				°
ero	2 mm	99		-			
ር	0 425 mm	94		-			90 92 94 96 98 100 102
	0.075 mm	74					Compaction (%)
		Material I	ndicators	; - (S	ANS 3001 Method	PR5)	
Gra	ding Modulus *	1.00	0 75 - 2 70				
Coa	arse Sand Soil-Mortar (%)	6		-			
	()	Atterberg	Limits -	(SAI	NS 3001 Method C	;R10)	<u> </u>
Liqu	uid Limit (%)	Undetermined	Í	Ì			<u>а</u> 60
Plas	sticity Index (%)	NP	≤ 12	\checkmark			
Line	ear Shrinkage (%)	NP	1	1			
	- ` '	Material Strength	- (SANS 3	001	Method GR30,GR4) - SCALPED)	ă
0	Max Dry Density (kg/m ³)	1751					0.0 0.1 1.0 10.0 100.0
Ī	Optimum Moisture Content (%)	12.2					Sieve Size
2	Mould Moisture Content (%)	12.1					CBR Chart
٨	Relative Compaction (%)	100.0					10
~	Swell (%)	0.0	<u>≤</u> 1.5	\checkmark			
D	Relative Compaction (%)	95.8					(%)
0	Swell (%)	0.0					B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B
~	Relative Compaction (%)	92.1					
<u> </u>	Swell (%)	0.0					
	@100% Max Dry Density	20					0 2
۲	@98% Max Dry Density	14					Compaction (%)
B	@95% Max Dry Density	8					• 85882
5	@93% Max Dry Density	6	≥ 7	*			Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
	@90% Max Dry Density	3					5 50 5 00 5 000 5 00 5 000 5 0000000000
			Mate	rial	Condition		t 450 - Stippery
In	situ Moisture Content (%)						350 - Good 300 - (May be Dusty)
		Soil Clas	sification	ו Ac	hieved By The Ma	terial	250 - Erodible Ravels
	COLTO:	G9 Subgrade					X 150 Good E 100
	AASHTO System	A-3 / A-2-4					50 Ravels and Corrugates
							0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 48
	Unified System	5P-5M					

Ruaan Lesch

Technical Signatory

For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

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 (<), non compliant (×) and uncertain (*) 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 (*) 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 (×) or non compliant (×) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

95% level or contidence 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 Director of Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.
 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 correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd 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.

				D+			<u>R-CBR-1-8</u> <u>May-19</u>
-		QUAL	4D (Pt	y) Lta.		600000
	Registration No. 95/077	42/07					TSallas
	Materials Testing	Laboratory					Testing Laboratory
ĒŇĪ	1UA 6 Mirrorball Street, G	George : PO Bo	ox 3186, (Geo	rge Industria, 653	36	
-LAB-	Tel: 044 8743274 :	Fax: 044 87457	79 : e	-mai	I: Ilewelyn@oute	niqualab.co.	za T0347
	Outeniqua Geotechnic	al Services			Project :	Portion 91 of	Matjiesfontein 304 - Keurboomst
etom	P O Box 964				Date Received :	08/02/2023	
31011	Knysna				Date Reported :	22/02/2023	
	6570				Req. Number :	0322/23	
entic	on : Iain Paton				No. of Pages :	3/3	
		CAL	<u>TES</u> IFORNI	<u>)T R</u> A B	<u>EPORT</u> EARING RATI	0	
San	nole Position (SV)	<u>тр</u> и		<u>.</u>		<u> </u>	85883
Den	th (mm)	800-2600	COLIN	<i>J</i> .			03003
San	pole No	85883	G8 SS	G			Sieve Analysis
Jan		ln_cit			I	<u> </u>	
als		Light Vollow	Orango				
teri			Jange				
Mai		Sand					gg 40
_		Proposed					20
	75	Material li	ndicators	<u>- (S</u>	ANS 3001 Method	GR1)	
		100		ainior		<u> </u>	0.0 0.1 1.0 10.0 100.0 Sieve Size
D	b3 mm	100		ő			
sin		100		<u> </u>			CBR Chart
as	37.5 mm	100		──		!	
ъ	28 mm	100		<u> </u>		!	
ag	20 mm	100		<u> </u>		!	
ent	14 mm	100		<u> </u>		!	
ŝrce	5 mm	100				!	
Ре	2 mm	100		──			
	0.425 mm	/5				!	92 94 96 98 100 102 Compaction (%)
	0.075 mm	Z.9			ANC 2004 Matheas		
Cro	ding Moduluo *		a 75 o 70	<u>; - (ə</u>	ANS 3001 Wethod	1 PR3)	
Gia	ung modulus	1.22	0.75 - 2.70	×			Sieve Analysis
Coa	irse Sand Soli-Mortal (%)	Z4 Attorborg	Limito	(6 11	NS 2001 Mothod (
Liau	ud Limit (9/)	Allerberg	Linnits -			JK IU)	
Diac	nu Linni (%)		< 12				. ≝. 60
line	ar Shrinkage (%)	NP	<u> ≤ 12</u>	–			40
LINE	Sar Offinikage (76)	Material Strength	- (SANS 3	2001	Method GR30 GR4		<u>م</u> 20
	Max Dry Density (ka/m ³)	1614					
2	Optimum Moisture Content (%)	11.2		<u> </u>		┟────┤───┘	Sieve Size
ž	Mould Moisture Content (%)	11.2		<u> </u>		┟────┤───┘	
	Relative Compaction (%)	100.0		<u> </u>			CBR Chart
Α	Swell (%)	0.0	< 1.5	\checkmark			
	Relative Compaction (%)	95 3	<u> </u>	⊢.́		┟────┤───┤	
В	Swell (%)	0.0		<u> </u>			., .,
	Relative Compaction (%)	92.8	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			°
С	Swell (%)	0.0		<u> </u>			
	@100% Max Dry Density	17	L	+			0 2
	@98% Max Dry Density	14					Compaction (%)
BR	@95% Max Dry Density	11	L	<u> </u>			• 85883
ū	@93% Max Dry Density	9	> 10	*			
	@90% Max Dry Density	7	v				Wearing Course Graph (TRH 20)
	Cool of max bry bonony	· ·	Mate	rial (Condition		6 500 - Slippery
In	situ Moisture Content (%)		mate				9 400 - 9 350 - Good
		Soil Clas	sification		hieved By The Ma	terial	250 Motoriale (May be Dusty) 9 200 Motoriale Ravels
	COLTO	G8 SSG					50 200 - Wildeendans Good
	00010.			<u> </u>			50 Ravels and Corruptions
	AASHTO System	A-3/A-2-4					
	AASHTO System	A-3 / A-2-4 SP		<u> </u>			0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 40 44 48

- Specimens delivered to Outeniqua Lab in good order.

Ruaan Lesch

Technical Signatory

For Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.

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 (<), non compliant (×) and uncertain (*) 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 (*) 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 (×) or non compliant (×) based on a 95% level of confidence with reference to SAMM GUIDANCE 1, Issue 2 : 20 June 2007 Section 2.

95% level or contidence 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 Director of Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd.
 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 correctness of all tests and reports, neither Outeniqua Lab (Pty) Ltd 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.

Appendix 4

DCP test data

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

3.

Consulting Geotechnical Engineers and Engineering Geologists

18 Clyde St Knysna PO Box 964 Knysna 6570 044 3820502(T) 044 3820503(F) iain@outeniqualab.co.za

10 January 2024

Familie Roux Eiendomme (Pty) Ltd 25 Soutpansbergweg Pretoria 0084

Dear Sir/Madam

<u>RE: ADDENDUM TO THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT – PORTION 91 OF MATJIESFONTEIN</u> <u>304, PLETTENBERG BAY</u>

1. Introduction and scope of work

As per our appointment received on 13 November 2023, we have undertaken addition testing on the above site. The scope of the work was to excavate additional trial pits along the northern boundary of the development area to determine depth of any water tables in this area, as requested by Eco Route Environmental Consultants on behalf of the DEA&DP. The methodology proposed and accepted was as follows:

- Review the geological and geotechnical data for the site;
- Conduct a subsurface investigation consisting of the following methods:
 - Excavate 5x new test pits spread out along the northern boundary of the development footprint with a TLB/back-actor to max depth of 2.5m or refusal.
 - Profile and photograph of test pits by qualified engineering geologist according to SAICE Code of Practice.
 - Record water tables if any.
- Present results in a short factual addendum report.

The testing commenced on the 23 November 2023 and was completed on the same day. The environmental conditions at the time were generally sunny and warm.

2. Results

The new test positions are indicated on the plan attached in Appendix 1, as TP12-16. The profiles for these test positions are also attached in the same appendix.

A summary of the soil profiles is provided in Table 1 below. The test pits were slightly variable, but generally exposed a dominantly sandy or silty sandy profile consisting mainly of naturally transported soils (aeolian/ alluvial/colluvial). Some localised deposits of imported fill/disturbed soil of variable thickness were also encountered above the naturally occurring soil horizons (refer specifically to TP12). Residual soils were encountered below the transported soils in one test pit (TP16) which were derived from the insitu weathering of the underlying shale rock, which was also exposed towards the base of TP16. *No ground water was encountered in any of the test pits.*

Table 1: Summary of test pit profiles

Test pos. No.	Imported (fill) soil	Transported soil	Pedogenic soil	Residual soil	Rock	Final depth of test pit	Refusal	Water table depth
TP12	0-2000	2000-3000	-	-	-	3000	None	-
TP13	0-400	400-2400	-	-	-	2400	None	-
TP14	0-150	150-2500	-	-	-	2500	None	-
TP15	-	0-2400	-	-	-	2400	None	-
TP16	-	0-900	-	900-1900	1900-2300	2300	None	-

3. Conclusions

The additional tests did not encounter any perched water tables or groundwater seepage, but this may be due to the generally dry conditions at the time of the investigation.

Yours faithfully

lain Paton Pr Sci Nat Pr Tech Eng

Appendix 1

					G	eotechnic	al Soil Pro	ofile	
				Client:	Eco Route Environmental	Consultancy			
	NU	UII		Project:	Portion 91 of Matjiesfonte	ein 304 Keurbo	omssstrand		
		ΟΤΓΟΙΙΙ		Area:	Plettenberg Bay				
	🔳 նն	UIECHI	AIPAT SERAIPES	Date:	23.11.2023				
				Excavator:	1LB 0422 X2764256		- Donotromotor (I		Dhoto of Toot Dit
		TP 1	6 Key to symbols:	mnle taken	Groundwater				
	- O	(0 to 900)	Moist, light reddish brown, r	nedium dense, pi	holed. CLAYEY SILTY	0			
	Ŭ	(0 10 500)	SAND , transported.	ieulum denee, pi		ן ל			m a second to a second a second
Δ	500					-500			
	- 500					3			
1496		(900 to 1900)	Moist, dark red mottled light	grey, stiff, fissur	ed, CLAYEY SAND,	-1000			
	- 1000		residual.					m)	
A STATE						1500		(n	
в	- 1500					-1300		pth	
- 74		(1000 to 2200)	Dark brown bigbly weather	d fine grained f	oliated Soft rock soft rock	2000		De	A Constant of the second secon
the second	- 2000	(1900 CO 2300)	Shale.	a, fine granica, i	onated, Soft Tock, Soft Tock	-2000			
С									B
	0500					-2500 +			
	- 2500								
						-3000			Se A LEAST AND AND AND A
	L 3000					0 20	40 60 80	100	C
			TP Stopped				(mm/Blow)		
			No Water				(

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

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 Geotechnical Services 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 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 erroneous conclusions drawn

3.