

GROUND RESPONSE DUE TO DEEP EXCAVATIONS IN SYDNEY SANDSTONE

Paul Hewitt¹ and Max Kitson²

¹*Technical Executive, Geotechnics
WSP Australia Pty Ltd, Sydney NSW 2000*

²*Principal Geotechnical Engineer
WSP Australia Pty Ltd, Sydney NSW 2000*

ABSTRACT

A deep basement was recently constructed in Hawkesbury Sandstone for a property development on Sydney's North Shore located adjacent to critical transport infrastructure. With a depth of over 43m, the excavation is among the deepest basement excavations in the world. This paper presents the geotechnical design challenges, construction outcomes, use of the Observational Method (OM) on the excavation, discusses cost savings through innovative construction and design, and presents applications of smart technologies to instrumentation and monitoring.

When unusual displacement was observed adjacent to the transport corridor due to structural uncertainties and construction activities, the OM and verification process provided a flexible framework within which to reassess ongoing movements and effects on adjacent infrastructure to ensure construction could proceed safely. The case history demonstrates the benefit of adopting the OM for excavations to achieve savings in time and cost, and to react to unexpected movements during construction.

1 INTRODUCTION

Ground movements during deep basement excavations may potentially seriously impact adjacent infrastructure and utilities. We need to consider the displacements that deep excavations induce to assess the impact on those assets and the necessary measures to mitigate against unsatisfactory performance.

This paper describes the excavation for a property development on Sydney's North Shore. The project involved excavating over 43m deep, and is among the deepest (known) building basement excavations in the world. The excavation took place adjacent to critical road and rail transport infrastructure. The influence of excavation on existing transport infrastructure was an important design consideration. An added complexity was the potential impact that building excavation and imposed building loads could have on nearby utilities, bridges and underground structures.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project development (known as "Eighty Eight") is currently under construction at 88 Christie St, St Leonards, NSW. Figure 1 shows the development's location north of Sydney Harbour.

The new development includes two residential towers (47 storeys high) and a commercial tower (15 storeys) over a large retail precinct with 10 levels of below-ground basement up to 43 m deep. The structure for the building is founded on pad footings. Figure 2 shows an aerial perspective of the development. The 8,000m² basement excavation extends to the Sydney Trains boundary along the west of Lithgow Street with the Pacific Highway to the north.

2.1 ADJACENT INFRASTRUCTURE

The site boundary is surrounded by sensitive buried utilities, road and rail infrastructure, and nearby buildings for which ground movement was a key consideration (Figure 4).

An initial scheme of the development was about 14m from the earlier-planned CBD Rail Link. The earlier-planned rail transport project comprised twin tunnels connecting south of the city in the Redfern/Airport region to the north at St Leonards beneath the western edge of site and track quadruplication that added two more tracks, one on each side of the existing lines and within the existing protection corridor, as shown in the schematic diagram in Figure 3. The earlier-planned CBD rail tunnel project was abandoned, and a different route selected for CBD rail link which is now the Sydney Metro City & Southwest project (under construction).




Figure 1: Development location (JQZ, <https://88byjqz.com.au/site.php>)



Figure 2: Aerial view perspective of the excavation




Figure 3: Schematic diagram with initial development scheme and earlier-planned CBD rail link




Figure 4: Location plan showing adjacent transport infrastructure and aerial view of excavation progress

3 EXCAVATION DESIGN

3.1 GEOLOGY

The site geology comprises the upper sedimentary formations of the Sydney Basin stratigraphic sequence, which consists of sub-horizontal beds of Triassic-aged rock comprising (youngest to oldest) Mittagong Formation and Hawkesbury (Sydney) Sandstone.

3.2 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

We assessed ground conditions from geotechnical information, including 52 borehole locations, from investigations carried out by WSP and others within the proposed development and surrounding areas. Rock strength index tests included unconfined compressive strength (UCS) and point load on recovered rock core samples. To understand and quantify the characteristics of the rock mass, we also used downhole geophysical surveys/borehole imaging to learn details of orientation, spacing, aperture, and infill characteristics of various rock mass defects including joints and bedding partings.

The development site is underlain by uncontrolled fill and residual soil, followed by Mittagong Formation and Hawkesbury Sandstone. The Mittagong Formation is characterised by interlaminated sandstone and siltstone comprising fine-to-medium grained, light grey sandstone with dark grey siltstone bands that are (generally) extremely weathered and extremely low strength. The Hawkesbury Sandstone is characterised as medium-to-coarse grained, grey, with cross bedding and medium-to-high strength. The subsurface conditions encountered are summarised in Table 1.

The rock classification adopted the Sydney classification system (Pells et al, 2019). The Sydney classification system, which was developed for foundations, is based on UCS of saturated substance (i.e. intact sandstone or shale), defect spacing and percentage of seams within a defined vertical interval of the near-horizontal bedded rock. Both strength testing and borehole imaging identified a weaker shale/ laminite band at about 40m depth close to final excavation depth. The summary of rock strength data is shown in Figure 5.

3.3 EXCAVATION RESTRICTIONS

Restrictions by the adjacent asset owners, TfNSW (ASA, 2015) and RMS (RMS, 2012) for the development included:

- Anchor systems cannot be used in the rail easement.
- Construction and operation of external developments shall not affect the stability and integrity of railway infrastructure through loading from the development and ground deformation.
- Maximum displacement of 30mm on the Pacific Highway.
- Monitoring of ground movements due to bulk excavation and monitoring of track structures required.

The selection of retention systems for the excavation to satisfy these criteria and avoid both temporary and permanent anchors within the rail corridor and road along the project boundaries had the major influence on basement geometry and the choice of retention systems.

Table 1: Subsurface conditions

Material unit	Material description	Thickness (m)	Top of unit, RL (m AHD)
Fill and residual soil	Clay and sand	1.5 - 2.0	82 - 75
Mittagong Formation	Class IV Sandstone and Shale	4.5 - 7.5	78.5 - 73.0
Hawkesbury Sandstone	Class IV Sandstone	2	74.0 - 68.5
	Class II Sandstone	3.5	72.0 - 66.5
	Class I Sandstone	19.6 - 24.0	68.5 - 43.0
	Class II interbedded Sandstone/ Shale	1.5	44.5 - 42.8
	Class I Sandstone	Not penetrated	43.0 - 41.3




Figure 5: Rock strength data (WSP, 2018)

3.4 EXCAVATION SUPPORT

Most of the basement excavation face retains a sequence of weathered shale and sandstone. The temporary shoring system supporting the ten levels of basement along the Sydney Trains boundary (Figure 6) consisted of:

- A stepped double contiguous concrete pile wall where the front wall had short dowel anchors and shotcrete located along the middle of the west (railway) wall.
- Ground anchors within a 20m wide square buttress of rock on the south corner that was not to be excavated.
- Ground anchors for 20m length in the north corner adjacent to the Pacific Highway railway bridge. The north corner was not fully excavated which allowed angled ground anchors to be installed within the remaining triangle of rock.



Figure 6: Excavation support along Sydney Trains (west) boundary

The middle section of wall along the railway side was about 40m long, that could not be anchored. We used two piled walls to avoid installing long anchors under the railway line, where the upper soldier piled wall was a permanent wall installed on the railway boundary, comprising 750mm diameter piles spaced at 2.5m founded in min. Class II/III Sandstone up to 4.5m height. The lower contiguous piled wall was temporary, comprising 600mm diameter piles spaced at 1.5m also founded in min. Class II/III Sandstone anchored with short rock dowels 4.5m long in every pile. This lower wall provided the passive toe support to the upper wall. We adopted the following proposed excavation sequence along the Sydney Trains boundary:

- Install upper permanent piled wall on railway boundary to 4.5m depth.
- Install lower temporary piled wall 3m from Sydney Trains boundary.
- Excavation to commence. Install rock dowels in every pile and then shotcrete within piled wall.
- Geotechnical engineer/ geologist to inspect exposed rock face every 2.0m intervals of excavation depth and advise requirements for localised rock bolting and shotcrete.
- Excavate to a maximum of 500mm below the next level of rock dowels and install, then install strip drains and shotcrete. Repeat for each level of anchors until reaching high strength rock.
- Continue excavation in this manner until basement excavation level.
- Construct basement structure including all pad footings, column, walls and slabs up to the loading dock slab LB01.
- Once loading dock slab has reached design strength, continue construction.

The shoring system to the three remaining sides of the excavation comprised shotcrete concrete walls spanning to 600mm diameter soldier piles. The piles are spaced 2.5m apart with ground anchors providing temporary support. The ground control solution with a pattern of rock bolts and ground anchors was selected to support the excavation 10m to 12m below surface level.

4 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The impact assessment involved geotechnical analyses that considered the effects of the proposed development including basement excavation and building loads, ground properties, and correction of the natural stress field based on rock mass quality.

Initially, we used two-dimensional (2D) finite element numerical modelling program RS2 for the Development Application (DA) submission that provided initial estimates of the potential impacts on the existing infrastructure.

The assumptions and limitations of a 2D model were too restrictive for the model to provide detailed estimates of ground movements and their impacts on the existing infrastructure. For detailed design, we used both 2D and 3D finite element numerical modelling programs to assess ground movement which considered the proposed excavation's geometry and provided more realistic estimates of the impact of construction on the existing infrastructure. These numerical analyses included continuum (using FLAC 2D and FLAC 3D) and discontinuum analyses (using Rocscience programs RS2 and RS3).

4.1 DESIGN PARAMETERS

The geotechnical design parameters adopted for this impact assessment were selected based on the Sydney classification system, results of the geotechnical investigation, the intact parameters, estimated GSI for each rock mass class, case history data (Figure 9), published data on sandstone and shale strength and stiffness, and the excavation depth.

The adopted geotechnical design parameters are summarised in Table 2. To address sensitivity, we reduced the values of cohesion and tensile strength for Sandstone IV and Mittagong Formation to less than 50% of design values (see values in brackets).

Table 2: Adopted design parameters

Material type	Unit weight (kN/m ³)	UCS (MPa)	Mass modulus (MPa)	GSI	Mohr-coulomb criterion		
					Tensile Strength (kPa)	Friction Angle (deg)	Cohesion (kPa)
Sandstone I	24	30	3000	75	300	55	1000
Sandstone II	24	25	2000	65	100	50	500
Sandstone IV	24	10	500 (200)	45	25 (0)	45 (35)	250 (30)
Shale II	24	15	1000	50	60	40	250

4.2 IN-SITU STRESS

The field in-situ stresses have a significant impact on both deep excavation conditions and induced ground movements in the immediate area of the excavation works, due to high in-situ lateral stresses, which can be 'locked in' within the bedrock stratum.

We incorporated adjacent deep excavations, including "The Forum" building, located north of the development (Figure 10) within the modelling as part of the impact assessment to provide a holistic approach to the major and minor stress distribution within the subsurface geological units adjacent to the excavation. We adopted the following in-situ stress relationship based on WSP's reference design for the nearby Sydney Metro City & Southwest project:

- Upper bound:
 $\sigma_{H(NS)} = 1.0\text{MPa} + 3.5\sigma_v$; $\sigma_{H(NS)} / \sigma_{H(WE)} = 1.5$ (1)
- Lower bound:
 $\sigma_v = \sigma_H = \sigma_h = 1.0$ (2)
(stress field assumed to be lithostatic)

We used the upper-bound stresses applied to fresh, good quality sandstone and shale (Class I and II). In poorer quality rock masses, the horizontal stresses are expected to be less, and the lower bound stresses were applied. The minor horizontal stress was applied perpendicular to the excavation's eastern and western walls; the major horizontal stress is applied perpendicular to the excavation's northern and southern walls.

4.3 PREDICTED GROUND PERFORMANCE

The proposed retention system design addressed the following displacement mechanisms which have been observed to cause ground surface deformation adjacent to the excavation and could affect the railway.

- Lateral earth (soil) pressure acting on the shoring system causing it to deflect.
- Relaxation of the rock mass resulting from a reduction in lateral stress (stress relief).
- Anchor hole drilling and installation.

The proposed shoring system with soldier piles and anchors was designed to control the ground surface deformation due to lateral soil pressure in the upper parts of the proposed excavation (mechanism 1). We chose the layout and stiffness of the shoring system to minimise the ground movements and the impact on the railway tracks, and rail overbridge.

The relaxation of the rock mass due to stress relief (mechanism 2) from the deeper parts of the basement excavation will happen irrespective of the shoring system type. The numerical assessment was calibrated against monitoring results from various deep excavations around Sydney, including monitoring results of the Embassy Residences (see Figure 2) basement excavation located on the western side of the rail corridor. Moving the boundary of the proposed development footprint and installing anchors just outside of the rail corridor will not significantly decrease ground movements of the rail corridor caused by rock stress relief, which are a result of an adjacent deep excavation.

Figure 7 shows the east-west cross sections of the development with the predicted ground movements from 2D numerical assessment due to the proposed excavation. As shown in Figure 7, the basement excavation below LB01 at RL69.5m AHD was extended to 3.1m inside the boundary to temporarily support the cantilever pile wall along the western boundary. This revised basement plan was adopted to address Sydney Trains' preference, such that no (temporary or permanent) anchors are constructed inside the rail property. The wall configuration was based on a similar cantilever post-tensioned pile wall which was successfully adopted for the Gore Hill Freeway widening at Artarmon at a location where project boundary constraints dictated that no ground anchors could be installed (Hewitt et al, 2008).

The adopted loadings for the 2D numerical assessment are more conservative than actual loading environments and the realistic loading reduces the impact of 3D effects. The predicted deformation from 3D numerical assessment indicates that the predicted deformations and stress concentrations obtained from the 2D assessment are likely to be conservative and reduces the displacement by up to 40% due to the 3D "buttressing effects".

Figure 8 shows the site's north east quadrant with the predicted 3D ground movements within the rail corridor, Pacific Highway and rail overbridge.




Figure 7: Predicted total ground movements of east-west section from 2D assessment

4.3.1 Deformation within Rail Corridor

The maximum predicted total vertical and horizontal deformations below the existing railway tracks after excavation completion are approximately 2mm and 6mm respectively (Figure 7). The maximum differential vertical and horizontal settlements below the existing rail track within the rail corridor due to the excavation were calculated to be less than

1mm and 2mm. Trigger levels for “Line Alarm Level 1” were 10mm for 60km/h track and 14mm for 40km/h track. Lateral movement affects the line value, with the line value determined by three track locations over 8m.





Figure 8: Predicted ground movements from 3D assessment

The estimated ground performance from the numerical assessment, a database of movements for walls using published case history data (Hewitt et al, 2008 & Wong, 2013), and monitoring data from other nearby projects indicates that lateral wall movements are generally in the 0.5mm to 2mm range per metre depth of excavation in rock. Figure 9 indicates the field performance of the Embassy development adjacent to the “Eighty Eight” development and the typical rates of movement observed in northern Sydney, in similar ground conditions. The lateral wall movement at the adjacent Embassy development was approximately 0.5mm or less per metre depth of excavation in rock. Trigger levels addressing total serviceability deflection (lateral displacement) of the wall in any one direction were 30mm adjacent to Pacific Highway.




Figure 9: Field performance with different retention systems

5 CONSTRUCTION PERFORMANCE

We adopted the observational method with some contingency measures to prevent a SLS or ULS from occurring as described in CIRIA C760 (Gaba et al, 2017), including the following:

- The installation of a temporary high stiffness anchor at a high level early in the excavation sequence to control ground movements due to wall deflection, with waler and allowance for additional pre-stressing.
- Excavation start in the south-eastern corner of the site to obtain evaluation of actual wall performance, recalibration of ground and analytical models and identification of recalibrated parameters.
- Along northern boundary, excavation to proceed in 6m to 9m wide vertical panels for horizontal distance of 6m to south of Pacific Highway retaining wall to provide "berm" effect.
- Allowance for additional anchoring/cable bolts along potential sub-horizontal shear/ laminite planes identified from borehole imaging and instrumentation installation, ideally prior exposure/ displacement (adopt endoscope methods if necessary).
- Limiting temporary excavation depths along northern boundary if SLS trigger level approached.

Trigger limits were identified at key construction stages to enable appropriate and timely decisions and interventions by the project team in relation to how the site retention scheme is performing and how movements are developing compared to the recalibrated and SLS characteristic predictions.

5.1 BASEMENT EXCAVATION

The bulk excavation progress, rock condition and shoring adopted along the south and northern (Pacific Highway) boundaries are shown in Figure 10, as at July 2020.



Figure 10: Bulk excavation works - view to south and north

5.1.1 West (Railway) Wall

The investigation indicated there could be weaker shale/laminite bands at about 40m depth. (see Figure 5). We therefore planned the installation of a temporary high stiffness anchor to control ground movements due to wall deflection, depending on the observed displacement.

During the bulk excavation, the automatic inclinometer measured more pronounced horizontal sliding movement on these two shale bands (Figure 11). The sliding movement on the horizontal shale bands was caused by the release of in-situ stress within the sandstone that allowed the block of sandstone above the shale band to move more than had been predicted.

We used RS3 which is a Rocscience 3D finite element program for modelling support design and surface excavations. Initially we used a slice model to calibrate the model to match the movement in the inclinometer (Figure 12). The shale band was modelled as a ubiquitous joint model in conjunction with the Mohr-Coulomb parameters. The dip direction was set at 10 degrees into the excavation and the friction angle was reduced to 24 degrees to calibrate with the inclinometer results. Once the model was calibrated we assessed various options to reduce the movement and provide additional support to the wall, so that movements would not impact the railway.

We decided to leave a rock buttress against the wall to be excavated last, with corner propping to be installed against the southern rock buttress (Figure 13). To reduce the potential for movement on the railway we modified the anchor length of the southern 20m wide rock buttress anchors to have an adequate bond length below the shale band, and installed hydraulic corner propping (Figure 6). Additional anchors were installed on the opposite corner to counteract this force.




Figure 11: Bulk excavation progress from west to east showing inclinometer movement on shale bands – 14 November 2019 to 19 March 2020




Figure 12: Calibrated 3D model with inclinometer measurements – 14 November 2019 to 19 March 2020




Figure 13: Staged excavation model leaving a rock buttress below the railway wall to be excavated last

5.2 INSTRUMENTATION AND MONITORING

A project team objective was to streamline data collection to maximise system and project integration, and shorten the review and decision-making process to improve construction safety. As a general trend, advances in construction monitoring are moving away from physical measurements at a limited number of points, towards widely distributed, wirelessly connected sensor networks, and to digital scanning techniques. This data allowed the excavation contractor to optimise construction processes and increase project safety performance. Monitoring for enhanced safety was also critical due to the project scale and proximity to existing infrastructure (e.g., rail bridge, underground utilities and road pavement).

Methods included surveys of deflections and rotation of the walls, laser wall scanning (Figure 14), ground settlement/heave and rail track. The analyses helped set trigger values based on the ‘traffic light’ principle to ensure we could anticipate and control excessive ground movements.

As part of controlling the excavation process, instrumentation and monitoring points were adopted as part of the excavation protection strategy as shown in Figure 15. The frequency of instrumentation monitoring was based on the excavation pace and was conducted in conjunction with regular visual observation. Wireless remote monitoring also provided assurance and enabled data-driven decision making. Table 3 shows the instrumentation schedule.

Walls were monitored to check the actual design performance during construction and to provide data for reviewing design and performance, and for risk management. Monitoring satisfied the designer that the geotechnical models employed in the design were representative, that predictions of the ground and rock support behaviour were accurate, and verified compliance with the design requirements. The maximum measured horizontal wall movement was 28mm at the mid-point of the west (railway) wall, which addressed restrictions by adjacent asset owners and demonstrated excellent agreement with design predictions.

Automated remote monitoring and precise manual surveying of the railway track and associated infrastructure on the North Shore Line was carried out as shown in Figure 16. Monitored assets include the Up Track North Shore Line, Pacific Highway bridge and piers, overhead wiring structures and upside crib wall. The Track Geometry was monitored in accordance with ASA Standard ESC 210 Track Geometry and Stability. In the early stages of the bulk excavation a track certifier was engaged to inspect the track as a baseline, and then subsequently inspect the track during bulk excavation.




Figure 14: Laser wall scanning on west wall indicated mean displacement of 10mm and maximum 28mm

Table 3: Instrumentation schedule

Instrument	Number	Remarks
Inclinometers	5	3 manual, 2 real-time, remote GeoFlex type. See Figure 15
Displacement Points	112	Around site perimeter and buildings
Bridge displacement	3	Tiltmeters
Laser scan		Individual point accuracy of 2mm on site perimeter
Track monitoring	30	Automated remote monitoring and precise manual monitoring of rail corridor to west of site. See Figure 16
Vibration Monitoring	5	Site perimeter
Crack gauge	~30	Visual check




Figure 15: Instrumentation plan and measured displacement



Figure 16: View along railway showing automated remote monitoring detail

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The construction of the project “Eighty Eight” required excavation to over 43 m below ground level adjacent to existing railway and highway assets. The project demonstrates the many aspects involved in respect to ground investigations, analysis, design and construction of deep basement retention systems in rock that are required to mitigate against unsatisfactory performance.

Design, excavation and construction of the site retention system incorporated several critical issues, including addressing stringent settlement and angular distortion criteria, construction safety, constructability, and the constraints of defined road and rail reserves. The design and construction process was successful and effective in addressing the concerns of all parties involved in the project.

Limited construction data available to-date indicates the displacement has been significantly reduced to achieve the performance criteria and validate the design implemented for the project. Monitoring data to date indicates the pre-construction geotechnical models and design parameters were appropriate, and that an observation-based approach allows selection of adequate retention support design to manage the risks associated with elevated stress conditions.

- Numerical analyses were carried out to assess the behaviour of the rock, site retention system, and adjacent infrastructure.
- The accuracy of this type of interaction assessment was significantly influenced by ground model parameters and rock mass properties. This emphasises the value of detailed ground investigations prior to modelling.
- The laser is a state-of-the-art development for monitoring wall movement. It offered precision and broad area coverage of wall movements through rain, dust and smoke (which occurred due to Sydney bushfires in January 2020).
- The real-time display of the movement of basement walls allowed continuous management of deformation during excavation, with the remote monitoring inclinometer system providing early detection of horizontal sliding along shale bands which enabled data-driven decision making.
- The real-time, automated remote monitoring and precise manual surveying of the railway track geometry and engaging a Track Certifier early in the bulk excavation works assisted in addressing impacts on track geometry.
- The maximum measured horizontal wall movement was 28mm at the mid-point of the west (railway) wall.

7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work reported in this paper was carried out during studies by WSP (formerly Parsons Brinckerhoff) from 2010 to 2020, for various schemes. ABC Consultants Pty Ltd were structural engineers for the project. Moit and Sons (NSW) Pty Ltd carried out the main excavation. JQZ, which owns the site, generously allowed us to publish this work. The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of fellow staff.

8 REFERENCES

- ASA Standard (2015), External Developments, Ref: T HR CI 12080 ST, Version 1.0, February 2015, and Civil Revision 1.0 10/11/2017
- Gaba A, Hardy S, Doughty L, Powrie W & Selemetas D. (2017) Guidance on embedded retaining wall design. CIRIA Report C760, London, UK
- Hewitt P, Burkitt, S. and Baskaran, B. (2008) Design and construction of retaining structures for Lane Cove Tunnel, 10th ANZ conference on geomechanics, Brisbane. 626-631; and Australian Geomechanics (2008), 43(1). 55-60
- Parsons Brinckerhoff (2012) St Leonards Commerce Centre, 88 Christie Street, St Leonards. Report on Geotechnical Investigation. Report 2108360A_PR_290 Rev A.
- Pells, P.J.N, Mostyn, G., Bertuzzi, R. and Wong, P. K. (2019) Classification of sandstones and shales in the Sydney region; A forty-year review. Australian Geomechanics, 54(2)
- Roads and Maritime Services (2012) Technical Direction GTD 2012/001, Excavation adjacent to RMS infrastructure https://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/business-industry/partners-suppliers/documents/technical-directions/gtd_2012-01.pdf
- Transport for NSW (TfNSW). (2019) Engineering Specification Track SPC 207 - Track Monitoring Requirements for Undertrack Excavation, Version 1.5, Issued April 2013, Reconfirmed 03 July 2019
- Wong, P.K. (2013) Excavation induced movements and risk management strategies, AGS Sydney Chapter Symposium on Retaining Structures, November 2013.
- WSP (2018) 88 Christie Street, St Leonards. Geotechnical Report for JQZ Pty Ltd. Report PS106114-GEO-REP-608A.