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# ANALYSIS OF SLOPE STABILITY GALE MOSS, CHORLEY 

## 1. BACKGROUND

E3P Understands that the Mineral Planning Group (MPG) are assisting their client (Ruttle Plant Hire) who intend to win minerals through excavation and backfill with imported arisings to later prepare and divest the site for development. The site is located to the north of Chorley and the north of the A674 known as Gale Moss.

The site is currently agricultural land utilised for livestock grazing and is occasionally utilised as the location of a car boot sale during preferable summer months. The site is lined by the M61 motorway to the west

To the periphery of the site there are a number of existing slopes but also following excavation there will be a high wall formed that also has the potential for slope failure and to induce failure in existing slopes. Furthermore, the Leeds-Liverpool Canal is present along the eastern boundary and the risk to infrastructure from any slope failure must be considered.

It is understood that the depth of excavation through the site will be limited to 3.00 m , as such this value has been used to establish parameters for the model. In addition, E3P has been supplied with a topographical survey (Gale moss June 2020 survey) to provide existing levels and slope details to utilise in the model. E3P has also been provided with a plan showing the total excavation depths proposed, keeping 1.00 m above the detected water table (MPG/GM/22-03 dated January 2022).

A location plan is presented within figure 1.1

FIGURE 1.1 LOCATION PLAN


## 2. OBJECTIVES

The proposed site excavation and regrading will result in a significant alteration to the current topography with the subsequent formation of high walls along the boundaries of the site as well as then the current slopes at the boundary edges.

In light of the identified potential mechanism for slope failure to be induced by the proposed 3 m deep excavation throughout the site, E3P has been commissioned to undertake further detailed slope stability analysis to assess the pertinent / relevant factor of Safety and potential failure mechanism in its current state and also the suitable distance from the boundary slope up to which any excavation can safely be advanced.

## 3. GEOMORPHOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

The site is located within an area of natural and Man Made undulating landforms, with the site falling in topographical height from south east to north by circa 7 m down toward the drains through this area. In the south west of the site an artificially raised embankment is present that facilitates the M61 - Junction 8 slip road and the main A674 highway to the south of the site. To the east of the site the Leeds-Liverpool canal is present and an artificial build up is expected in the vegetation between the back of towpath and the site boundary.

### 3.1. GROUND CONDITIONS

Ruttle Group have previously completed a series of trial pits through the site and have provided the logs to assist in the completion of the slope stability assessment. During the intrusive investigation undertaken by Ruttle Group one location (BHE) identified peat ( $0.50-1.50 \mathrm{~m}$ bgl) over clay $(1.50 \mathrm{~m}-3.50 \mathrm{~m}$ $\mathrm{bgl})$ though this is outside of the extraction area. Those completed through the remainder of the site identified sand and gravel with occasional sandy clay bands.

Ongoing groundwater monitoring has revealed a shallower water table than originally encountered, which has subsequently lead to the revised extraction profile to ensure a stand-off from groundwater.

## 4. GEOTECHNICAL SLIP CIRCLE ANALYSIS

Based on our review of the proposed works, the primary risk associated with future instability within the embankment would be associated with the effective removal of the toe of the slope during excavation of minerals and introducing a failure through the above ground slopes and or failure in the canal which could be located within a 'Slip Circle' mode of failure or slip surface along two material boundaries.

Given that the slopes are formed from predominantly granular soils the potential for future failure associated with rotational slip is relatively high. Therefore, to ensure the potential risk is accurately appraised, E3P has developed a detailed slope stability model with induced loadings to assess any potential degree of risk.

To ensure the perceived risk is fully appraised, E3P have created a slope stability model to assess the perceived location of all slip circles, their zone of influence, Factor of Safety and thus the potential of negative impact on the proposed works following removal of materials.

This slope stability analyses involves Limit Equilibrium (LE) analysis due to its simplicity and accuracy. This method consists of cutting the slope into fine slices and applying appropriate equilibrium equations (equilibrium of the forces and/or moments). According to the assumptions made on the efforts between the slices and the equilibrium equations considered, many alternatives were proposed, such as the Bishop and Fellenius methods. In most cases, they are shown to give similar results. For this study, Oasys Slope, EC7 Ultimate Limit State (ULS) scenario slope stability analysis program has been used.

### 4.1. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The comments made and conclusions drawn concerning the proposed earthworks associated with existing slopes within the subject site are appropriate at this point in time only and are based on the information available to E3P at the time of writing. If more information becomes available or the site conditions alter then the aforementioned comments and conclusions may have to be re-assessed. If any ambiguity exists concerning any point, for the avoidance of doubt guidance should be sought from E3P, in all instances.

### 4.2. INPUT PARAMETERS \& DATA

Appropriate soil mechanics parameters derived from site investigation \& data obtained during the Ground Investigations were analysed and interpreted in the Oasys Slope software.

Detailed proposed levels for the proposed excavation have been provided by the client within the Linear surveys Drawing (Ref: MPG/GM/22-03, dated Jan 2022) and the detailed excavation depths have been modelled accordingly.

For this assessment the Bishops method has been utilised.


An assessment of the slope has been undertaken at 10 critical sections as detailed within the E3P Drawing (ref: 14-244-001-RevC). The locations of for the slope assessment have been chosen along areas that are at a higher risk, such as steeper slopes, those that are close to roadways and/ or the canal in close proximity to the crest of the slope. It is understood that sections 1,2 and 6 are no longer within the 3 phase excavation approach but have been retained to show change and potential for future works/justification for excluding this area.

As well as assessing the slope in its existing form we have also modelled scenarios for a maximum load to fail the slope, the closest a 3.00 m excavation can be made at the toe of the slope before failure and then this scenario including a moving temporary load to allow for any heavy machinery such as excavators which may be used during works. Lastly, a scenario has been modelled to include the expected benching required to safely form the excavations at the site. In this revision of the assessment the proposals have been modified to include a mound of excavated materials to the south and eastern boundary. The load induced from this material has also been considered in the revision.

No true on-site data has been obtained therefore, to ensure a suitably robust assessment, conservative values of the soil material property parameters were utilised in the development of the Slope Modelling as detailed below.

TABLE 4.1 GEOTECHNICAL INPUT PARAMETERS

| Material Type | $C^{\prime}-$ Effective <br> Cohesion (kPa) | $\varnothing^{\prime}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ <br> Angle of Effective <br> Friction | Y(kN/m2) <br> Bulk Unit Weight |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SAND and GRAVELS | 0.0 | $35^{\star}$ | 18.0 |

*value derived from Unified Soil Classification System (USCS)

## 5. SLOPE ANALYSIS RESULTS

E3P have completed detailed analysis on the proposed slope sections in their current state, the results of each of the 10 proposed sections are detailed below in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THREE SCENARIOS

| Section | Factor of Safety (FOS) |  |  | Can proposed excavation be moved closer to slope to maximise removal ( $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N}$ ) | Is bund position / height causing instability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing Conditions (Topo Slope) | FOS w. proposed excavation levels (Incl. Bunds) | Maximum Load Failure (FoS/Max Load $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) |  |  |
| 1 | 1.800 | 1.40 | 1.072 / 600 | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | 1.707 | 1.374 | 1.072 / 300 | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | 1.665 | $0.662^{\wedge}$ | 0.662 / 300* | Y | N/A |
| 4 | 2.240 | $0.636{ }^{+}$ | 0.636 / 300* | N | Y |
| 5 | 2.691 | $0.735^{+}$ | 0.735 / 300* | Y | N/A |
| 6 | 1.243 | 1.698 | 1.041 / 300 | N/A | N/A |
| 7 | 1.024 | $0.447^{+}$ | 0.447 / 300* | N | Y |
| 8 | 1.836 | $0.713^{+}$ | 0.713 / 300* | N | Y |
| 9 | 17.791 | $0.562^{+}$ | 0.562 / 300* | N | Y |
| 10 | 31.916 | $0.840^{+}$ | 0.840 / 300* | N | Y |

[^0]Factory of Safety (FoS) as defined within EC7 ULS assessment suggests that all slopes below ' 1 ' demonstrate a failing slope. As such, scenarios that remain less than 1 are currently affected by the bund position/height or continuity with excavation slope that is causing instability. Where the bund design is altered by reducing the height or repositioning away from the excavation slope this will stabilise the section.

E3P has run the slope model with a 300 kN load at the peak of the slope to gain an indication of how the slope would re-act to an excavator or mechanical plant at this position. In all cases the FOS remains unchanged which indicated the bund remains the key failure mechanism and not the new load applied.

In addition to the above the natural slope has been modelled including the designer's excavation of 3.00 m depth. Detail in table 5.1 confirms where the excavation is not fully maximised and which sections would tolerate more excavation. Table 5.2 presents the distance the excavation could be moved towards the slope.

TABLE 5.2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR A 3.00M EXCAVATION

| Section | Current Easement | Possible Easement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 3 | 9 | 6 |
| 4 | 0 | +5 |
| 5 | 30 | 10 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 7 | 0 | +8 |
| 8 | 0 | +5 |
| 9 | 0 | +10 |
| 10 | 0 | +8 |

It should be noted that by design the newly formed slopes will need to be battered back to a maximum 45degree angle to reduce potential for instability.

To ensure the canal is not adversely affected by the works a 15 m easement from the canal edge is recommended.

The calculus was performed following the Bishop's Method utilising the calculus for Design Approach 1 according to EN 1997:2004 Eurocode 7: Geotechnical Design which requires the compliance with the following partial FoS for a ULS analysis for DA1 to be >1.
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## 6. CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1. EXISTING SLOPES

Based on the slopes in their existing manner it has been modelled that they are inherently stable and significant loadings can be applied without inducing slope failure issues.

However, the application of a bund of material to the existing slopes may induce instability and will need to be constructed in consideration of this. The slope created by extraction excavations is currently designed in a manner that interacts with the slope of the bund and therefore cumulates to instability. In most cases the bund will need to be repositioned or the height significantly reduced to ensure safety and stability. Alternatively, the excavation could be moved from the bund however this is likely to reduce extraction volumes.

### 6.2. EXCAVATION AT THE BASE OF SLOPES

When considering the pre-designed 3.00 m excavation to the toe of the slope in order to replicate materials extraction, the slope is likely to be stable. Currently where 0 easement is identified adjacent bunds the new excavation is likely to interact and induce a failure mechanism.

Within sections 9 and 10 the original slope is not considered to be sufficiently steep to slip or slump when an excavation is advanced through it and so is not applicable in this regard. These sections are along the line of the canal however and so an easement is still recommended to ensure works do not impact the canal structure.

In this scenario no loading has been applied to the top of the slope however, the movement of mechanical excavators and plant has been modelled in the final scenario to include temporary works.

### 6.3. TEMPORARY WORKS LOADINGS

It is evident from the review of the proposed construction drawings, scaled cross sections and slope stability modelling that the slope has potential failure mechanisms where the FOS falls below 1 due to the bund within sections $3,4,5,7,8,9 \& 10$. The 3.00 m excavation without the bund is likely to support the application of a load up to 300 kN at the top of the slope without failure.

### 6.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

It must be noted that detailed levels for the temporary or permanent future loadings have not been provided. Given that the slope from the highway toward the western and southern boundary of site appears to be fairly steep, in its current state this is modelled to be inherently stable though now considered outside of the phasing plan for excavation.

Following excavations slopes/bunds may require redesigning at the perimeter to ensure a safe angle is provided that would not impose any future geotechnical failures induced through slip circles; this includes the proposed excavations that may require benching and should be constructed using safe slope angles depending on the extraction depths at each and every location through the site.

It is recommended for design purposes that the base of the slope is mapped and sufficient easement placed around the periphery of the site to suitably manage the risk from slope instability and mark out the extents in order to calculate volumetrics for viability.
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A suitably qualified supervising geotechnical engineer should be appointed for the duration of the land enabling works and as such weekly inspection of the embankment will be made to ensure that should any evidence of slope failure be observed, appropriate mitigation and corrective action can be agreed with the client.

I trust that the above information is sufficient at this time and if you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.

## Yours sincerely,

For and on behalf of E3P Ltd
Roy Walker
Principal Geoenvironmental Consultant
Enclosed:
MPG Exploratory Borehole Logs; and,
MPG Exploratory Location Plan
E3P Slope Stability Cross Section Plan
E3P Slope Stability Cross Section and Easement Plan
E3P Slope Stability Analysis Output Plans
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[^0]:    ${ }^{+}$FOS less than 1 as the slope is safe however the bund design and/or excavation in the section hasn't been designed at $45^{\circ}$.
    *FOS remains unchanged with load applied as the slope is stable yet the bund design and excavation is failing as the slope in section is not designed at $45^{\circ}$.
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ Section 3 is unstable due to the angle on the excavation being over steepened - slight modification on design required.

