STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN (INCLUDING HYDRAULIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT)



Proposed Industrial Development 777 Yaamba Road PARKHURST

ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

APPROVED PLANS

These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

Development Permit No.: D/52-2019

Dated: 11 August 2020

12 June 2020

File No: K4820-0003



Phone07 5580 9777Emaileng@knobelengineers.com.auWebknobelengineers.com.auAddressPO Box 41, Varsity Lakes Q 4227



DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title:	Stormwater Management Plan (Including Hydraulic Impact Assessment)
Document No:	K4820-0003
Original Date of Issue:	15 May 2020
Project Manager:	Martin Roushani-Zarmehri
Author:	M. Roushani-Zarmehri
Client:	Siris Consulting Engineers
Client Contact:	D. Cugola
Client Reference:	777 Yaamba Road, Parkhurst
Synopsis:	This Hydraulic Impact Assessment Report provides details of the potential for hydraulic impact due to the Proposed Industrial Development on 777 Yaamba Road Parkhurst. It includes adopted modelling parameters, hydraulic constraints, conceptual design information for the proposed development and a summary of the mitigation of impacts.

Reviewed by RPEQ	Reg. No.	Signed	Date
Martin Roushani- Zarmehri	22549		12 June 2020

Revision/Checking History			
Revision No	Date	Checked By	Issued By
А	15 May 2020	Aaron Pianta	Martin Roushani- Zarmehri
В	12 June 2020	Aaron Pianta	Martin Roushani- Zarmehri

Distribution		
Recipient	No of Copies	Method
D.Cugola – Siris Consulting Engineers	1	PDF

The information contained within this report is provided in good faith in the belief that no information, opinions or recommendations made are misleading. All comments and opinions given in this report are based on information supplied by the client, their agent and third parties.

© Copyright of Knobel Engineers. No part of this document can be reproduced without the prior permission in writing of the Director of Knobel Engineers.

CONTENTS

1.0		INTRODUCT	ΓΙΟΝ	1
	1.1	Backgro	bund	1
	1.2	Study C	Dbjectives	1
	1.3	Site De	scription	1
		1.3.1	Location and Context	1
		1.3.2	Existing and Proposed Use	3
2.0		PROVIDED	DATA AND MODELLING APPROACH	4
	2.1	Existing	g Case Scenario Adoption	4
	2.2	RNAU 1	IMR TUFLOW Model	5
	2.3	Design	Case Provided Data	6
3.0		HYDROLOG	IC ASSESSMENT	7
	3.1	Hydrol	ogical Model - XPRAFTS	7
	3.2	XPRAF1	rS Model Results	9
4.0		HYDRAULIC	ASSESSMENT	. 10
	4.1	Hydrau	lic Modelling	10
		4.1.1	Model Consistency	. 10
		4.1.2	Land Use Manning's (n)	. 11
		4.1.3	Pre-Developed Scenario Model	. 12
		4.1.4	Post-Development Scenario Model	. 12
		4.1.5	Hydraulic Impact Assessment	. 13
		4.1.6	Proposed Flood Compliant Levels	. 15
5.0		WATER QU	ALITY ASSESSMENT	. 15
	5.1	Backgro	pund	15
	5.2	Constru	uction Phase	16
		5.2.1	Key Pollutants	. 16
		5.2.2	Sediment and Erosion Controls	. 16
		5.2.3	Water Quality Monitoring and Inspections	. 17
		5.2.4	Reporting	. 17
	5.3	Operat	ional Phase	17
		5.3.1	Stormwater Quality Objectives	. 17
		5.3.2	Post Development MUSIC Modelling	. 18
		5.3.3	Adopted Catchments	. 18
		5.3.4	Adopted SQID Design Parameters	. 18
		5.3.5	Post Development Modelling Results - Mitigated	. 20
6.0		CONCLUSIC)N	. 20

FIGURES

Figure 1:	Site Location Plan (Source: QLD Globe – Modified)	2
Figure 2:	RNAU Concept Plan – Yaamba Road Section (Modified from www.tmr.qld.gov.au)	2
Figure 3:	Deemed Lawful Points of Discharge (Source: RNAU Hydraulic Model, mapped in QGIS)	
Figure 4:	RNAU Model Components (Source: provided RNAU TuFLOW, files - Mapped in QGIS)	5
Figure 5:	Proposed earthworks design surface Digital Elevation Model (DEM) provided by the client	7
Figure 6:	Subject Site Location within existing RNAU Tuflow model catchment	
Figure 7:	LIM-16 Sub-Catchment properties – Source: Supplied XPRAFTS model	
Figure 8:	39% AEP XPRAFTS Local Inflow Hydrographs – Sub-Catchment LIM-16	9
Figure 9:	1% AEP XPRAFTS Local Inflow Hydrographs – Sub-Catchment LIM-16	10
Figure 10:	1% AEP TuFLOW Classic vs. TuFLOW HPC Comparison (Source: WaterRIDE)	11
Figure 11:	Examples of ROG Model Noise (Source: 39% AEP event Peak Afflux Map, via WaterRIDE)	14
Figure 12:	1% AEP event Peak Afflux Map (Source: WaterRIDE)	15
Figure 13:	Operational Phase Treatment Train (Source: KE MUSIC model)	19

TABLES

Table 1:	Provided TuFLOW Model Scenarios	5
Table 2:	Provided TuFLOW Model Scenarios	6
Table 3:	Adopted Initial Losses (Source: RRC/RNAU XPRAFTS Model)	9
Table 4:	XPRAFTS Peak Flow Rate	9
Table 5:	Manning's 'n' Roughness Coefficients – Adopted from Council's TUFLOW Model Parameters	11
Table 6:	Key Pollutants, Construction Phase	16
Table 7:	MUSIC Model Catchment Parameters	18
Table 8:	Adopted Bioretention System Parameters	19
Table 9:	Treatment Train Effectiveness at Receiving Node	20

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Siris Consulting Engineers, Lily Place Estate Site Layout Plan, (Ref: SCE-115-002)
Appendix B	Knobel Engineers, Model Layout Plans, (Ref: K4820/B001/A to B004/A)
Appendix C	Knobel Engineers, Pre-Development Peak Flood Mapping, (Ref: K3328/F100/A to F305/A)
Appendix D	Knobel Engineers, Post-Development Peak Flood Mapping, (Ref: K3328/F400/B to F605/B)
Appendix E	Knobel Engineers, Peak Flood Afflux Mapping, (Ref: K3328/F700/B to F705/B)
Appendix F	SDAP State Code Responses

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Knobel Engineers has been commissioned by Siris Consulting Engineers to carry out a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP), which includes a Hydraulic Impact Assessment (HIA) at 777 Yaamba Road, Parkhurst, ('the site'). This HIA is to facilitate a Development Application for an Industrial Reconfiguration Of Lot (ROL) application to Rockhampton Regional Council, and the referable State Agencies.

Accordingly, this report has been provided in response to the Information Requests ('IR') by Rockhamption Regional Council ('RRC') - Application Reference No: D/52-2019, dated 11 July 2019, and the Queensland Government's Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning ('SDMIP') – SARA Reference: 1907-12044 SRA dated 5 August 2019.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Response to RRC Information Request (Document No: K4820-0005) and the State Assessment and Referral Agency Information Request (Document No: K4820-0006), prepared by Knobel Engineers.

1.2 Study Objectives

This SMP aims to:

- Review existing information and studies for the subject site and surrounding catchment;
- Undertake site analysis for stormwater quantity and quality management purposes;
- Adopt the provided modelling files provided by the Department of Transport (as deemed appropriate by RRC), being the Rockhampton Northern Access Upgrade ('RNAU') TuFLOW Hydraulic Model, to establish a "base case" hydraulic model;
- Hydrological assessment of the subject site considering the proposed development;
- Update the "base case" model with the post-development scenario (provided by Siris Consulting Engineers), which adopts updated hydrologic implications, topographical modifications, manning's roughness and drainage, to investigate and determine if there are any anticipated flood impacts as a result of the proposed development.
- Analysis the pre- and post-development scenarios for the typical 39% AEP to 1% AEP critical duration events, for assessment purposes;
- Propose mitigation solutions should any hydraulic impacts be determined; and
- Provide output results from the hydraulic modeling including pre-versus post development flood level and velocity afflux mapping.

1.3 Site Description

1.3.1 Location and Context

The site is located at 777 Yaamba Road, Parkhurst, however is formally identified as the following lots:

- Lot 20 on SP314611 (Area = 10.67ha); and
- Lot 30 on SP314611 (Area = 8.887ha).

The site location and surrounding properties have been illustrated in *Figure 1* below.

The northern lot (30/SP314611) contains a major and minor access point, which fronts Yaamba Road. Yaamba Road forms part of the Bruce Highway, which is currently in the process of being upgraded as part of the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) Rockhampton Northern Access Upgrade (RNAU) project (RNAU Concept Plan: Proposed site's extents shown in figure 2 below).

Upon completion of the works at the site frontage, the subject site will retain the northern access point, however will be connected to a Service Road adjacent to the Bruce Highway. An opportunity to connect the southern portion of the site to a Southern Service Road is also available.

As illustrated in, the site is bound by an industrial lot to the north and south-west, bounded by Yaamba Road and a service road to the east and south-east of the site, and by the Queensland Rail ('QR') North Coast Railway Line to the west.



The subject site in the context of the surrounding area is shown in *Figure 2*.

Figure 1: Site Location Plan (Source: QLD Globe – Modified)



Figure 2: RNAU Concept Plan – Yaamba Road Section (Modified from www.tmr.qld.gov.au)

1.3.2 Existing and Proposed Use

The subject site was recently reconfigured through a partial resumption of land for the RNAU project. The site contains the remnants of the old Parkhurst Cement Works which was abandoned in 2009. The site contains a manmade waterbody to the south, which is deemed to have been utilised for industrial activities (Cement plant operations) over time.

As part of the Development Application (DA) for the site, it is proposed that the old cement works infrastructure is demolished and the site be levelled, in preparation of a 13 Lot Industrial Subdivision, and associated stormwater management area, as shown in Appendix A of this report (Drawing Ref: SCE-115-002).

1.3.3 Lawful Point of Discharge

Due to the complex topography within the existing site, as a result of the historical cement plant industrial activities, a stormwater catchment plan is not deemed appropriate. However, the existing and post-development Lawful Points of Discharge are able to be ascertained via the Rainfall-On-Grid hydraulic model, as these utilise topographical data, and determine the concentrated flow paths leaving the site.

Refer to Figure 3 below which illustrates the deemed pre and post-development Lawful Points of Discharge.



Figure 3: Deemed Lawful Points of Discharge (Source: RNAU Hydraulic Model, mapped in QGIS)

2.0 PROVIDED DATA AND MODELLING APPROACH

To assess the potential for both stormwater quantity management and flood hydraulic impact, as a result of the proposed development, a hydraulic impact assessment is deemed required. As part of a data agreement, Rockhampton Regional Council (RRC) have supplied the DTMR RNAU TUFLOW and XPRAFTS Model for development assessment purposes, as this model would more appropriately reflect an existing scenario for the assessment.

BMT WBM's TUFLOW model is deemed an appropriate model to adopt, as it simulates depth-averaged one and two-dimensional free-surface flows using a majority of the hydraulic shallow water equation.

The TuFLOW models provided by RRC contained design AEP storms between the 10% and 1% design AEP events, and therefore to provide an assessment of all typical design events from the 39% design AEP event, additional hydrological outputs were generated from the XPRAFTS hydrologic model (provided by RRC), to extend the TuFLOW model's design event runs.

This modelling approach has been adopted to meet the requirements requested by the State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA), where the following flood and stormwater events (39%, 18%, 10%, 5%, 2% and 1% AEP) are required to demonstrate that the post-development case will achieve a deemed nonworsening criteria impact when compared to the existing case scenario.

2.1 Existing Case Scenario Adoption

The supplied RNAU TUFLOW models were prepared by AECOM (Rockhampton) on behalf of Rockhampton Regional Council (RRC) and the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR), as part of the RNAU project.

The supplied modelling files include two different model setups – one for RRC and the other for TMR. Based off consultation with RRC's engineering officers, it was deemed appropriate to adopt the RNAU design model setup, given that this scenario more appropriately represents the 'existing condition' (inclusive of a completed RNAU project) of the site and its surroundings.

Further liaison with RRC has assisted in determining the suitable base model to be adopted. It was determined that the model scenario "D3c" by DTMR was the most appropriate model to adopt for a base case, given this scenario also takes into consideration climate change.

Refer to Table 1 below for the different types of scenarios provided by RRC.

For further details on the pre-development TuFLOW model setup and 2D Manning's roughness map, refer to *Appendix B* of this report.

Table 1: Provided TuFLOW Model Scenarios

TuFLOW Model Scenario	Model Description
E2c	RRC model setup – pre RNAU
R2e	RRC model setup – post RNAU
E2b	TMR model setup – pre RNAU
D3c (Adopted)	TMR model setup – post RNAU + Climate Change

2.2 RNAU TMR TUFLOW Model

The RNAU TUFLOW model by TMR is based on the extents of RRC's Limestone Creek Catchment. To simulate the worst-case scenario of the site, the existing detention basin will be represented as being at full capacity before the event storm is to be applied on the model.



Figure 4: RNAU Model Components (Source: provided RNAU TuFLOW, files - Mapped in QGIS)

Additional items that are to be noted as part of adopting the RNAU TuFLOW 'D3c' scenario model include:

- The level of detail as part of the RNAU project is based off design work completed as of the 15th March 2018;
- Bridge parameters are based on the 85% complete bridge design for Limestone Creek Southbound Bridge;
- The Ultimate Bridge Design for Limestone Creek Northbound Bridge was modelled as a sensitivity using the 15% complete bridge design drawings;
- Modelling is based on provided RNAU project design only;
- The adopted upstream flow diversion strategy at Norman Road and Bondeson Drive is modelled utilising adopted conceptual design available at the time of modelling; and
- The existing water body within the site area was modelled as full capacity, as historical aerial imagery demonstrates this water body generally being full over the long term.

Table 2 below identifies the event and duration modelling results supplied by RRC within the TuFLOW Model. Section 3.0 provides discussion on the adopted methods to extend the hydrologic outputs to simulate the critical duration events for the site.

Event (AEP)	Provided Durations (Mins)
39%	No results provided
18%	No results provided
10%	120mins
5%	60mins
2%	60mins
1%	90mins

Table 2: Provided TuFLOW Model Scenarios

2.3 Design Case Provided Data

Siris Consulting Engineers has provided the proposed design case Digital Elevation Model (DEM) data, which has been used as a base case in preliminary mitigation iterations. In order to provide a desired outcome for a deemed acceptable hydraulic impact, further consultation has been undertaken with Siris Consulting Engineers, to provide a civil design outcome which integrates the required hydraulic design outcomes.

The design case DEM data which has been 'stamped' over the existing case model, which has been illustrated below in *Figure 4* for an appreciation of the model approach.

For further details on the post-development TuFLOW model setup and 2D Manning's roughness map, refer to *Appendix B* of this report.



Figure 5: Proposed earthworks design surface Digital Elevation Model (DEM) provided by the client

3.0 HYDROLOGIC ASSESSMENT

3.1 Hydrological Model - XPRAFTS

RRC has supplied Knobel Engineers ('KE'), a copy of the XPRAFTS model used for the RNAU project. As per the supplied XPRAFTS model by RRC, the sub-catchments within the regional Limestone Creek catchments were reviewed, to determine which sub-catchment have influencing flows over the site, to run the appropriate hydrological simulations, for critical duration adoption purposes.

As seen in the Limestone Creek catchment delineation data, mapped in *Figure 5* below, the main subcatchment which has influence and pertains to the subject site is sub-catchment LIM-16. It is deemed no other sub-catchments contribute flow to the site, or the sub-catchment of which the site pertains to.



Figure 6: Subject Site Location within existing RNAU Tuflow model catchment

A screenshot of the sub-catchment properties within the supplied XPRAFTS model is shown below in *Figure 6.*

Rainfall Losses Perviou	15	Split catchment	into pervious/impervious
Initial/Continuing	LIM-16		Local Storm
		Location:	
Rainfall Losses Impervi	ous	1990	
Initial/Continuing		10	
ARBM			
Total Area	98.6922		125
Impervious	69.8318 %		
Vectored Slope	0.6447365! %		
Pervious Mannings 'n'	0.04		
Impervious Mannings 'n	0.025		
🗌 Use 10 UnEqual Su	ib areas		
Use Direct Storage	Coefficent		
Use non-standard S	itorage Exponent		se Baseflow

Figure 7: LIM-16 Sub-Catchment properties – Source: Supplied XPRAFTS model

The adopted Pervious Initial Loss, as per the provided XPRAFTS model for each corresponding design storm AEP event were retained, and have been shown in Table 3 below for clarity:

Event (AEP)	Adopted Initial Loss (mm/hr)
39%	10
18%	10
10%	10
5%	5
2%	0
1%	0

Table 3: Adopted Initial Losses (Source: RRC/RNAU XPRAFTS Model)

3.2 XPRAFTS Model Results

The inflow hydrographs found in the supplied XPRAFTS shows that peak flow and duration for the proposed development site for each corresponding event are:

Event (AEP)	XPRAFTS Peak Flow Rate (m³/s)	Critical Duration (min)	
39%	21.6	60	
18%	29.7	60	
10%	34.5	60	
5%	41.6	<mark>6</mark> 0	
2%	49.6	60	
1%	56.9	60	

Table 4: XPRAFTS Peak Flow Rate

For a visual appreciation of the flow hydrographs from the site's sub-catchments, a range of duration hydrographs have been provided for the 39% and 1% design AEP events in Figure 6 and 7, respectively.





As noted in the above figures, the critical duration has been determined as the 60min storm duration for all design AEP events.

Given the site is already zoned as industrial in the pre-development scenario, it was deemed reasonable to adopt these critical durations for the post-development assessment for a consistent approach.

4.0 HYDRAULIC ASSESSMENT

A hydraulic assessment utilising TUFLOW was undertaken to establish pre development flood extents/flow paths, flood levels and flood velocities across the site for the 1 in 2yr ARI (39% AEP), 1 in 5yr ARI (18% AEP), 1 in 10yr ARI (10% AEP), 1 in 20yr ARI (5% AEP), 1 in 50yr ARI (2% AEP) and 1 in 100yr ARI (1% AEP) critical design storm events.

To provide an adequate assessment in accordance with Council and SARA requirements, the hydraulic assessment will demonstrate and quantify any potential impacts caused by the proposed development, on peak flood levels within and external to the site. The following section describes the pre development and post development hydraulic model verification, set-up and results of the modelling.

4.1 Hydraulic Modelling

4.1.1 Model Consistency

To ensure consistency between the supplied models by RRC/TMR and that of KE's, all XPRAFTS and TUFLOW inputs by KE were based and built from the supplied models. The hydrologic method utilised within the supplied TuFLOW model was the Rainfall On Grid method, which has been retained for this assessment.

The supplied TuFLOW model has been setup to run utilising TuFLOW Classic, however to provide a much faster runtime, TuFLOW's Heavily Parallelised Compute (HPC) functionality with GPU processing has been adopted within the hydraulic impact assessment modelling. Accordingly, the HPC results have been confirmed via benchmarking against the Classic results, that the modelling outcomes are reasonably similar, and suitable for adoption for the hydraulic impact assessment.

See Figure 9 below which demonstrates the 1% AEP design event impacts, between the TuFLOW Classic result and the TuFLOW HPC result.



Figure 10: 1% AEP TuFLOW Classic vs. TuFLOW HPC Comparison (Source: WaterRIDE)

4.1.2 Land Use Manning's (n)

For both base case scenario and post development scenario, the Manning's 'n' values and associated model layers set up in the previous RNAU TUFLOW model remained unchanged and were adopted for this HIA. The adopted Manning's 'n' hydraulic roughness parameters are outlined below in *Table 5*.

Refer to Appendix B for the pre and post-development 2D Manning's 'n' roughness maps.

Materials Layer	Manning's 'n' Value
High Density Residential - General lots < 1200 sq. meters	0.060-0.150
Medium Density Residential - Mixture of clear and vegetation areas on developed land	0.060-0.120
Low Density Residential - High density vegetation with building obstructions	0.060-0.090
Industrial, Outlet Protection	0.060
High Density Vegetation - Very bushy and many plant obstructions	0.090-0.150
Medium Density Vegetation - Bushy with larger plant obstructions	0.070-0.110
Low Density Vegetation - Long grass, some brush	0.045-0.080
Channel	0.050-0.060
Riparian Corridor - Bushy with larger plant obstructions	0.060-0.100
Maintained Grass	0.035
Road Reserve	0.030
Railway	0.025
Fitzroy River Bed (at DS boundary)	0.022
Long Grass	0.040
Buildings	0.018-0.50
Steep Slopes	0.090-0.110

Table 5: Manning's 'n' Roughness Coefficients – Adopted from Council's TUFLOW Model Parameters

4.1.3 Pre-Developed Scenario Model

The base case model set up was described in the previous section (Section 2.2).

The peak water depth and peak velocity mapping results for the pre-development TUFLOW model scenarios have been presented in Appendix D, for the following design storm events:

- 1 in 2yr ARI (39% AEP);
- 1 in 5yr ARI (18% AEP);
- 1 in 10yr ARI (10% AEP);
- 1 in 20yr ARI (5% AEP);
- 1 in 50yr ARI (2% AEP); and
- 1 in 100yr ARI (1% AEP).

4.1.4 Post-Development Scenario Model

The proposed development layout of the site is attached in *Appendix A* of the report.

As illustrated in the development plan supplied by Siris Consulting Engineers, the proposed subdivision site has been designed to ultimately discharge flows from the individual lots to the proposed basin in the south-western corner of the site area. There is also a channel through the site to divert flows from the eastern side, and along the western boundary, to promote capture of flows off the Queensland Rail land, and into a formalised channel.

The developed scenario's building pads have been levelled to be above the adjacent major flow channels along the perimeter of the site, to ensure an adequate level of freeboard has been considered. The north-eastern half of the subject site will remain at existing site levels, as no earthworks are proposed in this region.

The 2D Manning's roughness 'n' has also been updated as per the Manning's values provided in Table 5, in proposed development areas, to account for future impervious surfaces and roads.

The topographical modifications undertaken using TuFLOW modelling tools, in addition the client's supplied design tin, includes proposed culverts discharging from the basin, and drainage under the proposed internal road, as detailed below.

Channels

It is noted that further refinement of the channels can be undertaken at detailed design to provide equivalent conveyance abilities;

- A channel which runs parallel along the inner western boundary of the site, that collects external north-western flows, and any additional flow from the adjacent QR land. This ultimately connects to the site's proposed basin. This channel varies along it's width, however has approximate maximum sizes of a 4m wide base, 10m wide top, and approximately 1.8m deep;
- A channel through the middle of the site, which connects the eastern parts, to discharge flows towards the western parts of the site, modelled to be approximately 4m bottom width, 8m top width, and approximately 600mm deep on the upstream side. Whereas on the downstream side, it has been modelled to be approximately 4m bottom width, 6m top width and 1.2m deep. These flows ultimately connect to the site's proposed basin;

<u>Basin</u>

- A basin has been provided at the southern corner of the site, which has a basin invert level at RL20.55mAHD at the lowest regions, and embankments as high as 23.0mAHD. The basin has a floor slope of approximately 0.8% to allow it to drain efficiently. The basin outlet pipes are detailed below;
- A portion of the proposed basin contains a stormwater quality treatment bioretention basin area.
 Refer to Section 5.0 of this report for further information of the adopted bioretention area.

Drainage Structures

- 2no. 900mm RCP cross-road drainage structures to connect middle channels internal to the site;
- Basin Outlets:
 - \circ ~ 1no. 600mm (W) x 900mm (H) Rectangular Concrete Box Culvert; and
 - o 3no. 900mm (W) x 900mm (H) Rectangular Concrete Box Culverts.

Designated Flood Level

The Defined Flood (Event) Level (DFL) for the site is determined via the 1 in 100yr ARI (1% AEP) storm event as defined in the Local government's requirement and QUDM. Given the topographical changes across the site and the flooding source, the post-development DFL for the site varies across the channel chainages, and the respective depth along the chainage. Accordingly, the detailed civil design is to adhere to the minimum DFL level requirements as shown in the post-development modelling peak mapping results.

The base case model set up was described in the previous section (Section 2.2).

Peak Mapping Results

The peak water depth and peak velocity mapping results for the post-development TUFLOW model scenarios have been presented in Appendix E, for the following design storm events:

- 1 in 2yr ARI (39% AEP);
- 1 in 5yr ARI (18% AEP);
- 1 in 10yr ARI (10% AEP);
- 1 in 20yr ARI (5% AEP);
- 1 in 50yr ARI (2% AEP); and
- 1 in 100yr ARI (1% AEP).

The peak water level map has also been provided for the 1 in 100yr ARI (1% AEP) event, to demonstrate the required DFL levels for the proposed development.

4.1.5 Hydraulic Impact Assessment

The peak water surface levels were generated for both pre-developed and post-developed Scenarios, and an afflux impact assessment has been undertaken and peak flood impact maps presented in Appendix E. The figures present the potential flood level impact (afflux) caused by the proposed development for the 39% to 1% design AEP events.

As seen in *Appendix E* of the report, there is afflux shown externally to the eastern and south-eastern sides of the site, within the existing DTMR roadside channels. It is however noted that these regions have been

Provided as dedications to DTMR previously, to provide trafficability off Yamba Road/Bruce Highway, and to contain stormwater within these roadside channels.

Furthermore, the afflux demonstrated is deemed to occur, given the development of the site up to the boundary is disallowing road surface flows to enter into the site, but rather is shown to be displaced into the allocated channels in the DTMR dedicated stormwater channels.

Accordingly, the afflux results shown in the stormwater channel regions are deemed to be generally contained in the DTMR road regions, and therefore not deemed to affect the trafficability of the proposed design works.

There is afflux demonstrated within the subject site boundaries, however this is deemed to be acceptable.

It is noted that there are small random afflux cells within the model, however given the adopted approach is a Rainfall On Grid method, it is common to experience a level of model noise as shown below in Figure 10.



Figure 11: Examples of ROG Model Noise (Source: 39% AEP event Peak Afflux Map, via WaterRIDE)

The post-development scenario has shown a general decrease in peak water levels for all design AEP events within the Railway Corridor and the north-western portion of the site, which is generally deemed a desirable outcome.

The peak flow rates and peak water levels leaving the site at the southern Lawful Point of Discharge (LPOD) also demonstrates a general reduction from pre to post-development scenarios for all design AEP events, and therefore is deemed an appropriate solution.



Figure 12: 1% AEP event Peak Afflux Map (Source: WaterRIDE)

Overall modelling indicates that there are no actionable or adverse impacts to neighbouring properties or transport infrastructure, in particular the QR Railway Corridor at the western side of the site (whereby peak flood level reductions have also been demonstrated), for all design AEP events. Accordingly, it is deemed that the requirements by the State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA) have been satisfied, in accordance with the State Development Assessment Codes.

4.1.6 Proposed Flood Compliant Levels

As discussed previously the proposed industrial lot level pads have been set above the designated flood event (DFE) for modelling purposes and as a conservative approach.

5.0 WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

5.1 Background

The development of the land has the potential to increase the pollutant loads within stormwater runoff and downstream watercourses. During the construction phase of the development, disturbances to the existing ground have the potential to significantly increase sediment loads entering downstream drainage systems and watercourses. The operational phase of the development will potentially increase the amount of sediments and nutrients washing from the site.

The following sections describe construction and operational phase controls and water quality modelling of the proposed treatment train in compliance with Council guidelines.

5.2 Construction Phase

A high risk of stormwater pollution will occur from the site during the construction phase due to erosion and sediment transportation off site to the receiving environment. The majority of this risk results from construction activities disturbing the site and exposing areas of soil to the direct erosive influence of the environment.

The following section outlines the procedures necessary to minimise erosion and control sediment during construction in accordance with the International Erosion Control Association (IECA) Best Practice ESC Document.

5.2.1 Key Pollutants

The key pollutants have been identified for the Construction Phase of this development.

Pollutant	Sources
Litter	Paper, construction packaging, food packaging, cement bags, material off cuts.
Sediment	Exposed soils and stockpiles during earthworks and building works.
Hydrocarbons	Fuel and oil spills, leaks from construction equipment and temporary car park areas.
Toxic Materials	Cement slurry, asphalt primer, solvents, cleaning agents, and wash waters (e.g., from tile works).
Acids or Alkaline substances	Acid sulphate soils, cement slurry and wash waters.

Table 6: Key Pollutants, Construction Phase

5.2.2 Sediment and Erosion Controls

Sediment and Erosion Control devices (S&EC) employed on the site shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the *International Erosion Control Association (IECA) Best Practice ESC Document*. As the bulk earthworks for the site have already been conducted, the following devices and management measures proposed for controlling sediment and erosion are specific to the construction of the operational phase development works.

Pre-Construction

- Stabilised site access/exit onto Yaamba Road (Service Road) to the east;
- Sediment fences to be located around the perimeter of the site;
- Sediment trap to be installed in the southeast corner of the site;
- Dust fencing to be installed if required; and
- Educate site personnel to the requirements of Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

Initial Construction – Bulk Earthworks

- Maintain construction access/exit, sediment fencing, dust fences and all other existing controls as required;
- Construct diversion drains to convey disturbed site run-off to the temporary sediment traps; and
- Confine construction activities to stages to minimise areas of disturbance at any given time.

Second Stage Construction

- Maintain construction access/exit, sediment fencing, dust fences, diversion drain, and all other existing controls as required;
- Progressively revegetate finished areas where applicable;
- Divert runoff from un-disturbed areas around disturbed areas; and
- Drainage structure protection around field inlets and gully pits.

During construction, all areas of exposed soils allowing dust generation are to be suitably treated. Treatments will include covering the soil and watering. Road accesses are to be regularly cleaned to prevent the transmission of soil on vehicle wheels and eliminate any build-up of typical road dirt and tyre dusts from delivery vehicles.

Adequate waste disposal facilities are to be provided and maintained on the site to cater for all waste materials such as litter, hydrocarbons, toxic materials, acids or alkaline substances.

5.2.3 Water Quality Monitoring and Inspections

To ensure that the water quality objectives are being met during the construction phase of the development water quality monitoring shall be conducted. Water quality monitoring shall use a calibrated probe or sampling and testing at a NATA registered laboratory.

Location: Monitoring Stations at the most downstream location of each sub-catchment, after sediment fences, to ensure an adequate reading of site sediment treatment.

Parameters: Site discharge criteria.

Frequency: Following at least 30 mm of rainfall in a 24 hour period.

The contractor shall be responsible for the inspection and maintenance of all sediment and erosion control devices. Additional controls and review of existing controls shall be undertaken in response to the results of the above-mentioned monitoring program.

5.2.4 Reporting

An inspection report shall be written by a suitably qualified and experienced scientist/engineer following each water quality monitoring episode. The report shall include at least the following information:

- Name, address and real property description for the development site;
- Council file reference number (if known);
- Monitoring locations;
- Performance criteria;
- Results for each monitoring location, identifying any breaches of performance criteria;
- Recommended corrective actions to be taken and additional sediment and erosion controls, if required; and
- Inspection reports shall be provided to the contractor for their action and compilation in an onsite register.

If the above-mentioned performance criteria are exceeded and results from the downstream monitoring stations show significant deterioration from upstream results (if applicable), the contractor shall implement all recommendation of the inspection report within one (1) working day of receipt of the report.

5.3 Operational Phase

The following sections provide details of the Stormwater Quality Improvement Devices (SQID's) proposed for the operational phase of the development.

5.3.1 Stormwater Quality Objectives

To protect the water quality of the downstream watercourses the following Water Quality Objectives (WQO's) has been applied to stormwater runoff from the site in accordance with the State Planning Policy 2017 and the RRC Stormwater Quality requirements.

Best Management Practices (BMP) are required to be demonstrated for all Development Applications within RRC and are recommended to be implemented by the developer. Where practicable, methods such as first flush devices, and discharging stormwater to landscaped/grassed areas prior to discharge to the LPOD, are to be incorporated into the site's stormwater strategy, where the opportunity is available.

The following load reduction targets must be achieved when assessing the post-development treatment train (comparison of unmitigated developed case versus developed mitigated case).

- 85% reduction in Total Suspended Sediment (TSS)
- 60% reduction in Total Phosphorus (TP)
- 45% reduction in Total Nitrogen (TN)
- 90% reduction in litter (sized 5 mm or greater)

5.3.2 Post Development MUSIC Modelling

To assess the potential quantities of pollutants anticipated to be discharged from the site, the water quality modelling package 'Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation' (MUSIC) V6.3 by eWATER has been applied. MUSIC Modelling Parameters and delineated data have been sourced from Water by Design, *MUSIC Modelling Guidelines*, and where possible, via online MUSIC Link data.

Rainfall data has been sourced from Rainfall Station 39083, (Rockhampton) using a date range from 1991 to 2001 and a 6 Minute Time Step, in accordance with RRC requirements.

5.3.3 Adopted Catchments

The development has been modelled with the assumption that all developable areas and road Q3-month flows are to be diverted to the treatment area, which is located at the lowest point within the subject site. The adopted primary treatment strategy for the site is a large bioretention basin for the entire development, which shall allow flows to be treated prior to discharge into the receiving waterways downstream of the subject site.

The MUSIC model schematic has been illustrated in Figure 9.

Stormwater Pollutant catchment modelling for the development has been estimated based off catchment analysis, and the prescribed Water by Design MUSIC modelling guidelines Version 1.0, 2010 (WBDMG).

Given the future variability in catchment type splits, a Lumped catchment approach has been adopted for the subject site, which adopts an Industrial Lumped type for consistency.

Typical Impervious Fractions used for Lumped-catchments have been adopted from Table 3.6 in the Water by Design MUSIC Modelling Guidelines Version 1.0, 2010.

Adopted catchment parameters have been provided below in Table 7.

Table 7: MUSIC Model Catchment Parameters

	ID Catchment Type Treatment Type		Adopted Parameters			
Catch ID			Area (ha)	fi		
Development Industrial (Lumped) Bio		Bioretention	13.21	0.90		

Further assumptions associated with the model involve:

- The rainfall-runoff parameters have been based off the Industrial Land Use parameters set out in WBDMG Table 3.7;
- The pollutant export parameters for Lumped-catchment Residential land use has been adopted from WBDMG Table 3.9;
- Default routing (No flow routing or translation between nodes);
- No seepage/exfiltration (0 mm/hr); and
- All other parameters used within the modelling were based on Water by Design MUSIC Modelling Guidelines Version 1.0, 2010.

5.3.4 Adopted SQID Design Parameters

A Bioretention (SQID – Stormwater Quality Improvement Device) will be utilised to treat stormwater runoff from the site, as it is deemed the most suitable for the proposed site use. The proposed SQID has been provided for modelling purposes only and is subject to council approval. Accordingly, similar and alternative SQID devices may be adopted upon council assessment and approval.

Detailed design of the stormwater treatment train shall be in accordance with the WSUD, Technical Design Guidelines for South East Queensland – Version 1 (June 2006).

BIORETENTION BASIN

A bioretention basin is designed to pond stormwater allowing it to percolate through a layer of filter media, typically sandy loam. Runoff passing through the filter media is collected with a perforated pipe discharging to the downstream drainage infrastructure. The Bioretention basins shall be located to treat all stormwater from the development areas.

The required bioretention parameters are based on the model output for compliance with the SPP and have been provided below in *Table 8*.

Parameter	Northern Basin Adopted Values
Surface Area (m²)	2100
Extended detention depth (m)	0.30
Filter area (m²)	1100
Unlined filter media perimeter (m)	0.01
Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)	180
Filter depth (m)	0.60
TN content of filter media (%)	400
Orthophosphate content of filter media (mg/kg)	30
Is the base lined?	Yes
Vegetated with effective nutrient removal plants	Yes
Overflow weir width (m)	3.60
Exfiltration rate (mm/hr)	0
Underdrain present?	Yes
Submerged zone with carbon present?	No
Depth of submerged zone (m)	N/A
Confirmation that K and C* remain default	Yes

Table 8: Adopted Bioretention System Parameters

An illustration of the MUSIC model of the adopted operational treatment train for the post-development site has been provided below in *Figure 10*.

eceiving Node	Bioretention Estimate - 21	00m2 SA - 1100m	2 FA Indust	ial - Lumped Catchment (Ap	oprox 13.21ha - Lots 1-6,10-12) [f
	Treatmont Train Effectiveness - Receiving No	ode		<u> </u>	
		Sources	Residual Load	% Reduction	
	Flow (ML/yr)	38.7	36.5	5.7	
	Total Suspended Solids (kg/yr)	5300	762	85.6	
	Total Phosphorus (kg/yr)	13.9	3.28	76.4	
	Total Nitrogen (kg/yr)	89.4	44.4	50.3	
	Gross Pollutants (kg/yr)	420	0	100	

Figure 13: Operationa

Operational Phase Treatment Train (Source: KE MUSIC model)

5.3.5 Post Development Modelling Results - Mitigated

The modelled Stormwater Quality Improvement Devices (SQID) has demonstrated a reduction in the amount of sediments and nutrients discharging from the post-development site. *Table 9* illustrates the effectiveness of the SQID's within the treatment train at the Receiving Node.

Parameter	Post	Post Mitigated	Reduction	Water Quality Objectives
Flow (ML/yr)	38.7	36.5	8	-
TSS (kg/yr)	5300	762	86	80 %
TP (kg/yr)	13.90	3.28	76	60 %
TN (kg/yr)	89.4	44.4	50	45 %
Gross Pollutants (kg/yr)	420	0	100	90 %

Table 9: Tr	eatment Train	Effectiveness	at Receiving	Node
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	------

The results demonstrate that the proposed SQID's meet the intended Water Quality Objectives for Gross Pollutants, Suspended Solids, Phosphorous and Nitrogen levels, in accordance with the RRC Requirements and The State Planning Policy 2017.

6.0 CONCLUSION

Knobel Engineers has been commissioned by Siris Consulting Engineers to carry out a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP), which includes a Hydraulic Impact Assessment (HIA) at 777 Yaamba Road, Parkhurst, ('the site'). This HIA is to facilitate a Development Application for a Industrial Reconfiguration Of Lot (ROL) application to Rockhampton Regional Council, and the referable State Agencies.

This Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) and Hydraulic Impact Assessment (HIA) was prepared to quantify and demonstrate the potential stormwater and flooding within the site, as a result of the proposed industrial development within 777 Yaamba Rd, Parkhurst, Rockhampton.

The results of the analysis have determined that:

- The adoption of a proposed basin and conveyance channels within the site, provides adequate mitigation, in order to demonstrate no worsening from pre to post-development scenarios. The proposed basin contains a bioretention component which has been demonstrated via a MUSIC model, to provide adequate stormwater quality treatment for the site, in accordance with The State Planning Policy;
- The stormwater quantity management for the site has been demonstrated via the hydraulic impact assessment component of this Stormwater Management Plan report;
- The designated flood level (DFL) for the site varies between approximately 25.00m AHD to 22.30mAHD, based on location within the site;
- The site in the existing scenario is inundated in the 1% AEP event, up to approximately 3.60m within the existing water body, and up to approximately 2.0m within the existing channels within the site;
- Existing velocities around the site are generally within 1.0m/s along the north, west and southern boundaries, and up to approximately 2.0m/s along the southern side, in the 1% AEP design event;
- The proposed development has generally demonstrated no actionable nuisance or adverse impacts externally (no material worsening of peak flood level or peak flood velocity), which includes the State Controlled Road (Yaamba Road/Bruce Highway) and the Railway Corridor to the west; and
- The current conceptual layout is deemed to be acceptable at this phase of the development application. Further refinement of the channels can be undertaken at the detailed design phase, to accommodate the required flows and outcomes from this preliminary hydraulic impact analysis.

APPENDIX

Α

Siris Consulting Engineers

Lily Place Estate Site Layout Plan

(Ref: SCE-115-002)



APPENDIX

В

Knobel Engineers

Model Layout Plans

(Ref: K4820/B001/A to B004/A)



	Cadastre Site Boundary: Existing Site - Manning's n Buildings Manning's Railway RNAU design boundary Medium Vegetation Low Vegetation						
			SIRIS CONSULTING ENGINEERS	DESIGN	DRAWN AR	APPROVED	EXISTING SI
1 15-05-2	Suite 4 - 155 Varsity P Varsity Lakes 0, 4227 10 FOR REPORT E: eng@knobelengin	Parade, PO Box 41, Varsity Lakes Q 4227 ABN: 33 071 435 202 07 5580 9133 W: knobelengineers.com.au	PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION 777 YAAMBA ROAD, PARKHURST				SCALE
SUE No. DATE	AMENDMENT GOLD COAST B	RISBANE BALLINA ROCKHAMPTON		1			1





			ENGINEERS	
			Suite 4 - 155 Varsity Parade, PO Box 41, Varsity Lakes Q 4227 Varsity Lakes Q 4227 ABN: 33 071 435 202	
1	15-05-20	FOR REPORT	E: eng@knobelengineers.com.au E: eng@knobelengineers.com.au	Ľ
ISSUE No.	DATE	AMENDMENT	GOLD COAST BRISBANE BALLINA ROCKHAMPTON	

	SIRIS CONSULTING ENGINEERS	-	AR	-	PROPOSED
X	PROJECT PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION 777 YAAMBA ROAD, PARKHURST				SCALE



APPENDIX

С

Knobel Engineers

Pre-Development Peak Flood Mapping

(Ref: K3328/F100/A to F305/A)









IMPORTANT NOTE

This plan was prepared to accompany an application to Rockhampton Regional Council and should not be used for any other purpose.

The dimensions and areas shown hereon are subject to field survey and also to the requirements of council and any other authority which may have requirements under any relevant legislation.

In particular, no reliance should be placed on the information on this plan for any financial dealings involving the land.

This note is an integral part of this plan.

client

project

JRT

Sibelco Site 777 Yaamba Road, Parkhurst

(with Ortho Underlay)

rpd

Lots 20 & 30 on SP314611

Rockhampton Regional Council

issue	date	details	authorised					
A	28-06-2019	Initial Issue	RJKF					
В	B 8-07-2020 Lots 10-12 & 7-9 (Stages 5 & 6) added		RJKF					
С	16-08-2021	RJKF						
D	7-09-2021	09-2021 Lots 10-12 widths amended						
create	d							
07 4927	Capricornsurveygroupcq SURVEYING & PLANNING SOLUTIONS 07 4927 5199 reception@csgcq.com.au 132 Victoria Parade, Rockhampton QLD 4700							
scale			datum					
1:4	000 ത	A3	-					
choot			and file					
SILEEL	110. • •							
1 0	11	7249-03-	ROL-D					
plan n	0.		issue					
70	10 0		п					
12	43-1	JJ-RUL	υ					

JRT CIVIL PARKHURST HANDLING PTY LTD LILY PLACE ESTATE 777 YAAMBA ROAD **ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL** PARKHURST, QLD. 4702 These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with

	PLAN REGISTER
Plan No.	Plan Title
SCE-115/001	Cover Sheet
SCE-115/002	Site Layout Plan
SCE-115/003	Staging Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/004	Staging Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/005	Typical Sections
SCE-115/006	Earthworks Plan General Layout
SCE-115/007	Earthworks Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/008	Earthworks Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/009	Earthworks Plan - Sheet 3
SCE-115/010	Roadworks Plan
SCE-115/011	Road Long Section Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/012	Road Long Section Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/013	Intersection & Vehicle Turn Paths Plan
SCE-115/014	Cul-de-sac & Intersection Setout Details
SCE-115/015	Stormwater General Layout
SCE-115/016	Stormwater Layout Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/017	Stormwater Layout Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/018	Sewerage Plan General Layout - Sheet 1
SCE-115/019	Sewerage Layout Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/020	Sewerage Layout Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/021	Sewerage Layout Plan - Sheet 3
SCE-115/022	Sewerage Long Section Plan - Sheet 1
SCE-115/023	Sewerage Long Section Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/024	Sewerage Long Section Plan - Sheet 3
SCE-115/025	Water & Electrical Services General Layout
SCE-115/026	Water & Electrical Services Plan - Sheet 1 Water & Electrical Convices Plan - Sheet 2
SCE-115/02/	water & Electrical Services Plan - Sheet 2



DA APPLICATION PLANS

DEVELOPMENT SITE

AD

APPROVED PLANS

Development Permit No.: D/52-2019

Dated: 11 August 2020

Harsha R. Weerasinghe **RPEQ 8372**





EMAIL: david@sirisengineers.com.au ABN:34 PHONE: 07 4930 2877 (office), 0407 119 734 (mobile) ADDRESC: Shap 3, 5, 7 Normanhy Street Vances (M







GENERAL

- 1. All dimensions on the job are in metres unless shown otherwise.
- 2. The contractor shall verify the locations of all existing services with the relevant authorities before commencing construction. Any costs associated with repairing damage to existing services shall be paid for by the contractor.
- 3. Dimensions, radii and levels refer to lip of, kerb and channel and are shown at tangent points and equally spaced points on single curves, unless noted otherwise. 4. All work shall be carried out in accordance with the local authority specifications and drawings unless directed otherwise.
- 5. All levels in this contract are AUSTRALIAN HEIGHT DATUM.
- 6. Levels for connection to existing works may be varied where necessary on site to achieve a satisfactorily smooth finish to the existing works. 7.
- All footpaths shall be topsoiled, turfed and hydro mulched as indicated on drawings. 8. All trees (except those on the fill and road works limits and those selected by the
- superintendent) to be retained. 9. Trees close to the road and sewers shall be determined on site by the superintendent for removal.
- 10. All materials shall be transported only on routes approved by council.
- 11. Method of disposal of all waste materials shall be to council's satisfaction.
- 12. All levels are dtm derived for layouts, longitudinal sections and cross sections. contractor to confirm on site before construction.
- 13. Developer to appoint contract for all fencing and landscaping if required. 14. All precast units are to be transported and installed as per manufacturers
- specifications and the structural integrity of each individual unit are in no way the responsibility of the consulting engineers.

GENERAL EARTHWORKS

- All fill areas shall be compacted to 95% std. All excess spoil to be placed as directed 1. by the site superintendent. All fill under roads shall be 100% standard compaction. Level 1 gta control and certification for "controlled fill" is as per AS 3798. Refer to dwg SCE-115-006 for earthworks details. 2.
- All earthworks quantities are solid fill.
- 4. Earthworks spoil is to be stockpiled as directed by the superintendent. Topsoil is to be stripped to a depth of 75mm and stockpiled for later respreading. Areas requiring filling or roadworks are to be stripped and vegetation in other areas shall be retained.
- Not withstanding the limits of cutting and filling shown on the drawings, the actual limits shall be determined on site by the superintendent during construction. Similarly, finished surface levels for allotments may be adjusted by a written direction of the superintendent during construction. (refer job specification).
- Silt fencing is to be placed on the down stream side of all stockpile sites and an adequate cutoff drain is to be placed on the upstream side of all stockpile sites.

EARTHWORKS AND ROADWORKS NOTES

- 1. Control testing of earthworks shall be undertaken in accordance with AS 3798.
- Fill shall be placed and compacted to the following standards: 2
- (i) Cohesive material: allotment fill shall achieve a minimum
- dry density ratio of 98% or higher. 3
- Roadwork embankments shall be compacted to the following standard:
- (i) Minimum dry density ratio of 95% for cohesive material
- (ii) or minimum dry density ratio of 80% for non cohesive
- material to a depth of 300mm below subgrade level. 4 Field density test shall be undertaken at the following minimum frequency: (i) Type 1 large scale operations lot fillings and road
- embankments (a) 1 test per layer or 200mm thickness per material
- type per 2500m² or, (b) 1 test per 500m³ distributed reasonably evenly throughout full depth and area or,
- (c) 3 test per visit whichever requires the most tests.
- 5 Road pavement shall be placed and compacted to achieve a minimum dry density ratio (MDDR) of 100% standard.
- Batter slopes 1 in 6 within road reserve & 1 in 4 within property boundary unless specified otherwise.

FILL MANAGEMENT NOTES

- 1. The fill material will comprise only natural earth and rock and shall be free of contaminants, noxious, hazardous, deleterious and organic material and shall be free draining.
- No demolition material shall be used as fill material.
- The fill is to be compacted in layers not exceeding 300mm 3. and to a minimum of 95% dry density ratio using standard compaction and in accordance with AS 1289.29. Level 1 certification is to be achieved where required.
- Any vehicle exiting the development site shall pass over the truck shake down facility prior to exiting the site to prevent organic material from leaving site.
- The temporary and permanent placement of fill is to be 5. executed such that adjoining property and roadways are not affected in any way.
- Works within the site shall only take place between the 6. hours of: 6:30am - 6:00pm Monday to Saturday; No works permitted on Sunday without prior approval.

EARTHWORKS LEGEND

Top of Batter Toe of Batter Balance contours Fill contours Cut contours Existing Contours Finished Surface Contours

APPROVED PLANS These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with **Development Permit No.: D/52-2019** Dated: 11 August 2020 11 3 O SERVICE ROAD

ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

ISSUE		DESIGN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DRAWN	DATE	REVISION DETAILS	N	DATUM	CO THE
R	A	DWC	DWE	06/20	DA APPLICATION		AHD	ENG																																			
¥							00.000	ABC																																			
S I						× *	CO-ORD.	AND																																			
ÔN							GDA94	ABC																																			
								CON																																			

TES CONSULTING SIGNS ARE NOT TO BE

SURVEYOR: Capricom Survey Group CIVIL DESIGNER: Siris Consulting Engineers LANDSCAPE DESIGNER: Contour Consulting PEO CERTIFICA erasinghe RPEQ 8372 OR & ON BEHALF OF SIRIS & ASSOCIATES CONSULTIN

PARKHURST HOLDINGS PTY LTD LILY PLACE ESTATE 777 YAAMBA ROAD PARKHURST, QLD. 4702

LIENT DETAIL











EARTHWORKS AND ROADWORKS NOTES

- Control testing of earthworks shall be undertaken in accordance with AS 3798. 1.
- Fill shall be placed and compacted to the following standards: 2. Cohesive material: allotment fill shall achieve a minimum (i)
- dry density ratio of 98% or higher.
- Roadwork embankments shall be compacted to the following standard: 3.
- (i) Minimum dry density ratio of 95% for cohesive material
- (ii) or minimum dry density ratio of 80% for non cohesive material to a depth of 300mm below subgrade level.
- 4 Field density test shall be undertaken at the following minimum frequency: (i) Type 1 large scale operations lot fillings and road
- embankments
 - (a) 1 test per layer or 200mm thickness per material type per 2500m² or,
 - (b) 1 test per 500m³ distributed reasonably evenly throughout full depth and area or,
- (c) 3 test per visit whichever requires the most tests. Road pavement shall be placed and compacted to achieve a minimum dry 5.
- density ratio (MDDR) of 100% standard. Batter slopes 1 in 6 within road reserve & 1 in 4 within property boundary
- unless specified otherwise.

- PAVEMENT & KERB
- 1. Pavement thickness is provisional only and shall be confirmed after the subgrade testing. The contractor shall initially excavate 250mm below finished surface.
- 2. Pavement design is to be in accordance with council's engineering works manual.
- 3. All kerb and channel shall be mountable kerb and channel unless noted otherwise. Refer to details on plan SCE-115-013.
- 4. Pram ramps to be provided at all intersections where shown.

LINEMARKING NOTES

- 1. All signs and pavement markings are to be in accordance with the 'Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices' (QLD).
- 2. All works shall be constructed in accordance with current council standard specifications, methods and drawings.
- 3. Noses of all traffic islands to be painted with reflective white paint 4. All redundant line markings shall be ground off.
- 5. All existing redundant signs shall be removed / relocated.

VN DATE

A DWC DWC 06/20 DA APPLICATION

REVISION DETAILS

AHD

CO-ORD.

GDA94

Y OF SIRIS AND ASSOCIATES CONSULTING HESE DRAWINGS AND DESIGNS ARE NOT TO BE

ARE TO BE VARIFIED ON SITE PRIOR TO

TENTS OF THESE

DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS PLAN

LIENT DETAIL

rasinghe RPEQ 8372

PARKHURST HOLDINGS PTY LTD

INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

777 YAAMBA ROAD

PARKHURST, QLD. 4702

SIRIS

CONSULTING

ENGINEERS

EMAIL: david@sirisengineers.com.au PHONE: 07 4930 2877 (office) 0407 119 734 (mobile) ADDRESS: Shop 3 5-7 Normanby Street_Yeppoon QLD 4703

ABN:34 481 028 699

SURVEYOR: Capricorn Survey Group

OR & ON BEHALF OF SIRIS & ASSOCIATES CONSULTIN

PEO CERTIFICAT

CIVIL DESIGNER: Siris Consulting Engineers

LANDSCAPE DESIGNER: Contour Consulting

11









ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

APPROVED PLANS

These plans are approved subject to the current conditions of approval associated with **Development Permit No.: D/52-2019**

Dated: 11 August 2020



LONGITUDINAL SECTION ROAD B Horizontal scale 1:500 (A1) Vertical scale 1:100 (A1)



LILY PLACE ESTATE ROAD LONG SECTIONS PLAN SHEET 2	BENECIUM	HOR. 1:500 0 10 20 	
E-115-012	A	VER I. 1:100 do not scale - Ask IF in doubt	







POINT	EASTING	NORTHING	LEVEL	CHAINAGE
46	245707.788	7420456.419	24.339	0.000
47	245707.682	7420463.525	24.330	7.154
48	245704.834	7420470.037	24.175	14.308
49	245699.687	7420474.938	24.061	21.463
50	245693.044	7420477.465	24.175	28.617
	1		1	



) В	B CUL-DE-SAC SETOUT TABLE										
١T	EASTING	NORTHING	LEVEL	CHAINAGE							
	245496.062	7420517.219	24.289	0.000							
	245490.518	7420524.248	24.284	9.000							
	245482.867	7420528.901	24.279	18.000							
	245476.354	7420534.918	24.276	27.000							
	245474.377	7420543.560	24.274	36.000							
	245477.624	7420551.809	24.272	45.000							
	245484.963	7420556.784	24.272	54.000							
	245493.828	7420556.746	24.273	63.000							
	245501.124	7420551.710	24.275	72.000							
	245504.301	7420543.433	24.278	81.000							
	245503.639	7420534.478	24.282	90.000							
	245505.418	7420525.705	24.287	99.000							
	245506.712	7420522.963	24.289	102.033							

AD A & B INTERSECTION SETUDI TABLE

)INT	EASTING	NORTHING	LEVEL	CHAINAGE
6	245575.223	7420433.856	24,738	0.000
57	245568.510	7420431.792	24.606	7.069
8	245561.518	7420432.454	24.324	14.137
9	245555.311	7420435.741	24.049	21.206
-0	245550.836	7420441.154	23.940	28.274















		6 ¹⁴ 6 ¹⁰⁰ 6 ¹⁰ 6 ¹⁰					er had	PT JUCTOR DE LA CONTRACTOR DE LA CONTRAC
M	. ехт) (мн.	<u>1/1</u> (мн.	2/1) ROCKHAMPTON R APPROVI These plans are approvided conditions of approval a Development Permit Dated: 11 August 20	EGIONAL COUNCIL ED PLANS ed subject to the current associated with No.: D/52-2019 20		(MH. 5/1)	(MH. 6/1)(MH	. 7/1) (MH. 8/1) (MH. 9/1)
		~~~	Design Surface Natural Surface					Lot 2
PIPE DIAMETER	150 dia.	150 dia.	150 dia.	150 dia.	150 dia.	150 die	a. 150 dia.	150 dia. 150 dia.
LINE Datum R.L.	6.000		-	<	SEWER01			
DEPTH TO INVERT	4.176	4.032 4.032 3.940	3.920 3.05 4.05 5	0.0 0.0 0.0		3.132	3.559 3.559 7.539 7.03	3.773 3.645 2.699 3.526 3.526
R.L. OF INVERT	17.070	17.318	17.548 18.148 18.148		18.788	19.388	19.977 19.997 20.027	20.047 20.047 21.287 21.447 21.467
R.L. OF FIN.SURF.	21.350	1.468	12.203		0	22.520	23.537 23.537	23.985
CHAINAGE	8 34.157	\$1.562	6 90.046	90.000	45.765 000'06		4.500	43.904 24.000 3.527 68 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.527 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.577 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.5777 93.57777 93.5777 93.5777 93.57777 93.57777 93.57777 93.57777 93.57777979 93.577779797979797979797979797979797979797

HORIZONAL SCALE: 1:2000

1	ISUE DES	ign drawi C DWE	DATE 06/20	REVISION DETAILS	, Î		COPYRIGHT © THEBE DESIGNS AND DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHT AND BELONG THE PROPERTY OF SIRIS AND ASSOCIATES CONSULTING ENGINEERS. THESE DRAWINGS AND DESIGNS ARE NOT TO BE REPRODUCED ON USED WITHOUT THE WRITEN CONSIDENT OF THE	DESIGN REVIEW	SURVEYOR: CIVIL DESIGNER: Siris Consulting Engineers LANDSCAPE DESIGNER:	PARKHURST HOLDINGS PTY LTD	SIRIS CONSULTING	
					Ŷ	GDA94	ABOVE MENTIONED COMPANY. THE CONTENTS OF THESE DRAWINGS ARE ELECTRONICALLY GENERATED, CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE ONLY TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE INTENTED BY THE ABOVE MENTIONED COMPANY. DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS PUAN. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE VARIFIED ON SITE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.	DRAFTING REVIEW	RPEQ CERTIFICAT: FOR & ON BEHALF OF SIRIS & ASSOCIATES CONSULTING ENGINEERS	LILY PLACE ESTATE 777 YAAMBA ROAD PARKHURST, QLD. 4702	ENGLI devi6@driverojners.com.au PHONE 07 4930 2877 (dfrca) 0404 119 724 (mole) 0400 28699 PHONE 07 4930 2877 (dfrca) 0404 119 724 (mole) 0404 119 724 (mole) 0400 119 724 (mole) 0400 119 724 (mole) 0400	SC





Image: Note of the i	SIRIS CONSULTING ENGINEERS ABN:34 161 028 699 (mobile) 4703	PLANIN
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------





				2			2N	SIGIN S		$\frown$
155	UE	DESIGN	DRAWN	DATE		REVISION DE	TAILS		N	DA
-	A	DWC	DWC	06/20	DA APPLICATION					Ał
E									XX	
ŝ									XXX	CO-
0 N										GD.
									 1	





