

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

MEETING MINUTES, POST AMALGAMATION MEETING 9 (Ver 2)

Venue: Gladstone Regional Council, Calliope Training Room

Date and Time: Wed 16th August 2017
9:30am – 3:30pm

At meeting - Kym Downey (MRC), Pierre Neethling (GRC), Jorge El Khouri (GRC), Scott McDonald (GRC), Phil McKone (LSC), Mike Prior (LSC), Brendan Fuller (CHRC), Grant Vaughan (RRC), Jamie McCaul (RRC), Luke Coughlan (IRC), Alan Heit (BSC), Johny Purkaystha (IRC), Chris Hegarty (Cardno)

Apologies: Pat Moore, Leesa Miller

No	Item	Action By
1	<u>Welcome</u>	
2	<p><u>Matters arising from previous meeting minutes (refer Attachment A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NCDC are appreciative of the CMDG decision to allow document use – but no progress yet. 2. Drainage solutions for small infill development where land falls away from the road. Jamie is working on this and 3. Hydrant Pavement markings – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cardno to amend drawing CMDG-W-062 to show the RRPM marker at the edge of the carriageway rather than the middle for consistency with the detail on the drawing b. Cardno to amend drawing CMDG-W-062 Note 3 “For Urban Areas, Hydrant Posts (if in position) to be removed c. Brendan to investigate the approaches of other councils (inc. FNQROC and SEQ) in relation to wider practice including colour choices (yellow or other alternatives) 4. Rural Property Access – CMDG-R-040 (Mike to report to the next meeting) 5. Bungs for sewer testing (Mike to report to the next meeting) 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Jamie RRC</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cardno</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cardno</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Brendan CHRC</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Mike LSC</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Mike LSC</u></p>
3	<p><u>CMDG Governance</u></p> <p>The following actions were agreed following a brief discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A termination clause is to be included. Cardno to draft a suitable clause for consideration. Costs for parties to terminate should include basic items such as removal of logos from the website and recalculation of fee percentages but would not include removal of the party from all tables of difference etc – this would be carried out as part of later document reviews. 2. A clause is to be inserted for the recalculation of fee percentages applying to each Council to be carried out at least every 5 years. 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cardno</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cardno</u></p>

No	Item	Action By
4	<p><u>New D1 Rural Roads table</u></p> <p>The combining all Rural Road Elements for each Council into a single table was discussed and the following outcomes agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jamie is to review the changes for RRC and advise 2. Additional lines are to be used in the table for each Council where multiple vpd break-ups are used under the same road hierarchy 3. A link is to be provided to the Excel table on the website so that users can navigate around the complex table. 4. Kym advised that MRC categories for rural access are Primary and Secondary – not Primary A and B. Cardno to amend. 5. Grant is to try and format a simpler table for the groups consideration. 	<p><u>Jamie RRC</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Grant RRC</u></p>
5.0	<p><u>Document reviews – All Documents</u></p> <p>The documents reviewed were amended live (on data projector) during the meeting and Cardno has the agreed changes saved to USB.</p> <p>The following changes are to be applied to all documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All references in the documents are to be to “Local Government” • Priority of Interpretation clause to be included. • Vague references to drawings in all documents is to be removed. 	<p><u>Cardno to action all items</u></p>
5.1	<p><u>GRC Document reviews – D3 Structures and Bridges Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D03.05.03 Check cycleway or cycle lane width 2m? 	<p><u>Cardno to action all items</u></p>
5.2	<p><u>GRC Document reviews – D4 Surface Drainage Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig D04.06.01 Leave original figure with subsoil behind kerb not under it • D04.06.04 and D04.08.02 Retain absolute min grade of 0.5% for subsoil drainage • Review document references to ensure thin walled pipe is excluded. Slotted PVC pipe or rigid flat panel geocomposite (eg Megaflo) is OK. • 3m tail into chamber structure within stormwater drainage trenches is to be inserted into the document. 	<p><u>Cardno to action all items</u></p>

No	Item	Action By																																																
5.3	<p><u>GRC Document Reviews - D5 Stormwater Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.05.13.02 Jamie is to check if the Water By Design reference is satisfactory Table D05.04.01 - Minor urban ARI was returned to Q5 (GRC had proposed Q10). Scott at GRC to advise if adoption of Q5 for Urban minor is satisfactory or whether a table of difference is needed. Table D05.04.01 - Major Collector, cross drainage culverts, minor design was reset at 2% AEP (50 Year ARI). All Councils to consider if this is satisfactory. D.05.16.02 When developing lands are located at the lower end and higher side is developed prior to lower side. Refer to figure D05.15.02 as an illustration. There are two choices to be offered either connect upstream existing roofwater to new pipe (level II) or install Level III drainage. Table D05.06.02 following is to be completed by all Councils <p>Table D05.06.2 – Approved Modelling Packages</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="214 793 1102 1291"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>BSC</th> <th>CHRC</th> <th>GRC</th> <th>IRC</th> <th>MRC</th> <th>LSC</th> <th>RRC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Runoff Routing:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>XP Raft/ TUFLOW</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drainage Analysis:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Drains (ILSAX)/ PCDRAINS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Steady Flow</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>HEC-RAS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsteady flow</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>MIKE 11/ XPSWIM/ TUFLOW</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Quality</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>MUSIC</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		BSC	CHRC	GRC	IRC	MRC	LSC	RRC	Runoff Routing:			XP Raft/ TUFLOW					Drainage Analysis:			Drains (ILSAX)/ PCDRAINS					Steady Flow			HEC-RAS					Unsteady flow			MIKE 11/ XPSWIM/ TUFLOW					Water Quality			MUSIC					<p><u>Jamie RRC</u></p> <p><u>Scott GRC</u></p> <p><u>All Councils</u></p> <p><u>Cardno to action all document changes</u></p>
	BSC	CHRC	GRC	IRC	MRC	LSC	RRC																																											
Runoff Routing:			XP Raft/ TUFLOW																																															
Drainage Analysis:			Drains (ILSAX)/ PCDRAINS																																															
Steady Flow			HEC-RAS																																															
Unsteady flow			MIKE 11/ XPSWIM/ TUFLOW																																															
Water Quality			MUSIC																																															
5.4	<p><u>GRC Document Reviews – D6 Site Regrading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D06.08.15 (c) reference to use of timber retaining walls deleted (due to concerns over longevity of timber) D06.09.03 batters within private land 1 in 4 is OK but within Council land 1 in 6 is required. Figures are required within the document to demonstrate items such as the location of the concrete mowing strip, retaining wall location in relation to natural ground level, easement locations/ownership Sub Committee of Jamie RRC, Phil LSC and Chris Cardno to further consider retaining wall requirements in terms of ownership/benefitted land, easements. This will include a review of available information regarding practice in South Australia and may involve a legal review to ensure that the position adopted does not leave Councils with unintended liability for retaining wall construction or maintenance. 	<p><u>Cardno to action all document changes</u></p> <p>Jamie RRC, Phil LSC and Chris Cardno</p>																																																

No	Item	Action By
6	<p><u>GRC Document reviews – Design Specs</u></p> <p>The following documents have been reviewed by GRC. Please review each document and make a list of any items you wish to raise for discussion. At the meeting we will only consider items raised by exception and we will not be going page by page through each document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C202 Rural Road Clear Zones – adopted with no changes • C212 Clearing and Grubbing - adopted with no changes • C220 Stormwater Drainage - adopted with minor corrections • C230 Subsurface Drainage – adopted subjected to corrugated plastic pipe being excluded (through concerns of it often being crushed during construction and consequently ineffective) • C231 Subsoil and Foundation Drains – Adopted with reinstatement of min cleanout spacing to 60m • C233 Drainage Mats (NEW) - adopted with no changes • C501 Bushfire Protection – adopted subject to deletion clause C501-05.02 related to the ripping the roadline to 200 – 300mm <p>Construction Specifications are Attachment F</p>	
7	<p><u>Drawing number reviews</u></p> <p>The alternative drawing numbering system put forward by GRC was discussed and the following outcomes agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where the suffix A has been utilised to distinguish minor changes between drawings they are to be replaced with a 2 digit suffix instead. For example, current drawings CMDG-R-100 will become CMDG-R-100-01 and CMDG-R-100A will become CMDG-R-100-02. The change is to avoid confusion with the drawing revision number. There are 27 drawings to be amended (as well as consequential amendments regarding cross referencing). 2. Cardno is to revisit the original IMEA drawing numbering system if possible to see if this provides further insight. 3. The group is reluctant to amend all drawing numbers at this stage due to concerns over confusion and a need for many cross referencing changes (in CMDG documents and Councils own documentation systems) 	<p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p>
9	<p><u>Signing off Operational Works Plans</u></p> <p>CP1 is to be amended to require the words regarding drawing status “<i>For Construction only when stamped and signed as approved by Council</i>” to be inserted on the bottom right hand corner of drawings submitted to Council for operational works approval.</p>	<p><u>Cardno</u></p>
10	<p><u>Use of Timber Guide Posts</u></p> <p>C263 Guide Posts is to be amended to delete all references to Timber Guide Posts</p>	<p><u>Cardno</u></p>

No	Item	Action By
	<p>Remaining agenda items were not discussed due to lack of time. These items are to be held over until the next meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting would be at the same Venue (GRC training room at Calliope) on 12 October 2017. Cardno to send around a date claimer.</p> <p><u>Meeting Close</u></p>	<p><u>Cardno</u></p>