

# CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

## MONTHLY TEAMS MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 2021

**Venue:** Microsoft Teams

**Date and Time:** 17/12/2021 11:00am (Completed about 12:25pm)

**Attendance:** Chris Hegarty (MCE), Richard Bywater (MCE), Jamie McCaul (RRC), Grant Vaughan (RRC), Scott McDonald (GRC), Brendan Fuller (GRC), Robin Thekkekara (IRC), Dev Krishnasamy (LSC)

**Apologies:** Kym Downey (CHRC), Graham Sweetlove (MRC), Allan Heit (BSC)

Item	Item	Action By
1	<p><b>Website</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Discuss <b>Made Known (Through Wade Hunt IT)</b> quotes for website improvement options. Refer to <b>attachment A</b>.</li></ul> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p>Agreement from committee that further investigation into updating the website is warranted. Jamie McCaul (RRC) to investigate procurement policy for requesting quotations for updating the website.</p>	Jamie McCaul (RRC)
2	<p><b>D11 Water Network Design and Construction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Discuss changes instigated by LSC and GRC</li><li><b>Attachment B</b> is the Proposed Rev K document.</li></ul> <p>The significant changes affecting all Councils and brief background are as follows:</p> <p><i>D11.06.04 The hydraulic capacity shall be sufficient to allow current and planned (including staging) service area of all allotments, to be serviced directly and separately with the Desired Service Standard of the Water Supply Service Provider. The intention of this clause is to ensure that network design includes the maximum development allowable under the respective planning schemes for the Local Government. For example this may include allowance for future duplex / unit development and development of adjoining or nearby land identified by master planning.</i></p> <p><u>Background:</u> Reworded for clarity. <b>Accepted.</b></p> <p><i>D11.06.05 Where the entire area of any allotment cannot achieve the Desirable Service Standards (that is, part of the allotment is higher than the defined building pad level or mean lot level whichever is higher), a plan showing the serviced area should be produced, and the Local Government or water Supply Service Provider approval sought before proceeding. Covenants confirming the area cannot be serviced by water supply or Community Title may be required</i></p> <p><u>Background:</u> The Titles office will no longer register covenants excluding building on the unserviceable land area. A recent example from LSC of a covenant that was approved is as follows:</p>	

Item	Item	Action By																																				
	<p><b>4. Description of Covenant</b> (include reference to relevant section of legislation) Pursuant to Section 97(3)(a)(i) of The Land Title Act 1994 the Covenantor shall be advised that any building erected within the Covenant Area are excluded from the Standard Service Area for standard water service connection availability in accordance with the Water Supply (Safety &amp; Reliability) Act</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Table D11.07.02 Minimum and Maximum Pressures for Network Design</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="204 443 1198 1249"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Minimum Pressure at the Node</th> <th>Node Level for Design</th> <th>Maximum Desirable Pressure</th> <th>Absolute Maximum Pressure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Banana Shire</td> <td>22 m</td> <td rowspan="2">Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Central Highlands Regional</td> <td>22 m</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gladstone Regional</td> <td>25 m (in main)* 20m (in main – constant flow network)</td> <td>Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location</td> <td>50 m (reticulation network)</td> <td>80 m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Isaac Regional</td> <td>22 m</td> <td rowspan="4">Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Livingstone Shire</td> <td>22 m</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maranoa Regional</td> <td>20 m</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rockhampton Regional</td> <td>22 m</td> <td>50 m</td> <td>80m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* In all design instances it is required that there is a minimum of 22m at the water meter</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The table has been modified to clarify the function as a guide for designers (eg network modellers) of the network rather than outlining customers service standard issues such as the requirement for 22m at the water meter. Having said that GRC has not specified the 22m in a separate document so the note regarding 22m at the water meter is required – other Councils could have the same issue and the note could be applied to other councils also.</p> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p>D11 Rev K as per <b>attachment B</b> be approved to load up to the website. <b>Changes generally approved. Robin Thekkekara (IRC), Dev Krishnasamy (LSC) to confirm acceptance prior to finalising document. MCE to upload once confirmation is received.</b></p> <p>Chris to confirm with Kym Downey (CHRC).</p> <p>Chris Hegarty (MCE) to email out GRC policy regarding boosters to committee members.</p>		Minimum Pressure at the Node	Node Level for Design	Maximum Desirable Pressure	Absolute Maximum Pressure	Banana Shire	22 m	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest	50 m	80m	Central Highlands Regional	22 m	50 m	80m	Gladstone Regional	25 m (in main)* 20m (in main – constant flow network)	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location	50 m (reticulation network)	80 m	Isaac Regional	22 m	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest	50 m	80m	Livingstone Shire	22 m	50 m	80m	Maranoa Regional	20 m	50 m	80m	Rockhampton Regional	22 m	50 m	80m	<p>Robin Thekkekara (IRC)</p> <p>Dev Krishnasamy (LSC)</p> <p>MCE</p>
	Minimum Pressure at the Node	Node Level for Design	Maximum Desirable Pressure	Absolute Maximum Pressure																																		
Banana Shire	22 m	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest	50 m	80m																																		
Central Highlands Regional	22 m		50 m	80m																																		
Gladstone Regional	25 m (in main)* 20m (in main – constant flow network)	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location	50 m (reticulation network)	80 m																																		
Isaac Regional	22 m	Finished surface/ street elevation at the main location, building pad level or at the mean lot level, whichever is the highest	50 m	80m																																		
Livingstone Shire	22 m		50 m	80m																																		
Maranoa Regional	20 m		50 m	80m																																		
Rockhampton Regional	22 m		50 m	80m																																		
	<p><b>D2 Pavement Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table D1.27.03 provides an interpretation that a surface may only be sealed when the traffic is greater than 150vpd, yet Table D2.08.01 provides a surface may only be sealed when the traffic exceeds 100vpd.</li> </ul>																																					

Item	Item	Action By
------	------	-----------

- Table D12.13.01 and D2.08.01 have inconsistencies regarding asphalt depth – proposed changes to Table are in yellow highlight.

Table D1.27.03 Rural Road Elements for Isaac Regional Council

Traffic Volume or Road Class	<150 VPD (or rural access)(or rural access)	150 – 500 (or rural minor collector)(or rural minor collector)	500 – 3000 (or rural major collector)	>3000 (or arterial)(or arterial)
Road Reserve (flat terrain ≤ 5%)	20m	20m	25m	As per Division 8: Schedule C Sub- Arterial
Road Reserve ** (Undulating/Hilly > 5%)	25m	25m	30m	
Formation	8m	8m	10m	
Pavement Width	8m gravel	8m	10m	
Seal Width ***	8m	8m	10m	
Lane width	2 x 3.5m	2 x 3.5m	2 x 4.0m	
Desirable Speed Environment	100kph	100kph	100kph	
Design Speed for Individual Elements (Minimum)	80kph	80kph	80kph	

Notes:

- \*\* In undulating terrain this width shall be increased to enable services to be constructed on accessible flatter land on top and below batters.
- \*\*\* Where the road is a designated on-road bicycle route (signposted and pavement marked) the shoulder provision needs to conform to the AUSTRROADS Traffic Engineering Practice Part 14: Bicycles

Table D2.08.01 Pavement Design Criteria

Street Type	Minimum Pavement (mm)	Minimum Surface Treatment	Minimum Base Course CBR <sup>(a)</sup>	Minimum Subbase Course CBR
Access Place/Access Street	200	25mm (DG10) or 40mm (DG14)	80	35
Urban Collectors (Major and Minor)	200	40mm (DG14)	80	45
Sub-Arterial	250	40mm (DG14)	80	45
Arterial	In accordance with DTMR Pavement Design Manual		80	45
Park Residential	200	25mm (DG10) or 40mm (DG14)	80	35
Rural & Rural Residential				
• <150 vpd	150 <sup>(b)</sup>	Gravel <sup>(c)</sup>	80	35
• >150 vpd	200	2 coat seal	80	35
Industrial	300	50mm (DG14)	80	45
Roundabouts	250	50mm (DG14 Polymer modified)	80	45

Note:

- a) Should supply of CBR 80 material be unavailable then CBR 60 material may be used subject to satisfactory pavement design.
- b) depth of base course only (subbase course not required)
- c) Seal may be required in some instances – refer to Rural Road Elements Tables in D1 for the relevant local government

Table D2.13.1 Preferred Asphaltic Concrete applications

Road Type	DG10 (Depth)	DG14 (Depth)
Access Place	25mm	40mm
Access Street	25mm	40mm
Minor Urban Collector		40mm
Major Urban Collector		40mm
Trunk Collector Street		40mm
Sub Arterial		40mm
Park Residential	25mm	40mm
Industrial Access		50mm
Industrial Collector		50mm

Item	Item	Action By														
	<p>Table D21.13.01 was recently amended in version 4 and is provided above for clarity only. Just a reminder that Table C245.30.1 (provided for clarity below) has already been modified as follows to ensure minimum 25mm thickness is provided.</p> <p><b>Table C245.30.1 Tolerance for Course Thickness</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="204 342 884 667"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="204 342 635 398">Nominal Size of Asphalt (mm)</th> <th data-bbox="635 342 884 398">Tolerance (mm)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 398 635 443">5</td> <td data-bbox="635 398 884 443">+5 -0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 443 635 488">10</td> <td data-bbox="635 443 884 488">+5 <del>-5-0</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 488 635 533">14</td> <td data-bbox="635 488 884 533">+5 <del>-5-0</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 533 635 577">20</td> <td data-bbox="635 533 884 577">+10 -10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 577 635 622">28</td> <td data-bbox="635 577 884 622">+10 -10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="204 622 635 667">40</td> <td data-bbox="635 622 884 667">+10 -10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Resolution</u> Table D2.08.01 be amended as shown above with changes in yellow highlight. These amendments are corrections or clarifications and are to be carried out prior to impending LSC document review considering new pavement design references and other matters. <b>Robin Thekkekara (IRC) expressed concerns with the increase from 100vpd to 150vpd. Robin to consider reducing the vpd from 150 to 100 in Isaac Regional Council's table for rural roads elements.</b></p>	Nominal Size of Asphalt (mm)	Tolerance (mm)	5	+5 -0	10	+5 <del>-5-0</del>	14	+5 <del>-5-0</del>	20	+10 -10	28	+10 -10	40	+10 -10	Robin Thekkekara (IRC)
Nominal Size of Asphalt (mm)	Tolerance (mm)															
5	+5 -0															
10	+5 <del>-5-0</del>															
14	+5 <del>-5-0</del>															
20	+10 -10															
28	+10 -10															
40	+10 -10															
4	<p><b>Water Meter arrangements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been previous requests for amendment to the Large water meter installation drawing CMDG-W-094 and other variants to include a low flow bypass meter.</li> <li>• However, there are other issues relating to the installation of large water meter which vary based on type of meter, metering function and other issues.</li> <li>• It is suggested that the group consider the use of a separate document to outline these requirements (which includes sketches of metering arrangements) with a view to discontinuing the standard drawing.</li> <li>• <b>Attachment C</b> is the QUU example</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution</u> <b>A new document could be produced for Large Water Meter Installation requirements based on the QUU example if required, further discussion required. Jamie McCaul (RRC) to canvas with FRW and other Councils to determine a proposal.</b></p>	Jamie McCaul (RRC)														
6	<p><b>IPWEAQ Standard Drawing Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McMurtrie Consulting Engineers has expressed an interest in participating in the review in response to an email invitation on 29 Nov 2021.</li> <li>• Need to discuss the review and its relevance to CMDG as well as whether others within the Steering Committee have offered to review.</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution</u> None. <b>Noted that GRC have already been participating in the review.</b></p> <p>Action By MCE</p>															
7	<b>Standard Drawings</b>															

Item	Item	Action By																																																							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard drawings listed for review at meeting 15 and included on the Meeting 16 agenda (which did not proceed). The attached excel document outlines the status of the drawings and some issues which need to be clarified on each document.</li> <li><b>Attachment D</b> includes drawings which have been amended based on known requests for document changes from the group as well as some other changes by MCE to reflect what we think is current practice.</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="240 533 1220 1317"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Current version on website</th> <th>Proposed version</th> <th>Proposed changes</th> <th>Resolution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CMDG-G-011</td> <td>E</td> <td>F</td> <td>LSC new draft</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-R-051</td> <td>E</td> <td>F</td> <td>Joint detail removed. FRC Spec added.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-R-055</td> <td>F</td> <td>G</td> <td>New bollard details and note changes</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-R-055A</td> <td>D</td> <td></td> <td>discontinue this version.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-R-058</td> <td>None</td> <td>A</td> <td>New Drawing for Pathway Joint detail</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-S-058</td> <td>E</td> <td>F</td> <td>MRC applicability changed to YES</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-W-040</td> <td>F</td> <td>G</td> <td>Rework of trench profiles</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-W-041</td> <td>E</td> <td>F</td> <td>Added detail on vertically acting thrust blocks</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-W-091</td> <td>G</td> <td>H</td> <td>GRC change re PN 12.5 Poly Pipe class</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMDG-W-093</td> <td>H</td> <td>I</td> <td>32 and 40mm meters added</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All Councils to review drawing revisions and provide yes/no with regards to approval and comments if applicable.</p> <p>It was noted by a number of committee members that there are changes required to various standard drawings to align them with changes made in the specifications. Richard Bywater (MCE) stated that MCE has started a list of changes. Committee members to send through any required changes to MCE to add to the list.</p> <p>Scott McDonald (GRC) raised the issue of all GRC Sewer Pumping Station drawings are the same number 50 with letters used to identify individual drawings. Discussion regarding potentially providing number instead of letters e.g. 100 series. Agreed that MCE would allocate drawings number for discussion.</p>		Current version on website	Proposed version	Proposed changes	Resolution	CMDG-G-011	E	F	LSC new draft		CMDG-R-051	E	F	Joint detail removed. FRC Spec added.		CMDG-R-055	F	G	New bollard details and note changes		CMDG-R-055A	D		discontinue this version.		CMDG-R-058	None	A	New Drawing for Pathway Joint detail		CMDG-S-058	E	F	MRC applicability changed to YES		CMDG-W-040	F	G	Rework of trench profiles		CMDG-W-041	E	F	Added detail on vertically acting thrust blocks		CMDG-W-091	G	H	GRC change re PN 12.5 Poly Pipe class		CMDG-W-093	H	I	32 and 40mm meters added		<p>All Councils</p> <p>All Councils/ MCE</p> <p>MCE</p>
	Current version on website	Proposed version	Proposed changes	Resolution																																																					
CMDG-G-011	E	F	LSC new draft																																																						
CMDG-R-051	E	F	Joint detail removed. FRC Spec added.																																																						
CMDG-R-055	F	G	New bollard details and note changes																																																						
CMDG-R-055A	D		discontinue this version.																																																						
CMDG-R-058	None	A	New Drawing for Pathway Joint detail																																																						
CMDG-S-058	E	F	MRC applicability changed to YES																																																						
CMDG-W-040	F	G	Rework of trench profiles																																																						
CMDG-W-041	E	F	Added detail on vertically acting thrust blocks																																																						
CMDG-W-091	G	H	GRC change re PN 12.5 Poly Pipe class																																																						
CMDG-W-093	H	I	32 and 40mm meters added																																																						
8	<p><b>Invoicing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RRC have advised that, in accordance with the contract that each Local Government is to be invoiced separately</li> </ul> <p><u>Resolution</u></p>	<p>MCE</p>																																																							

Item	Item	Action By
	<p>MCE to invoice each Local Government separately once fees have built up. This is likely to be approximately every two months rather than monthly to reduce time spent invoicing.</p> <p>Grant Vaughan to forward email to other Councils regarding contract and purchase order advice.</p>	Grant Vaughan (RRC)
9	<p><b>C244 – Sprayed Bituminous Surfacing</b></p> <p>Some discussion regarding changes from Robin Thekkekara (IRC) suggested by a bitumen supplier/contractor. Robin to provide further information on potential changes.</p>	Robin Thekkekara (IRC).
10	<p><b>Standard drawing styles</b></p> <p>Richard Bywater (MCE) raised the style of the standard drawings for discussion due to the inconsistency between drawings. Richard to collate examples of the different styles and a proposal for a style to be discussed at the next meeting.</p>	MCE
11	<p><b>D1 – Rural Elements Tables for IRC and CHRC</b></p> <p>MCE to investigate the “As per Division 8: Schedule C Sub- Arterial” reference in CHR and IRC rural road elements tables.</p>	MCE