# **CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES**

# **2022 MEETING 1 MINUTES**

Venue: Microsoft Teams

Date and Time: 4 February 2022 11:00 am

Attendance: Chris Hegarty (MCE), Richard Bywater (MCE), Mohit (RRC), Grant Vaughan (RRC), Scott McDonald (GRC), Brendan Fuller (GRC), Robin Thekkekara (IRC), Dev Krishnasamy (LSC), Graham Sweetlove (MRC), Karen McMillan (MRC)

Apologies: Alan Heit (BSC), Kym Downey (CHRC), Jamie McCaul (RRC)

Item	Item	Action By
1	Website	
	Progress report on website update including the low cost offer obtained by IRC.	
	Resolution	
	RRC to put together draft scope after discussion with internal I.T. department. Draft scope to be sent around for comment prior to next meeting.	Grant Vaughan
	Action By – RRC	(RRC)
2	IPWEAQ Standard Drawing Review	
	<ul> <li>Update on whether anyone has received approval to participate in the review including any updates on IPWEAQ Progress.</li> </ul>	
	Resolution	
	No updates or response received by any committee members.	
3	Standard Drawing Styles	
	<ul> <li>Some examples of drawing styles are attached in Attachment A for discussion</li> <li>The intention is that drawings would be changed to reflect the preferred style when amendments to drawings are proposed.</li> </ul>	
	Resolution	
	Adopt favoured drawing style:	
	Arial narrow font.	MCE (as
	Absolute minimum text sizes: 1.75mm for body text, 2.5mm for titles	required)
	Desirable text sizes: 2.0mm for body text, 4.0mm for titles	
4	D1 – IRC and CHRC Rural Roads Tables	
	<ul> <li>Both the IRC and CHRC Rural Roads Tables have text As per Division 8:         Schedule C Sub Arterial under the &gt;3000 (or Arterial) column.</li> <li>The origin and meaning of this text is unknown</li> <li>There are 2 alternatives – to reference Austroads in this column OR to populate this column with appropriate figures. The suggested resolution follows the latter course with suggested figures in yellow highlight</li> </ul>	

Item Item Action By

## Resolution

Adopt the following yellow highlighted changes for Table D1.27.02 and D1.27.03 once confirmation has been received from CHRC and ISC that the change is acceptable

**CHRC/ISC** 

Table D1.27.02 Rural Road Elements for Central Highlands Regional Council

Traffic Volume or Road Class	<150 VPD (or rural access)	150 – 500 (or rural minor collector)	500 – 3000 (or rural major collector)	>3000 (or arterial)
Road Reserve (flat terrain≤ 5%)	20m	20m	25m	<mark>40m</mark>
Road Reserve ** (Undulating/Hilly > 5%)	25m	25m	30m	40m
Formation	8m	8m	10m	<mark>10m</mark>
Pavement Width	8m gravel	8m	10m	<mark>10m</mark>
Seal Width	7m	7m	8m	<mark>10m</mark>
Shoulders ***	Incl. 0.25m sealed on each side	Incl. 0.25m sealed on each side	Incl. 0.5m sealed on each side	Incl. 0.5m sealed on each side
Desirable Speed Environment	100kph	100kph	100kph	100kph
Design Speed for Individual Elements (Minimum)	80kph	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 AUSTROADS Traffic Engineering Practice Part 14: Bicycles.

Table D1.27.03 Rural Road Elements for Isaac Regional Council

Traffic Volume or Road Class	<150 VPD (or rural access	150 – 500 (or rural minor collector	500 – 3000 (or rural major collector)	>3000 (or arterial)
Road Reserve (flatterrain ≤ 5%)	20m	20m	25m	<mark>40m</mark>
Road Reserve ** (Undulating/Hilly > 5%)	25m	25m	30m	<mark>40m</mark>
Formation	8m	8m	10m	<mark>10m</mark>
Pavement Width	8m gravel	8m	10m	10m
Seal Width ***	8m	8m	10m	10m
Lane width	2 x 3.5m	2 x 3.5m	2 x 4.0m	2 x 4.0m
Desirable Speed Environment	100kph	100kph	100kph	100kph
Design Speed for Individual Elements (Minimum)	80kph	80kph	80kph	80kph

Notes: Not reproduced in this agenda - same as CHRC

Item	Item				Action By	
5	Standard Drawin	ngs				
	Meeting (Attachn need to b  Attachm requests by MCE to	16 agenda (went B) outling e clarified or ent C include for document to reflect what some drawing een actioned	which did no nes the statu n each docu es drawings t changes f at we think is ngs previou	which have been amo	ned excel document d some issues which ended based on known as some other changes ams meeting have	
		Current version on website	Proposed version	Proposed changes	Resolution	
	CMDG-G-011	E	F	LSC new draft	Further explanation required – MCE/MSC to check previous minutes and compare with IPWEAQ Drawing 1602	MCE/LSC
	CMDG-R-051	Е	F	Joint detail removed. FRC Spec added.	Complete markups on attached plan - MCE	
	CMDG-R-055	F	G	New bollard details and note changes		
	CMDG-R-055A	D		discontinue this version.		MCE
	CMDG-R-058	None	А	New Drawing for Pathway Joint detail	50mm gravel layer required under path.	
	CMDG-W-040	F	G	Rework of trench profiles		
	CMDG-W-041	E	F	Added detail on vertically acting thrust blocks		All
	•	uirement for	this form wi	Il be enforced as requ	with requested changes ested by the committee	
6	for minor AEP 1% covers m and mino	this table is proads is accord ARI 100).	oresented in eptable for I think this I flows only a	the major system ( the has come about becau and the CMDG table at	•	

Item	Item			Action By
	Table 7.3.1 – Recommended design average recurrence intervals (AF exceedence probabilities (AEP) for the minor system			
	[1]	A 51 ( )		

Development category [1]			AEP
Central business and commercial	Central business and commercial		10%
Industrial		2	39%
Urban residential high density – grea	ater than 20 dwelling units/ha	10	10%
Urban residential low density – 6 to 2	20 dwelling units/ha	2	39%
Rural residential – 2 to 5 dwelling units/ha		2	39%
Open space – parks, etc.	Open space – parks, etc.		
	Kerb and channel flow	10 <sup>[2]</sup>	10%
Major road	Cross drainage (culverts)	50 <sup>[3]</sup>	2%
Minor rood	Kerb and channel flow	[4]	[4]
Minor road	Cross drainage (culverts)	10 <sup>[3]</sup>	10%

#### Notes:

- [1] The terms used in this table are described in the Glossary (Chapter 13) and Table 7.3.3.
- [2] The design AEP for the minor drainage system in a major road must be that indicated for the major road, not that for the development category of the adjacent area.
- [3] Refer to discussion in Section 7.3.7.
- [4] Refer to relevant development category (above).

### The relevant table in CMDG looks like this at the moment

Table D05.04.1 - Design Annual Exceedance Probabilities

Dayalanment Catago	Major System		Minor System		
Development Category		ARI (yrs)	AEP (%)	ARI (yrs)	AEP (%)
Central Business & Cor	mmercial	100	1	10	10
Industrial		100	1	2	39
Urban Residential (High 20 dwelling units/ha)	n Density – greater than	100	1	10	10
Urban Residential (Low Density – 6 & up to 20 dwelling units/ha)		100	1	2	39
Rural Residential – 2 to	5 dwelling units/ha	100	1	2	39
Open Space – Parks, e	tc.	100	1	1	63
Major Collector /	Kerb and channel flow	100	1	10	10
Distributor and higher	Cross drainage (culverts)	100	1	50	2
Minor road	Kerb and channel flow	20	5		
	Cross drainage (culverts)	20	5	10	10

### Notes:

- The design AEP for the minor drainage system in a major road shall be that indicated for the major road, not that for the Development Category of the adjacent area.
- 2. Cross drainages should be designed to accept the flow for the minor system AEP shown. In addition, the designer must ensure that the major system backwater does not enter properties upstream. If upstream properties are at a relatively low elevation, it may be necessary to install culverts of capacity greater than that for the minor system AEP design storm to ensure flooding of upstream properties does not occur. In addition, the downstream face of the causeway embankment may need protection where overtopping is likely to occur.
- The terms used in this table are described in the QUDM Glossary and/or Table 7.3.3 of QUDM 2013.
- 4. Council specific or refer to development category.
- 5. VDg, flow depth and width limitations are applicable in accordance with QUDM.

Recent changes to Minor AEP's agreed by the Councils have in fact resulted in complete agreement with QUDM. It is therefore considered the Design AEP table is superfluous and should be deleted.

**MCE** 

Item	Item	Action By
	Alternatively the table may be retained with the Major System column deleted (and note references will also need to be amended / clarified)	
	references will also freed to be afficilited? Claffilled)	
	Resolution	
	Clause D05.04.02 and Table D05.04.01 be amended as follows:	
	D05.04.02 Design Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) shall be 1% (ARI 100 years) for the Major System and in accordance with QUDM Table 7.3.1 for the Minor System.	
	Delete Table D05.04.01	
	(Also correct <i>Error! Reference source not found</i> throughout the document)	
7	Proposed Agenda for next Long Agenda meeting March 2022 at Calliope	
	<ul> <li>The following is a list of possible agenda items drawn from what is partially completed or actioned work over the last few years. The intention of this item is to discuss prioritisation of these items with a view to preparing the next agenda.</li> </ul>	
	<ol> <li>D1 Geometric Road Design – finalise new tables (M15.5)</li> <li>D1 Geometric Road Design – solar lighting rural and urban (M15.18)</li> <li>D2 Pavement Design – amend APRG Report 21 as outdated reference and LSC to review design procedure and references. (M15.7)</li> <li>D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design revision (M15.15)</li> <li>Draft underbore detail (item M15.16)</li> <li>D5 Stormwater Design – Provide template for SWMP – GRC to provide? (M16.5)</li> <li>PS5 PVC Pressure Pipe (Poly services to be PN16 not PN 12) (M16.9)</li> <li>C273 Landscaping – amend hydromulch spec (M16.10)</li> <li>PS26 Marker Posts – (M15.20)</li> <li>PS28 Gaskets – (M15.21) – this one should have been actioned?</li> <li>C242 Pavements – Amend references as advised by GRC (M15.22) – this one should have been actioned?</li> <li>D10 Landscape Design</li> <li>Parks standard drawings</li> <li>D6 Site regrading – consider retaining wall issue</li> </ol>	
	Resolution Not discussed	
8	CMDG-S-030 Type C Vertical H.C.	
	<ul> <li>RRC Comments from Mohit - CMDG-S-030 Type C Vertical H.C Heavy duty fibreglass coated junctions are made from a 45'junction and a 45'bend. This places the property connection directly above the sewer main. A standard (less than 2 metres deep junction is made up from a 45' junction and a 60' bend this offsets the property connection to one side (as it's drawn in CMDG-S-030). Is there any reason the standard connection cannot be directly above the main like a heavy duty junction.</li> </ul>	

Item	Item	Action By
	Refer note  House drain  45° Y-Junction 150 MIN Compacted Sand surround  GRP heavy duty extended drop junction "Hardie Iplex" or similar approved.  • The standard connection could be above the main but the concrete support under the bend off the main would mean the main would need to be encased in concrete to comply. For discussion – drawing extract above for clarity.  Resolution  Not discussed	
9	CMDG-S-026 Lamphole Details	
	<ul> <li>RRC Comments from Mohit - CMDG-S-026 Lamphole Details. Why is a Lamphole limited to a maximum of 1200mm? A Lamphole is for camera and clearing access.</li> <li>It is unknown why the depth was limited to 1200mm. Depths over 2100 would require a GRP heavy duty junction. For discussion – drawing extract follows.</li> </ul>	

Item	Item	Action By
	Concrete Encased Bolted Trap Screw  Natural surface  Natural Surface  Straight 150mm  1/3 of Pipe  Concrete Thrust block  SECTIONAL ELEVATION  END ELEVATION	
	Resolution Not discussed	
10	Post meeting item – Meeting Numbering It is proposed to have no distinction between the short teams and the long meetings regarding the naming convention. This would also mean that minutes from the teams meetings would also be loaded up to the website to avoid confusion.  Suggested Resolution Meeting name to be the calendar year followed by the number e.g. 2022 Meeting 1 All meeting minutes to be uploaded to the website.	MCE
11	Post meeting item – Audio issues	
	Feedback/ echo issues were noted by a number of committee members with the cause seeming to be Richard Bywater's (MCE) connection.  Suggested Resolution  Richard Bywater (MCE) to investigate different microphone setup to rectify the issue.	MCE