

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

2022 MEETING 08 MINUTES

Venue: Teams

Date and Time: 2 September 2022 11:00 am

Item	Item																																											
1	Welcome Attendance: Chris Hegarty (MCE), Richard Bywater (MCE), Scott McDonald (GRC), Graham Sweetlove (MRC), Jon Ashman (LSC), Daniel Price (BSC), Sarah Banda (CHRC), Michael Stanton (IRC), Jamie McCaul (RRC)																																											
2	Apologies Tony Lau (LSC) Grant Vaughan (RRC), Mohit Paudyal (RRC), Brendan Fuller (GRC), Joel Kuczynski (IRC), Anthony Lipsys (BSC), Greg Abbotts (LSC)																																											
3	True and correct record of minutes from previous meeting Refer Attachment A <u>Resolution:</u> That the minutes of the meeting held in Calliope on 4 th August 2022 be formally adopted.																																											
4	Terms of reference and Budget Forecast annual budget has been calculated based on the spend since November 2021 and estimated to be \$112,500.																																											
5	Outstanding items from the previous meeting This includes items which were not fully resolved at the previous meeting or items not considered due to time constraints. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>M22.01.01</td><td>Website Update</td><td>All</td></tr> <tr> <td>M15.5</td><td>D1 Geometric Road Design – finalise new tables</td><td>All</td></tr> <tr> <td>M15.15</td><td>D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design revision</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>M15.16</td><td>Draft underbore detail</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>M16.11</td><td>C273 Landscaping – amend hydromulch spec</td><td>GRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M15.20</td><td>PS26 Marker Posts</td><td>GRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.02.05</td><td>Use of Corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes</td><td>LSC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M10.5.1</td><td>D6 Site regrading – consider retaining wall issue</td><td>LSC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.03.01</td><td>Lockrail park access</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.03.03</td><td>D2, C242 & C221 Use of Recycled Glass</td><td>GRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.03.05</td><td>CP1.28 Bonding of uncompleted works. Amendments to document.</td><td>GRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.04.01</td><td>Review of Reference documents in all Specifications</td><td>BSC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M22.04.04</td><td>D5 – Polypropylene maintenance structures for gravity sewers</td><td>LSC</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Item number	Item	Proponent	M22.01.01	Website Update	All	M15.5	D1 Geometric Road Design – finalise new tables	All	M15.15	D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design revision		M15.16	Draft underbore detail		M16.11	C273 Landscaping – amend hydromulch spec	GRC	M15.20	PS26 Marker Posts	GRC	M22.02.05	Use of Corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes	LSC	M10.5.1	D6 Site regrading – consider retaining wall issue	LSC	M22.03.01	Lockrail park access		M22.03.03	D2, C242 & C221 Use of Recycled Glass	GRC	M22.03.05	CP1.28 Bonding of uncompleted works. Amendments to document.	GRC	M22.04.01	Review of Reference documents in all Specifications	BSC	M22.04.04	D5 – Polypropylene maintenance structures for gravity sewers	LSC
Item number	Item	Proponent																																										
M22.01.01	Website Update	All																																										
M15.5	D1 Geometric Road Design – finalise new tables	All																																										
M15.15	D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design revision																																											
M15.16	Draft underbore detail																																											
M16.11	C273 Landscaping – amend hydromulch spec	GRC																																										
M15.20	PS26 Marker Posts	GRC																																										
M22.02.05	Use of Corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes	LSC																																										
M10.5.1	D6 Site regrading – consider retaining wall issue	LSC																																										
M22.03.01	Lockrail park access																																											
M22.03.03	D2, C242 & C221 Use of Recycled Glass	GRC																																										
M22.03.05	CP1.28 Bonding of uncompleted works. Amendments to document.	GRC																																										
M22.04.01	Review of Reference documents in all Specifications	BSC																																										
M22.04.04	D5 – Polypropylene maintenance structures for gravity sewers	LSC																																										

Item	Item		
	M22.07.03	Corrugated plastic subsoil pipe	MCE
	M22.07.04	RRC grated crossover drawings	RRC
	M22.07.05	W-061 and W-061A – Hydrant and Valve Boxes	GRC
6	New Agenda Items		
	<i>Item number</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Proponent</i>
	M22.08.01	Approaches from Industry regarding new products	MCE
	M22.08.02	D14 Floodways	MCE/RRC
7	General Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daniel Price has formally replaced Allan Heit as the Nominee for BSC. Brief discussion on the use of standard drawings and the requirements for project specific assessment by an appropriately qualified professional, i.e. an RPEQ in Queensland. Even though the drawings are reviewed by RPEQs on the committee, it is not possible to cover the variety of specific situations and conditions that may be encountered. Agreement that the disclaimer currently on the drawings is adequate. 		
8	Next Meeting Next meeting to be via Teams on 7 th October at 11am		
9	CMDG Action Register The latest register is Attachment B CMDG Trial Register The latest register is Attachment C		
10	Meeting Closed at 12.05pm		

Item No.	Item Details
M22.01.01	<p>Website Update</p> <p><u>Previous Resolution on 24 June 2022</u></p> <p>MCE to request a quotation from LGAQ for the new website.</p> <p>Grant to confirm with RRC procurement whether 3 quotes are required or LGAQ can be engaged directly (maybe via local buy). MCE to request additional quotes if advised by Grant.</p> <p>Grant confirmed that if the website is procured through LGAQ then they can be engaged directly following receiving a quotation.</p> <p>Richard has since had a meeting with the Digital Business Lead from LGAQ to discuss the CMDG website requirements. There may be some issues with procurement due to LGAQ policy only allowing work for local governments. An exemption may need to be negotiated. Further information is due to be received during the week commencing 18th July 2022.</p> <p>Potentially LGAQ would be able to design the new website, populate the content, and provide development, maintenance and training as required. A conservative 6 month timeline should be allowed from initial engagement to use of the new website.</p> <p>MCE have not received any update following the meeting on 13th July. Brief discussion on potential purchasing issues.</p> <p>Mention of Denis from CQIT may be retiring.</p> <p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>Richard to follow up with LGAQ to chase information for presenting to committee. Richard to review emails and find mention of potential end of domain hosting service from CQIT.</p> <p>LGAQ has confirmed that the contract for the website must be with a LGA. An option would be for a single Council to pay for the website and any annual maintenance fees with MCE completing the liaison. Alternatively, MCE can request quotes from other website developers. For discussion.</p> <p><u>Meeting Discussion</u></p> <p>Agreed to look into alternative website hosting services if and when CQIT can no longer host the website.</p> <p>Discussion around options for proceeding with LGAQ or getting alternative quotations from other companies. Some advantages with using LGAQ are that they are already across all of the Council requirements and have data stored in Australia.</p> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p>Agreed to proceed with LGAQ via GRC if GRC can engage LGAQ directly and then invoice MCE for distribution to the rest of the committee. Scott to confirm with procurement section internally at GRC if this is possible.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>GRC/ MCE</p>
M15.5	<p>D1 Geometric Road Design – finalise new tables</p> <p>Proposed D1 Document ver 10C is at Attachment D1</p> <p><u>Meeting discussion 4 Aug 2022</u></p> <p>Changes/ additional wording to the Hartec response document:</p> <p>1.0 The CMDG committee have committed to seek to align standards wherever possible and will review areas where there are differences between LGAs moving forward.</p>

	<p>1.2 A path is required on all roads to comply with the planning regulations. However, the committee accepts that there are situations where a path may not be necessary and individual LGAs may accept this on a case by case basis with suitable justification.</p> <p>3.1 Mohit to provide additional information. 2 parking lanes + 1 through lane vs 1 parking and 2 through lanes.</p> <p>5.3 Carriageway widths below the minimums will be considered on a case by case basis with justifications from the consulting engineers and accepted at the discretion of the LGA. Note to be added beneath table - At the discretion of the LGA, pavement width reductions to 5.5m may be acceptable in certain circumstances.</p> <p>5.4 Remove text "Consideration can be given to a lesser width with appropriate justification" Add "LGAs are reviewing rural residential requirements in this regard."</p> <p>6.2 A potential solution is the provision of a 100mm pipe at 1.0% grade extending to the front property boundary where a kerb adapter is located at the time of subdivision. However, the Steering Committee was reluctant to mandate this.</p> <p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>Update response document with above comments and respond to Hartecs.</p> <p>The following resolutions were made in relation to document changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHRC D1 Urban Table - amend to require a pathway for an Access Place • All LGA's D1 Urban Table – add a note to indicate Pathway for a Local Access/Access Place is Desirable but that there are situations where a path may not be necessary and individual LGAs may delete the path requirement on a case by case basis with suitable justification * • RRC D1 Urban Table - to add note to Local Access hierarchy indicating that at the discretion of the LGA, pavement width reductions to 5.5m may be acceptable in certain circumstances • CMDG-R-051 – add note to clarify that landings are to be provided only where this can be practically achieved. <p><u>Current Status of D1 Urban and Rural Tables</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RRC – Completed • CHRC – Completed. • GRC – Completed. • MRC – Drafts completed - Graham getting confirmation. • LSC – Completed. • IRC – awaiting feedback on prepared drafts of urban and rural tables – No issues noted – will confirm soon • BSC – Completed – Format to be adjusted to align with other LGAs <p>In addition to the above MCE will amend the existing D1 Urban Tables to reflect the provision of a concrete pathway for all hierarchies (with the agreed note)</p> <p>Response document was updated by MCE and reviewed by Jamie. Response sent to Hartec on 26/08/2022.</p> <p><u>Meeting Discussion</u></p> <p>*Discussion around providing guidance on suitable justifications for deleting the path requirement. For example limited number of properties, short lengths of road/ cul-de-sacs. Would be good to have to ensure consistency between development application assessments. Agreed that internal guidance documents may be the best way to proceed.</p> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris to send around final D1 documents for a 2 week review period by the committee. On acceptance by the committee the document will then be sent out to industry for a 3 week review period. • Graham to chase up a response from MRC. <p><u>Action By - All</u></p>
--	--

M15.15	<p>D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design revision – Awaiting Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous resolution was <p><i>Cardno to check D9 and check where we are at with the changes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCE have completed a review of the document and are in the process of updating the document for review by the committee <p><u>Previous resolution</u> Discussed and agreed to minimise level of detail and refer to Austroads. MCE to complete draft and forward to committee for review.</p> <p><u>Current Status</u> In progress. Send to committee for review when complete.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>																
M15.16	<p>Draft Underbore Detail - Awaiting Action – No resolution this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The previous resolution was <p><i>Cardno to provide draft underbore detail for consideration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCE intend to progress this item with a draft drawing based on SEQ – any examples or advice on content from members would be appreciated. <p><u>Previous Resolution 24 June 2022</u> MCE to commence investigation into underbore detail.</p> <p>Proposed new underbore drawing is currently in progress Attachment F.</p> <p><u>Previous Resolution</u> MCE to cross check new drawing with other Councils and TMR standard drawings then send to committee for review with commentary/ background information.</p> <p><u>Current Status</u> In progress. Send to committee for review when complete.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>																
M16.11	<p>C273 Landscaping – amend hydromulch spec- Awaiting Action– No resolution this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current hydro mulch specification uses seed varieties that are more suited to colder climates. See Attachment J for example seed mix used by Dennis Contracting Services <p><u>Previous Resolution 24 June 2022</u> GRC, MRC, LSC are happy with the revised specification. RRC, IRC, CHRC, BSC to review and provide feedback/ acceptance.</p> <p>Proposed spec acceptable - responses received so far:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Local Government</th><th>Acceptance</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Banana Shire</td><td>? Daniel to check</td></tr> <tr> <td>Central Highlands Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Gladstone Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Isaac Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Maranoa Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Livingstone Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rockhampton Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Local Government	Acceptance	Banana Shire	? Daniel to check	Central Highlands Regional	Yes	Gladstone Regional	Yes	Isaac Regional	Yes	Maranoa Regional	Yes	Livingstone Regional	Yes	Rockhampton Regional	Yes
Local Government	Acceptance																
Banana Shire	? Daniel to check																
Central Highlands Regional	Yes																
Gladstone Regional	Yes																
Isaac Regional	Yes																
Maranoa Regional	Yes																
Livingstone Regional	Yes																
Rockhampton Regional	Yes																

	<p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>Make changes to specification based on the feedback provided by Dennis Contracting Services and send to committee for final review.</p> <p><u>Current Status</u> – Changes still underway</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE</p>																
M15.20	<p>PS26 Marker Posts- Awaiting Action– No resolution this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment K is draft PS26 provided by GRC • The previous resolution was: <p><i>Amended Purchase Spec PS26 provided by GRC.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All Councils to confirm if they use timber marker posts or not</i> • <i>If no Councils use timber posts this will be replaced on CMDG-W-060 with Flat posts</i> • <i>Councils to confirm which colours for which applications</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need guidance on the above dot points so that PS26 can be finalised. <p>Timber posts responses received:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Local Government</th><th>Timber posts permitted</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Banana Shire</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr> <td>Central Highlands Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Gladstone Regional</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr> <td>Isaac Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Maranoa Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Livingstone Regional</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rockhampton Regional</td><td>No</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>MCE to research and check IPWEAQ and SEQ specifications, then update PS26 based on the findings. Drawing required updating to have post 900/1200 above ground (not total length) in urban areas, 1800 in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Current Status</u></p> <p>In progress. Send to committee for review when complete.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE</p>	Local Government	Timber posts permitted	Banana Shire	No	Central Highlands Regional	Yes	Gladstone Regional	No	Isaac Regional	Yes	Maranoa Regional	Yes	Livingstone Regional	No	Rockhampton Regional	No
Local Government	Timber posts permitted																
Banana Shire	No																
Central Highlands Regional	Yes																
Gladstone Regional	No																
Isaac Regional	Yes																
Maranoa Regional	Yes																
Livingstone Regional	No																
Rockhampton Regional	No																
M22.02.05	<p>D5 – Use of corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes- Awaiting Action– No resolution this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSC is suggesting use of corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes. 																

6-2021	CMDG-D, CMDG-D5, C221.		Addition of corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes.	<p>Twin wall corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes offer many benefits compared to reinforced concrete pipes. Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent corrosion and chemical resistance • Can be cut to length with no detriment to corrosion resistance • Excellent rubber ring joint sealing system • Smooth bore providing optimum hydraulic performance • Available in 6 metre lengths • Lighter to handle with a lower risk rating for those handling the pipes • Smaller diameter pipes can be man handled • Lower transport costs • Large and diverse range of fitting available <p>1.1 CMDG-D, CMDG-D5, C221. Addition of corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes.</p>
--------	------------------------	--	--	--

- C221 Section C221.04 mentions FRC and RCP pipes but not Plastic.
- Current Section D05.18 reads as follows.


D05.18. PIPE MATERIAL

D05.18.01. The following pipe materials are approved subject to minimum cover and installation requirements stated by the manufacturer:

- Steel reinforced concrete pipe and culverts to AS4058; and
- Fibre Reinforced pipes to AS4139.; and
- Other pipes will be considered subject to individual Council approval.

D05.18.02. All joints between pipes shall be Rubber Ring Joints (RRJ).

- It is noted that Hydra Storm supplies pipe as follows:
 - Manufactured in accordance to AS – NZS 5065
 - Available from Diameter Nominal (DN) 225mm to 600mm
 - Manufactured from recycled HDPE



- C221 will need to be updated at the same time as D5.
- Richard mentioned that he is meeting with a representative from Iplex next week where he will get additional information and specifications.

Previous Resolution

Richard to collate information and specifications and send to committee for further discussion at next meeting with proposed changes to D5 and C221 to permit use of corrugated polypropylene drainage pipes.

Action By MCE

- Richard has met with the sales Rep but proposed changes to D5 and C221 are still being considered. It is recommended that Polypropylene pipes with classification SN8 are approved up to a diameter of 600mm.
- The technical guide for Blackmax (Iplex) is included as ~~Attachment N.~~

Use of polypropylene drainage pipes up to 600mm diameter in urban areas only - responses received:

	Local Government	Acceptance
	Banana Shire	Yes
	Central Highlands Regional	Yes
	Gladstone Regional	Yes
	Isaac Regional	Yes
	Maranoa Regional	Yes
	Livingstone Regional	Yes
	Rockhampton Regional	Yes
	<p>Commentary around impact on plastic pipes due to grass fires etc in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>Update D5 and C221 to permit polypropylene pipes (SN8) in urban areas only up to 600mm diameter. Add notes around to be installed as per manufacturers specifications. Revised documents to be sent to committee for review.</p> <p><u>Current Status</u></p> <p>In progress. Version 9 of D5 is included as Attachment D. Updated C221 to be sent to committee for review when completed.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE</p>	
M10.5.1	<p>D6 Site Regrading – consider retaining wall issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The previous resolution was Meeting 10 – Sub Committee of Amal Meegahawattage (LSC), Jamie McCaul (RRC), and Chris Hegarty to review the document and advise. Phil McKone to check LGAQ legal site for any retaining wall related advice Meeting 13. This item was not discussed. Chris, Jamie and Dev to meet to progress further. No progress on this issue yet – need to discuss its priority and resources to progress the matter <p><u>Previous Resolution</u></p> <p>Jamie and Chris to discuss further and determine a potential resolution.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>Jamie mentioned seeing lots of this type of boundary retaining wall being used in the region.</p> <p>Mention of previously court case regarding retaining wall failure, Jamie to investigate the outcome of the case to provide potential guidance on how to proceed.</p> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p>Jamie and Chris to discuss further and determine a potential resolution.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE/RRC</p>	
M22.03.01	<p>CMDG-G-013 Locking Rail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The previous resolution was <i>Some interest from committee regarding removable bollards/lockrails. Existing lockrail drawing (not part of standard drawings set) to be discussed at next meeting.</i> Discussions at the previous meeting centred on a new Lockrail drawing presented by LSC some time ago (along with a suite of Parks drawings). However, there already is a lockrail drawing included in CMDG. Both drawings are at Attachment O. RRC Parks have advised that they are heading away from the lockable pole insert type given the manual handling associated with it. They are actually replacing these types across the region with the swing gates as shown in the attached picture. 	



Scott has provided the IPWEAQ drawings which have slightly different details to the CMDG drawings as well as some swinging gate details.

MCE have created a CMDG swing gate drawing using a combination of the IPWEAQ drawing example and the existing RRC gate shown in the photo above. The drawing is also in **Attachment O**.

Drawing applicability

Local Government	Rail drawing – G-013	Gate drawing – G-021
Banana Shire	Yes	Yes
Central Highlands Regional	Yes	Yes
Gladstone Regional	Yes	Yes
Isaac Regional	Yes	Yes
Maranoa Regional	Yes	Yes
Livingstone Regional	Yes	Yes
Rockhampton Regional	No	Yes

Previous Resolution

RRC to consider and confirm whether a single gate option is required. GRC to confirm applicability for new gate drawing G-021. Drawing to be uploaded to website once feedback is received.

Current Status

Drawing to be uploaded to website once feedback is received.

Jamie still to confirm if a single gate option is required. Drawing to be uploaded or modified base on feedback.

Action By

MCE/RRC

M22.03.03

D2, C242 & C221 Use of Recycled Glass

- GRC are seeking to amend CMDG to allow use of Recycled Glass in line with the TMR specs for pavement design – reference to be considered in either (D2 - Pavement Design) or (C242 - Flexible Pavement).
 - In addition to pavement, having Recycle Glass as a suitable material for stormwater bedding/trenching material around concrete pipes (C221 Pipe Drainage).
- Proposal:

- In C242 - Recycle glass aggregate may be considered as an alternative to a quarry or natural sand material for unbound pavements when used in accordance with TMR specifications.
- References Materials: MTRS05 Unbound Pavements, MTRS36 Recycle Glass Aggregate.
- In C242 - Recycle glass aggregate may be considered as an alternative to a quarry or natural sand material for bedding material of reinforced concrete and fibre reinforced concrete pipes in accordance with bedding material grading limits.
- There are other alternative recycle materials that may be considered by the group.
- **Attachment Q** is the Current TMR Spec for recycled glass.

Table 7.2.1 – Constituents in Type 2 materials

Subtype	Maximum Limit of each Constituent (percent by mass)				
	Natural gravel or quarried material	Recycled materials			
		Recycled concrete	RAP	Recycled brick	Recycled glass ^
2.1	100	100	0	0	0
2.2	100	100	15	15	0
2.3	100	100	20	20	20
2.4	100	100	20	45	20
2.5	100	100	45	45	20

^ Recycled glass shall comply with the requirements of MTRS36 *Recycled Glass Aggregate*.

- For discussion at this stage – if there is appetite for its use we can investigate what document changes may be necessary to make it happen

Use of recycled glass - responses received so far:

Local Government	Pavements	Stormwater Bedding/ surround
Banana Shire	No	No
Central Highlands Regional	Yes?	No?
Gladstone Regional	Yes	Yes
Isaac Regional	No	No
Maranoa Regional	Yes	No
Livingstone Regional	Yes	Yes
Rockhampton Regional	Yes	Yes

Previous Resolution

Applicability to be confirmed by BSC, CHRC, IRC, MRC, LSC and RRC.

D2 and C242 to be updated following responses.

Current Status

D2 and C242 to be updated. Awaiting advice from some Councils on permitted use.

Resolution

All councils have provided responses. MCE to update C220, D2 and C242 in conjunction with Grant's review. Ensure that TMR specifications are referenced.

Action By

MCE/RRC

CP1.28 Bonding of uncompleted works. Amendments to document

- The meeting 15 resolution on this was “Take out of agenda for now. GRC will provide additional information and commentary for clarity”.
- GRC have provided a marked up version of CP1 with proposed changes mainly around the use of bonding deeds but also other issues – refer to comments in Right hand column..
- **Attachment R1** is the CP1 Ver 4 Draft document and **Attachment R2** is an example bonding deed used by RRC.
- **Attachment R3** is the existing CP1B Security Lodgement Form. It is suggested that this form be retained as it has value in calculating the bond amount based on information provided by the RPEQ Engineer. The bonding deed is then the agreement between the Council and the developer which quotes the calculated bond amount.

Resolution

The CP1 Version 4 draft be adopted with changes below and loaded up to the website.


- The bonding deed be provided in MS Word format on the website
- General acceptance of CP1 version 4:
- Remove drainage from uncompleted works bond
- Insertion of “approval prior to submission” clause
- 4. a) Security lodgement form or bonding deed to be completed....
- Remove bond value factor table from Security Lodgement Form.
- E) Timeframes to be put on all uncompleted works bonds – to be approved by Council
- F) A bonding deed must be signed for all bonding deeds.
- Add “The developer must comply with any other requirements imposed by Ergon Energy”
- Add to Table CP1.28.1:

	Incomplete Works Bond Multiplier	Security Lodgement Form	Bonding Deed
Banana Shire	1.5		
Central Highlands Regional Council	1.5		
Gladstone Regional Council	1.5	No	Yes
Isaac Regional Council	1.5		
Livingstone Shire Council	2.0		
Maranoa Regional Council	1.5		
Rockhampton Regional Council	2.0	No	Yes

Councils to confirm whether security lodgement form or bonding deed is required.

Action By

MCE, BSC, CHRC, IRC, LSC, MRC

M22.04.01	<p>Review of Reference documents in all Specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BSC (Daniel) suggests the group consider a Design Specification review and revising the referencing to current standards/guidelines. These references should provide the same or better information that was originally referred to by the CMDG Design Specs. Whilst GRC conducted a review of many of the specs when joining the group there has been only ad hoc review of standards and references since. For discussion at this stage – the question is when should reviews take place and what resources should be assigned to it? <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p>Discussion around potential review of documents as some have not been revised since 2007. Chris to review documents and highlight the ones in need of a review. In addition, it was agreed to complete a detailed review the documents on an ad hoc basis as changes are required/ requested to specific documents.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE</p>																
M22.04.04	<p>D5 – Polypropylene maintenance structures for gravity sewers – Not discussed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Iplex has requested that CMDG D5 be updated to allow for the use of 1000mm dia polypropylene maintenance shafts. The Iplex Ezipit technical guide is included as Attachment S EZI pit, in all the sizes (MS (DN425), MC(DN600) and MH(DN1000)) are approved by the majority of the water Authorities in Melbourne, approved by Unity Water, Gold Coast Council, Logan Council, and Redlands Council in the SEQ water grid. The EZI pit has been around for a number of years - with about 15 years of use in Australia and 35 years use in Europe.  <p>Use of polypropylene maintenance structures - responses received so far:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Local Government</th><th>Acceptance</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Banana Shire</td><td>?</td></tr> <tr> <td>Central Highlands Regional</td><td>?</td></tr> <tr> <td>Gladstone Regional</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr> <td>Isaac Regional</td><td>?</td></tr> <tr> <td>Maranoa Regional</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Livingstone Regional</td><td>?</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rockhampton Regional</td><td>?</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Suggested Resolution</u></p> <p>For discussion</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p>	Local Government	Acceptance	Banana Shire	?	Central Highlands Regional	?	Gladstone Regional	No	Isaac Regional	?	Maranoa Regional	Yes	Livingstone Regional	?	Rockhampton Regional	?
Local Government	Acceptance																
Banana Shire	?																
Central Highlands Regional	?																
Gladstone Regional	No																
Isaac Regional	?																
Maranoa Regional	Yes																
Livingstone Regional	?																
Rockhampton Regional	?																

M22.07.03	<p>Corrugated plastic subsoil pipe – Not discussed</p> <p>Following a query from a contractor regarding subsoil pipe alternatives, the question around the acceptability of 100mm corrugated plastic subsoil pipes has arisen. Currently CMDG C230 specifically excludes the use of corrugated plastic subsoil drainage pipes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MATERIALS</p> <p>C230.12 APPROVED PLASTIC MATERIALS</p> <p>C230.12.01 Strip filter drains are approved. Strip Filter Drains are a proprietary product, deep-fin plastic core, 120kPa minimum crush strength, 40mm minimum thickness, fully enclosed by a non-woven geotextile and shall be in accordance with MRTS03 - Drainage, Retaining Structure and Protective Treatments. Specification</p> <p>C230.12.02 Corrugated plastic subsoil drainage pipe is not approved for use.</p> <p>100mm corrugated plastic subsoil pipes are still the standard in the industry and are currently getting installed all over the region by multiple different contractors. Corrugated plastic subsoil pipe is on the design drawings submitted by different consultants and approved by councils. It is also not getting flagged on council inspections. It is shown on the standard drawings D-040 and D-041 (subsoil drainage details). Even though the specs override the drawings, drawings are the main thing that people seem to refer to.</p> <p>For discussion</p> <p><u>Suggested resolution</u></p> <p>TBC</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p>
M22.07.04	<p>RRC grated crossover drawings – Not discussed</p> <p>Rockhampton Regional Council (RRC) have developed two standard drawings for grated overhead crossings at driveway crossovers, with RRC-R05 applicable for pedestrian and residential applications, and RRC-R06 applicable for commercial and laneway applications. Refer to Attachment T for details. These drawings have been in use in the RRC LGA since 2017 and are routinely referred to for the issue of works in road reserve permits as well as Council projects.</p> <p>RRC have requested, via Grant, that these two drawings be included in CMDG.</p> <p>Comments have been received regarding potential sharp transitions at the edges, a minor update to the drawing may be required to show a small wedge of asphalt either side of the grates. GRC and RRC have also noted that these should only be used when there is no other alternative and would not generally apply to greenfield sites.</p> <p><u>Suggested resolution</u></p> <p>Create two new CMDG drawings that replicate/ replace the RRC standard drawings (with minor amendments) but ensure that it is noted on the drawings that these are only for use in exceptional circumstances as directed or approved by local government.</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p> <p>MCE</p>

M22.07.05	<p>W-061 and W-061A – Hydrant and Valve Boxes – Not discussed</p> <p>Scott noted that there was a drafting error on drawing W-061. As part of the review process it was noted that the drawings contain significant levels of information for products that are off the shelf. There is widespread use of the polypropylene boxes within the roadway in many locations around Rockhampton, this may be due to the interpretation around the note on drawing W-061A:</p> <p><u>POLYETHYLENE SURFACE BOX – HYDRANT/VALVE</u> NOTE: BOX NOT RECOMENDED FOR HEAVY, FAST MOVING TRAFFICABLE AREAS</p> <p>For discussion</p> <p>The proposed drawings removes many of the redundant dimensions but still retains key information and combines both drawings W-061 and W-061A Attachment U.</p> <p><u>Suggested resolution</u> Adopt the updated drawing W-061 which combines the polypropylene detail from W-061A and remove W-061A.</p> <p><u>Action by</u> MCE</p>
M22.08.01	<p>Approaches from Industry regarding new products – Not discussed</p> <p>MCE are regularly approached by companies presenting new products or trying to get existing products approved for use in the region covered by CMDG. Currently we review these requests and forward relevant information to the committee for information or present for discussion at a meeting when changes to CMDG documentation may be required or beneficial.</p> <p>MCE are seeking direction on the committee's preference for dealing with these requests.</p> <p><u>Suggested resolution</u> For discussion</p> <p><u>Action By</u></p>

M22.08.02	D14 Floodways – Not discussed	
	The previous resolutions on this document are below. The current document is at Attachment E .	
	Meeting 11 13 Mar 2018	D14 Floodways a. Cardno to revise D14 using the new layout and document structure provided by RRC b. Table D14.09.01 needs revision and clarity eg d50 c. SPA and IDAS references need to be amended
	Meeting 12 25 Oct 2018	D14 Floodways 'Sustainable Planning Act' needs to be updated/changed to 'Planning Act 2016'. Table D14.03.01 – note the source of the information in this table – It's a government source and policy could change.
	Meeting 13 14 Mar 2019	Dev (LSC) is currently working on a new draft for D14 Floodways
A draft of D14 was prepared in 2018 but does not appear to have progressed since. <u>Suggested resolution</u> For discussion only to get direction at this point <u>Action By</u>		