

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

2025 MEETING 1 MINUTES

Venue: Teams
Date and Time: 13th February 2025 at 11:00 am

Item																															
1	<p>Welcome Attendance:</p> <table><tr><td>Richard Bywater (MCE)</td><td>Allen Chen (LSC)</td></tr><tr><td>Todd Lisle (MCE)</td><td>Jon Ashman (LSC)</td></tr><tr><td>Brendan Fuller (GRC)</td><td>Jarvis Black (MRC)</td></tr><tr><td>Scott McDonald (GRC)</td><td>Nathan Garvey (BSC)</td></tr><tr><td>Grant Vaughan (RRC)</td><td>Sarah Banda (CHRC)</td></tr><tr><td>Jamie McCaul (RRC)</td><td>Michael Stanton (IRC)</td></tr></table>	Richard Bywater (MCE)	Allen Chen (LSC)	Todd Lisle (MCE)	Jon Ashman (LSC)	Brendan Fuller (GRC)	Jarvis Black (MRC)	Scott McDonald (GRC)	Nathan Garvey (BSC)	Grant Vaughan (RRC)	Sarah Banda (CHRC)	Jamie McCaul (RRC)	Michael Stanton (IRC)																		
Richard Bywater (MCE)	Allen Chen (LSC)																														
Todd Lisle (MCE)	Jon Ashman (LSC)																														
Brendan Fuller (GRC)	Jarvis Black (MRC)																														
Scott McDonald (GRC)	Nathan Garvey (BSC)																														
Grant Vaughan (RRC)	Sarah Banda (CHRC)																														
Jamie McCaul (RRC)	Michael Stanton (IRC)																														
2	<p>Apologies:</p> <table><tr><td>Anthony Lipsys (BSC)</td><td>Mohit Paudyal (RRC)</td></tr><tr><td>Frans Krause (GRC)</td><td>Mark Ware (IRC)</td></tr><tr><td>Cameron Hoffmann (MRC)</td><td>Leonardo Hurtado Stagnaro (MRC)</td></tr><tr><td>Chandrasiri Jayalath (BSC)</td><td></td></tr></table>	Anthony Lipsys (BSC)	Mohit Paudyal (RRC)	Frans Krause (GRC)	Mark Ware (IRC)	Cameron Hoffmann (MRC)	Leonardo Hurtado Stagnaro (MRC)	Chandrasiri Jayalath (BSC)																							
Anthony Lipsys (BSC)	Mohit Paudyal (RRC)																														
Frans Krause (GRC)	Mark Ware (IRC)																														
Cameron Hoffmann (MRC)	Leonardo Hurtado Stagnaro (MRC)																														
Chandrasiri Jayalath (BSC)																															
3	<p>True and correct record of minutes from previous meeting Refer Attachment A</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Resolution:</u> No comments were received within 2 week review period and the minutes of the meeting held via Teams on 14th November 2024 have been formally adopted and uploaded to website.</p>																														
4	<p>Terms of reference and Budget CMDG Governance and Tender documents currently under review. Jamie to provide update if available.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution:</u> Jamie McCaul (JMCM) circulated an email in October with regards to the updated governance and tender documents, agreed to adopt moving forward. JMCM to provide documentation for CEO sign off to other LGA's.</p> <p>Jarvis Black (JB) queried if there was a need for all Council's to be involved in the tender – i.e. would one council lead the tender. JMCM advised that previously a review panel of GRC/RRC/LSC members would review the tender and advise other LGAs. Scott McDonald (SM) raised that a panel of three alternative members could be formed if another LGA wished to be involved.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u> Governance strategy document has been finalised and is circulating with LGA's. Five LGA's have signed off so far. Once all parties are signed off, the tender will be issued.</p>																														
5	<p>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.</p> <table><tr><th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr><tr><td>M24.03.01</td><td>Roofwater Pipes Under Footpaths</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.06.02</td><td>Draft floodway and bed level crossing major changes</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M24.06.03</td><td>Erosion and Sediment Control Documents</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.06.04</td><td>D2 Pavement Design</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.07.02</td><td>D1 – Wildlife Corridors</td><td>LSC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.08.01</td><td>CCTV Survey for new sewers</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.08.02</td><td>Changes to drawing applicability table</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M24.09.02</td><td>Street Tree Planting</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M24.09.04</td><td>Design of Local Roads</td><td>MCE</td></tr></table>	Item number	Item	Proponent	M24.03.01	Roofwater Pipes Under Footpaths	RRC	M24.06.02	Draft floodway and bed level crossing major changes	MCE	M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC	M24.06.04	D2 Pavement Design	RRC	M24.07.02	D1 – Wildlife Corridors	LSC	M24.08.01	CCTV Survey for new sewers	RRC	M24.08.02	Changes to drawing applicability table	MCE	M24.09.02	Street Tree Planting	MCE	M24.09.04	Design of Local Roads	MCE
Item number	Item	Proponent																													
M24.03.01	Roofwater Pipes Under Footpaths	RRC																													
M24.06.02	Draft floodway and bed level crossing major changes	MCE																													
M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC																													
M24.06.04	D2 Pavement Design	RRC																													
M24.07.02	D1 – Wildlife Corridors	LSC																													
M24.08.01	CCTV Survey for new sewers	RRC																													
M24.08.02	Changes to drawing applicability table	MCE																													
M24.09.02	Street Tree Planting	MCE																													
M24.09.04	Design of Local Roads	MCE																													

Item			
	M24.09.05	List of Specifications	MCE
6	New Agenda Items		
	Item number	Item	Proponent
	M25.01.01	Amendment to PS-11	MCE
	M25.01.02	Shared Parking	GRC
7	General Business		
8	Next Meeting		
	Next meeting to be via Teams at 8am on Thursday 27 th March 2025.		
9	CMDG Action Register The latest register is Attachment B CMDG Trial Register The latest register is Attachment C Schedule 1 The latest schedule is Attachment D		
10	Meeting closed at: 12:10pm		

Agenda Items Detail

Item No.	Item Details
M24.03.01	<p>Roofwater Pipes Under Footpaths</p> <p><u>M2024.03 Discussion</u> Discussion on how to document a suitable solution in CMDG. Various suggestions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifting footpath slightly to achieve some concrete over the pipe. This would require greater than 2.5% grade from back of kerb to footpath. • Allow reduced thickness over pipe e.g. 50mm • Use a RHS instead of 100mm uPVC • Add sawn joint over the path to ensure neat crack at weak point. • Roofwater drain to extend from kerb adaptor under the footpath to a minimum of 300mm past the edge of the path. <p><u>M2024.03 Resolution</u> MCE to review other standards including IPWEAQ (e.g. drawing RSD 201). MCE to make changes to drawing R-061 based on research and points above. Drawing to be sent to committee for review. Scott to check with his team for current approach taken in GRC region.</p> <p><u>M2024.06 Update</u> Draft drawing is attachment E for discussion. Note that barrier kerb situation is potentially acceptable, however mountable kerb is problematic still. Suggest outcome is to locally raise path to improve cover.</p> <p><u>M2024.06 Discussion</u> Show adapters on the plans (RHS to round to back of kerb adaptor). Jamie advised that internally they have been raising the footpath locally. Grant noted that charged line have also been used at RRC by civil operations.</p> <p>Significant discussion on potential options and disadvantages of each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase verge gradient <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cheap and simple solution that allows roofwater drain to be installed and operate normally

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May result in driveway issues and footpath grade noncompliance when lifting locally over roofwater lines. ○ May not be very aesthetic ○ Conflicts with D1 verge grades • Charged line <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Easy and cheap solution that has is being used currently. ○ Does not require any additional LGA infrastructure or adjustment to the footpath level ○ May have maintenance issues due to water and debris sitting in lower section of pipe. Note that roofwater pipes are not LGA infrastructure. • 'inter-allotment' style pipes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neat solution without having potential maintenance issues. ○ Increased cost over other options ○ Additional infrastructure for LGAs to maintain ○ Additional service line in verge (reduced space) <p>Agreed to introduce a table of difference. LGA's to determine their individual preferences and advise.</p> <p><u>M2024.06 Resolution</u> LGA's to discuss internally and determine their individual preferences and advise.</p> <p><u>M2024.07 Update</u> No additional information or updates have been received by MCE.</p> <p>LGAs to determine requirements to allow update of drawing CMDG-R-061.</p> <p><u>M2024.07 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further internal discussions have been had generally for all LGA's. • MRC likely to suggest a few options to be made available (case by case). • Jamie McCaul (RRC) raised what the standard of 'outer'-allotment drainage would be. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MCE to review options and advise proposed concept. • MCE to review dimensions on kerb adapters and update to match commercially available units. • Consider both RHS and pipe depending on option. <p><u>M2024.07 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCE to put together options list for Council's to provide an order of preference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D5 table required for options. ○ Drawings also required. • MCE to update R-061 to clarify the hatch pattern for cutouts. • MCE to review options for 'outer'-allotment drainage and advise proposed concept. • MCE to review dimensions on kerb adapters and update to match commercially available units. <p><u>M2024.08 Update</u> With MCE for further review. Preference with some LGAs remains raising 50mm dependent on suitability property side. MCE to present 3 plan options within the next few weeks for review.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Update</u></p> <p>Sketches for different options are included as Attachment E.</p> <p>Changes to path should be considered in conjunction with Street Trees position</p> <p>For discussion.</p>
--	---

M2024.09 Discussion:

Discussed drafted options:

- Option 1 – increase verge grade to 5%.
- Option 2 – charged line.
 - Discussed the need for bends – ‘to be used as required’.
- Option 3 – relocate path.
- Option 4 – relocated path and vary verge grade.
- Option 5 – inter-allotment style network.
 - Highlighted that there would be a limit to room in the verge to accommodate the inter-allotment style drain.
 - Jamie McCaul (JMcM) raised ownership of the roofwater infrastructure. It was agreed that it would be suitable to maintain the current status quo – e.g. landowner to own and maintain up to the connection point into the main line.
 - Issues with implementation on small (400m²) lots was discussed.

Discussed preference to have a priority.

M2024.09 Resolution:

- Adopt a priority table with order of preference for each LGA.
- 50mm minimum thickness to be adopted to allow for reinforcement (if present) to pass over roofwater pipe(s).
- Option 1 – maximum 5% allowable, per D1 desirable.
 - LGA’s to advise on potential to vary batter slope to accommodate and make allowance in D1.
- Option 5 to become essentially conventional inter-allotment drainage.
- Grant Vaughan (GV) raised potential to adopt up to 10% between kerb and footpath to accommodate.
- RRC and MCE to investigate impact to vehicle vertical clearance when using steeper grades behind the kerb.
- MCE to update drawings of options and circulate to committee for review.
- MCE to consider updates to D5 to support drawing changes. May need to specify more detail on position and minimum requirements for roofwater kerb adaptors.

M2025.01 Update

- Refer to draft drawing, **Attachment D**.
- Priority table shown – all LGA’s to provide feedback on preferred option/s.
- Two options shown, Option A which maintains 2.5% across the whole verge, and Option 2 which increases back of kerb to footpath grade to 5%.
- Verge increased to 4.5m for consistency with future changes to D1 to accommodate street trees.
- Back of kerb to footpath offset proposed to be 1400mm which allows for both street lighting poles and street trees to maintain clear zones and gives street trees sufficient ground surface area. Also provides sufficient cover to both options for roofwater pipes as a ‘deemed to comply’ approach.
- Ground Clearance Checks:
 - Option A (2.5% verge, jump-up outlet) – 13mm B85 clash.
 - Option B (5% verge) – 22mm B85 clash.
 - LGA’s to consider clash issues noted above.
- Option 5 is proposed to be covered off by Note 15.

M2025.01 Discussion

- Extent of roofwater to be provided behind footpath to be shown on the drawing.
- Jamie McCaul raised potential for further verge widths increases as a result of sewer in road.
- Verge to be noted as 4500min (typical) on drawings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verge grades to be noted as max. • IO to be located within property boundary. • Option of ramping longitudinally discussed, vertical clearance issues were discussed as a reason to not formally adopt this as an option. • Update notes with regards to removing RHS or preferring pipe. • Preference to adopt RHS for Option B discussed. Scott McDonald raised that RHS vs pipe could be left up to the developer. • Drawing to be updated to provide clarity between retrofit roofwater with existing path and new installation of roofwater drain prior to footpath construction. • Changes to be made and sent for committee review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Jarvis asked for background info on decisions to be included in email. ◦ Plot vertical clearance checks for information only. • Check adapter is available for 125x75 RHS. <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M24.06.03	<p>Erosion and Sediment Control Documents RRC have produced an updated document that combines D7 and C211, refer attachment J1-3.</p> <p>I suggest calling the document D7 as per other document that have had the construction specification combined e.g. D11 and D12.)</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of sections that have taken from IECA and also from other RRC's policies, but RRC have tried to keep the important bits in the document and not refer off to other legislation too much without making the document huge. • This is quite a change from the previous document so worth everyone having a good look through it. Jamie is happy to take any questions or make changes required. • The document requires some formatting which MCE is working on. • There is a WbD checklist for inspection and design that should also be included which is also attached. <p><u>M2024.06 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jamie advised that the State is returning for further audits in October. As part of the audit, the design guidelines must comply with RRC's Action Plan. • Water by Design has provided a model planning scheme policy for use. • The requirements for qualifications were discussed, specifically that there are not many CPESC's locally. It was discussed that RRC had agreed to accept a suitably qualified RPEQ (including requiring that the RPEQ had attended advanced training in erosion and sediment control). • The difficulty of policing compliance was discussed. Staffing was identified as the limiting factor. • Allen (LSC) advised that Water by Design are preparing an Action Plan for LSC. <p><u>M2024.06 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCE and LGAs to review RRC's guide ESCP plan and D7. • Confirmation of requirements at each stage is needed (MCU/ROL vs OPW vs prior to prestart). <p><u>M2024.07 Update</u> Comments only received from GRC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading the Natspec specification 0022 it has well defined certification requirements depending on the separate contexts. • "Design certification" only has to be a "suitably qualified professional" then "additional certification" has three types of professional engineers depending on what is to be undertaken.

- CMDG D5 simply states “RPEQ or CPESC” which may be interpreted as a CPESC would be able to certify items that Natspec classes as “additional certification” as they are not excluded.
- May be worth reviewing the wording/ requirements.
- The proposed D7 changes thing again by not even mentioning the three types of professional engineers depending on what is to be undertaken.

D05.22. STORMWATER QUALITY

D05.22.01. The developer shall submit MUSIC model and output from MUSIC model as a part of Site Based Stormwater Management Plan demonstrating stormwater quality objective is achieved in accordance with State Planning Policy 2017.

D05.22.02. A development is required to comply with the State Planning Policy 2017 in relation to Water Quality Objectives.

D05.22.03. The developer shall submit **Erosion** and Sediment Control (ESC) plan as required by the Local Government Authority at the operational works stage. Plans are to be certified by an appropriate RPEQ experienced in this field or Certified Professional in **Erosion** and Sediment Control (CPESC). ESC plans are to be updated, certified and submitted to the Local Government Authority as construction works proceed.

ESC Plan

0022 Control of erosion and sedimentation (Design).docx - Compatibility Mode • Saved to O: Drive • Brendan Fuller

gn Layout References Mailings Review View Help Acrobat

Paragraph Styles Adobe Acrobat Voice Sensitivity Editor Reuse Files

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

- Inspection and test plans, and procedures for review and/or amendment to the ESCP.
- Identification of site responsibilities.
- Construction program and installation sequence for ESC measures.
- Other relevant information Council may require to properly assess the ESCP: [complete/delete]

Design certification

Certificate: Provide a signed and dated design certificate as evidence that a suitably **qualified** professional has reviewed all the design documents, including erosion and sediment program and plans for the development, and can verify that the designed measures will effectively mitigate sediment migration from the development site.

Additional certification

Sites with a soil disturbance greater than 2500 m²: Provide certification by a professional engineer that the ESCP conforms to the following:

- Satisfies the intent and design/performance standards established by all relevant local state and federal policies relating to erosion and sediment control.
- Has been reviewed and approved for construction, soil science, hydrology/hydraulics and site revegetation/rehabilitation.

Certification by a hydrology and hydraulics professional engineer: Required for sites greater than 1 ha or where the ESCP incorporates a sediment basin.

Certification by a geotechnical specialist: Required if ESCP incorporates a sediment basin with a constructed earth embankment with a height greater than 1 m.

© AUS-SPEC (Oct 21) 16 "[Insert date]"

D07.01.04-A suitably **qualified** and experienced professional must have completed an advanced **specialised training** course in erosion and sediment control provided by a reputable body and be able to provide documentary evidence of such training upon request. **Qualifications** accepted as meeting this requirement include IECA's Registered Soil Practitioner-Erosion and Sediment Control (RSP-ESC) or Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control (CPESC).

Qualifications ¶

D07.01.05 The Design Certificate Erosion and Sediment Control Form is to be completed and submitted to Council with the Operational Works application. The form can be obtained from Council's website.

Design Certificate ¶

Action By
All

M2024.07 Discussion

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jamie McCaul (RRC) advised that the extent of what has been put forward is as per direction from Water By Design and Topo. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed limit of certification governed by the Professional Engineers Act – i.e. an RPEQ not competent should not be certifying ESCP designs. Alan Chen (LSC) advised LSC likely to provide advice by mid-September. Jamie McCaul (RRC) advised this is critical to get sorted sooner rather than later. Discussed if there's any intent to provide the draft to industry for review. Responses from LGA's on internal reviews to be provided prior to going to industry. MCE to put together some sample standard drawings. Brendan Fuller (GRC) queried what is the need to produce this document separately from IECA guidelines. Jamie McCaul (RRC) advised the intent is to simplify the large amount of info in IECA for ease of implementation. Jamie McCaul (RRC) advised the example ESCP plan is available and will be circulated. <p><u>Post meeting note</u> Scott, Jamie and Richard have discussed the changes to the previous D7 document. Jamie to provide breakdown of previous content that has been removed or modified. Further consideration to be given to the document format/ content and ensuring consistency between CMDG specifications. Content from NATSPEC and other LGAs such as FNQROC development manual to be reviewed and considered.</p> <p><u>M2024.07 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCE to put together some sample ESCP standard drawings. <p><u>M2024.08 Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott/ GRC have provided further comments, refer Attachment J4 Jamie has reviewed GRC comments and will update including GRC's comments where possible. Any other comments are to be delivered to Jamie ASAP. Once updated, Jamie to release to all for final review. MCE to assist Jamie in formatting where required. <p><u>M2024.09 Update</u> MCE, RRC and GRC have been working on the new document. MCE have formatted document and made some minor changes. GRC have completed a further review and comparison of content between the new D7/C211 and the current versions. Document should be ready for review by committee in the next few weeks. Document to be released for industry review for 2-3 week period.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u> Document updates in progress.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awaiting further discussion between Richard, Jamie and Scott. Aim is to have this sub committee meeting prior to the next CMDG meeting. Jamie noted the Water By Design reviewed RRC current/ underdevelopment procedures and visited some construction sites recently. General feedback was positive and some recommendations given, which will be considered during D7 updates. Jamie discussed that additional material may be created to help bolster the guidelines. Jamie raised that RRC are considering not approving ESC plans but rather noting that Council has no objection (similar to other LGAs in SEQ region). RRC is also investigating offset policies and regional water quality assets. <p><u>Action by</u> All</p>
M24.06.04	<p>D2 Pavement Design D2 is undergoing review by RRC.</p> <p><u>M2024.06 Discussion</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allen raised Table D2.13.1 25mm vs TMR MRTS30 min 35mm, noting that the asphalt contractor working on a local subdivision had identified that they would not warrant the work if it was not in accordance with TMR specification. • A brief review of Austroads AGTPT Part 2 identified that 25mm DG10 should be considered appropriate. • It was noted that table C245.22.2 of C245 conflicts with CMDG D2. <p><u>M2024.06 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant was asked to review construction specifications as part of the ongoing review of CMDG D2. • MCE to provide input on asphalt mix designs <p><u>M2024.08 Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely entire set requires general review however may be timely to review pavement related standards. • MCE to complete initial review of pavement related standards, then provide to all for comment before commencing update. • MCE to provide initial review to GV to share with RRC engineers for review prior to comment. <p><u>M2024.09 Update</u></p> <p>D2 – Grant has provided the updated document which has minimised the changes to the essential updates to ensure the document is still current.</p> <p>C241 Stabilisation - We will review other Austroads, AUS-SPEC, IPWEA, TMR Specs. C241 in its current form seems so far removed from practical use.</p> <p>C242 – not a lot of structural change required</p> <p>C244 – Could be replaced either by MRTS11, or re-written to be more in line with AGPT Part 4K: Seals.</p> <p>C245 – We have reviewed in detail, but would be similar to C244 - not too far off currently. But we will need to ensure it aligns with the D2 updates in terms of layer thicknesses, references etc.</p> <p>In summary, there is a fair volume of work to set terms/framework of the review, undertake review, update following committee feedback. However, significant benefit will be gained by having the documentation updated current standards and ensuring consistency between CMDG specifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally agreed that the pavement stabilisation spec doesn't get used much. Jarvis Black (JB) identified that MRC uses TMR specs more than the CMDG spec for stabilisation. • LGAs to check internally if C241 is useful, either in its current state or an updated state. RB to discuss with LSC construction managers to get input. • C242 – minor update and review required • C244 – agreed to align with Austroads. • C245 – agreed to align with Austroads. • JB and Michael Stanton (MS) to provide initial feedback on changes. <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution</u></p> <p>Agreement from the committee for MCE to continue with updates to construction specifications. MCE to make the necessary formatting changes to D2 and discuss any suggested changes with Grant. Document to then be sent to the committee for review.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u></p> <p>Document updates in progress.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard advised updates are ongoing and will be circulated for review by the committee. <p><u>Action By</u></p>
--	---

	MCE
M24.06.05	<p>D10 Landscaping Design D10 (draft) is being prepared by RRC.</p> <p><u>M2024.06 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant presented the draft D10 document to the committee. The origin of the original draft D10 was discussed, noting it was never circulated for use. It was expected that Greg Abbotts (LSC) created the draft in 2010 or thereabouts. This document has formed the base of the revised draft, as amended by Michael Ramsay (RRC's landscaping consultant). The revised document has amendments made in yellow. It was decided that C273 would not be combined with D10. The issue of circulating IPWEA drawings was raised, noting they operate on a subscription model. Scott McDonald (GRC) advised that other Councils have shared IPWEA drawings on their websites in the past, however would like to confirm this proposal with IPWEAQNT first before including on the CMDG website. It was agreed that two planting tables would be used, one for RRC and GRC each. Other LGA's were to provide their preferred default or provide a bespoke table if required. The impact of planting requirements on sight distance (refer to G16) was raised. Cross checking was required to ensure intersection sight distance was maintained. Post meeting commentary from GRC and MCE: Scott McDonald - Should it be SISD or SSD? SSD is a lower value allowing for stopping, concern that SISD requirements may be significant larger than 15-20m. Some intersections may be 60m apart meaning no trees allowed. Rich Bywater – Will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis as trunk of a tree might not be considered to obstruct sight distance. Also position of tree relative to kerb and traffic lane will have an impact. However, default should be to achieve SISD where possible. Further discussion required. RRC advised that the BCC Specification S190 is the best source of information for best practice landscaping/planting. Scott raised that review of specifics based on different climate vs Brisbane may be necessary. Bollard standard drawing – steel for urban, timber/plastic for parks etc. Changes to drawing required. Scott raised intent of future movement of design vs construction sets. Rich confirmed approach is to generally combine on an ad-hoc basis. Agreed to make D11, D12 and D7 Design and Construction. Jarvis raised that website changes may be required. Rich suggested changing the website reference to 'Specifications' and localising all D and C suite. A prompt for what is superseded is to be included on the drawings. Suggested Design and Construction, D7 for example. <p><u>M2024.06 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCE/RRC to determine if the 'approved planting list' refers to the construction docs or the appendix. RRC to review C273 and if updates are required to align with D10. LGA's to advise their preference of planting table default. MCE to cross-check D10 with G16 to ensure correct sight distance is maintained. LGA's to advise if their requirements to BCC S190 vary. <p><u>M2024.07 Update</u> At the time of writing comments have only been received from GRC:</p> <p>GRC have reviewed the BCC content and noted that it generally aligns with AUS-SPEC with some of differences where BCC wanted to change to suit their needs.</p> <p><i>There are a few items that could be consider for inclusion if we are talking landscaping as a whole.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Do we need to tie into Retaining Walls, potential need for open spaces or landscape area. Reference to other CMDG specification doc to guide requirements.</i> <i>Temporary Landscape fencing</i>

- *Temporary grassing – do we provide coverage rates and requirements.*
- *It has watering requirements, do we need to consider Irrigation requirements – drip irrigation systems / micro-irrigation system / subsurface drip irrigation systems*
- *Do we need to articulate the handling of seed mixture*
- *Fertiliser, do we have content like bags to be un-open when brought on-site and have labelling etc.*
- *Topsoil nutrient level tabled information*

In referencing a third party document (BCC) will mean we never really have full control of the content.

GRC preference would be to take the content out that meets CMDG's needs. If we reference BCC specification the ongoing review of the BCC documents would be required to ensure that content is still suitable.

In referencing others does it start to take us away from a one stop shop model we keep trying to achieve for our customers, on the other hand if the information is out there why reinvent the wheel.

FNQROC may have some content in their development manuals that can add value to the development of content for CMDG.

Is the referencing of a 24 pages specification within our own 14 page specification over complicating things?

Marked up version by Scott is included as **Attachment K**.

Additional comments/ feedback from GRC:

- The objectives in D10 come from the Pine Rivers Plan 2006 (**Attachment K1**) and PSP30 for landscaping (**Attachment K2**) and have no context with anything in the document.
- The FNQROC 2005 D9 (**Attachment K3**) document was the starting point for D10 landscaping design and the current 2019 D9 (**Attachment K4**) is where it is now.
- Sections within D10 have been modified from original which makes it difficult to compare.
- S190 specification began as a reference specification for Brisbane City Council in 2000 (refer attached part D - **Attachment K5**) and was not based on Natspec (refer to images below). In 2001 there was a landscaping design guideline for tree planting (Part B07 **Attachment K6**)
- Mackay landscaping documentation appears to be based on the FNQROC development manual.
- Recommendation is to start the specification again with the FNQROC D9 document as a basis/ guide, then incorporate the S190 information (**Attachment K7 & K8**) from Brisbane City Council. Note that some content from BCC S190 relates the CMDG construction spec C273.

For discussion and consideration.

Response from IPWEAQ re sharing of drawings

IPWEA are aware that a number of LGAs refer to IPWEA drawings and some also upload them to their own websites. IPWEA don't really support this but are understanding of the issues with access due to the paywall.

IPWEA support the idea of a free access model and are exploring various contribution models with a focus on providing free access to end users. However, they see some potential difficulties with implementation given the input and investment from number of LGAs and organisations. They note that the introduction of the 3 tiered subscription model, with Bronze providing access to the technical documents only, may help to make the content more accessible.

Until a free access model (or otherwise) is implemented IPWEA's position is for drawings to be referenced to their website rather than be uploaded elsewhere. However, they have no plans to police the upload of sharing for the drawings as they don't believe this would be helpful to industry.

M2024.07 Discussion

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant Vaughan (RRC) advised that the draft documentation had been circulated internally. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will propose further changes – i.e. irrigation etc. Nathan Garvey (BSC) advised similarly had been circulated internally and will provide comments. Jarvis Black (MRC) advised similarly. Discussion on GRC comments and creating a coherent document that contains all the content relevant to CMDG. General agreement that this should be the approach. Richard raised that C273 may have some overlaps with S190 and all documents need to be considered together. Jarvis noted that content and planting in C273 is limited for to verge and medians environments. <p><u>M2024.07 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LGA's to provide feedback to MCE. FNQROC and NATSPEC to be reviewed and considered. Key content to be extracted from S190 and included in D10. <p><u>M2024.08 Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant advised RRC are putting together a document that covers their requirements on this topic. Multiple RRC staff are providing input. Expected completion is within weeks. Agreement that further review by committee is held until RRCs document is completed. <p><u>M2024.09 Update</u> Grant to advise on progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RRC continuing with the updating of D10 document. Draft expected to be finalised around February 2025. <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u> RRC to advise on progress.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant advised February is unlikely to be achieved as RRC are having a number of internal workshop. Likely to be ready for committee review closer to end of March. <p><u>Action By</u> RRC</p>
M24.07.02	<p>D1 – Wildlife Corridors</p> <p>Livingstone Shire Council proposes to update the <i>CMDG Design Guidelines D1 – Geometric Road Design</i>, to enhance the requirement of wildlife corridors over road design. We have drafted the following updating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Under Clause D01.04 of CMDG Geometric Road Design, <i>Fauna Sensitive Road Design</i> by Department of Transport and Main Road and <i>Queensland Urban Drainage Manual</i> shall be included as reference and source document. Under Annexure D01E – Livingstone Shire Council D1 Road Design Hierarchy Tables (note: this table is specifically for LSC, no need to be agreed by other Councils): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife Corridors for Major Urban Collector shall be “Yes”. A note shall be added to the item of “Wildlife Corridors” on the table of “Urban Areas” as below: For a road with hierarchy of Major Urban Collector or higher, if it runs through the area under biodiversity overlay, or area with biodiversity concerns by local authority, wildlife corridors for terrestrial animals shall be provided. The detail of the wildlife corridor, including the size, location, frequency, shall be assessed and determined by suitably qualified person. For a road with hierarchy of Major Urban Collector or higher, if it runs through a waterway under biodiversity overlay, or a waterway with biodiversity concerns by local

authority, wildlife corridor shall be design in associated with the culvert crossing design. The detail of the wildlife corridor, including the size, location, frequency, shall be assessed and determined by suitably qualified person.

(3) A note shall be added under the table of "Rural Areas" as below:

Wildlife Corridors for terrestrial animals and/or associated with drainage facilities shall be designed by a suitably qualified person , for rural roads passing through areas with critical biodiversity concerns, as per the determination by local authority.

3. Under Standard Drawing No. CMDG-R-013 and CMDG-R-014, similar note as the above could be added. (Note: the standard drawings are applicable to all Councils. Putting these provisions in might need to be discussed in CMDG committee. But we could make an applicable table to define which Council applies.)

4. Add the following provisions under "Urban Design Criteria" (note: the provisions are applicable to all Council, which shall be discussed in CMDG committees. But we could make an applicable table to define which Council applies):

D01.26 Wildlife Corridors

D01.26.01 Wildlife Corridors for terrestrial animals shall be designed in accordance with *Fauna Sensitive Road Design by Department of Transport and Main Road*, or any other relevant standards, by a suitably qualified person, for roads of a certain hierarchy, as per the determination by local authority,.

D01.26.02 Wildlife Corridors at culverts or any drainage facilities associated with the road shall be designed in accordance with *Queensland Urban Drainage Manual and Austroad Guideline, Guide to Road Design Part 5: Drainage – General and Hydrology Considerations*, or any other relevant standards, by a suitably qualified person, for roads of a certain hierarchy, as per the determination by local authority.

5. Add the following provisions under "Rural Design Criteria" (note: the provisions are applicable to all Council, which shall be discussed in CMDG committees. But we could make an applicable table to define which Council applies):

D01.32 Wildlife Corridors

D01.32.01 Wildlife Corridors for terrestrial animals and/or associated with drainage facilities shall be designed in accordance with *Fauna Sensitive Road Design by Department of Transport and Main Road, Queensland Urban Drainage Manual and Austroad Guideline, Guide to Road Design Part 5: Drainage – General and Hydrology Considerations*, or any other relevant standards, by a suitably qualified person , for rural roads passing through areas with critical biodiversity concerns, as per the determination by local authority,.

The above proposals are very general provisions, only to enhance the requirement of wildlife corridor. No detail specifications were added. Details should still be considered by the engineer conducting the design.

Related references are **~~Attachments L1-3~~**

M2024.08 update


Brief summary from Allen about LSC's wish to include information and direction on the inclusion of wildlife corridors.

Rich noted that environmental requirements are usually covered by State legislation and approvals. However, inclusion of general guidance in CMDG documentation may be beneficial provided it does not contradict or confuse state requirements.

Wildlife corridors to be discussed further in the next meeting.

M2024.09 update

Suggest adding proposed clauses to D1 but remove road hierarchy reference as the requirement should be based on the environmental requirements rather than the road type. For note LSC's planning scheme (A04.1) does not refer to road hierarchy:

	<p>the Schedule SC7.5.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 48%;"> <p>PO4 Development protects existing biodiversity corridors and assists in the establishment of new corridors which have adequate dimensions and characteristics to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) unimpeded movement of terrestrial and aquatic fauna that are associated with or are likely to use the biodiversity corridor as part of their normal life cycle evolutionary and genetic processes; (b) the natural change in distributions of species and connectivity between populations of species over long periods of time; (c) ecological responses to climate change; (d) maintenance of large scale seasonal/ migratory species processes and movement of fauna; (e) connectivity between large tracts and patches of native remnant vegetation and habitat areas; and (f) effective and continuous movement of </div> <div style="width: 48%;"> <p>AO4.1 Development involving roads, pipelines, pedestrian access and in-stream structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) does not create barriers to the movement of fauna (including fish passage) along or within biodiversity corridors; or (b) provides effective wildlife movement infrastructure in accordance with best practice which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) enables fauna to safely negotiate a development area; and (ii) separates fauna from potential hazards through the use of appropriate fencing. <p>AO4.2 Development ensures that biodiversity corridors have a sufficient width to protect habitat, minimise impacts from adjoining land use, and to enhance connectivity in accordance with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) regional corridors retain a width of at least </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div>Livingstone Shire Council</div> <div>Livingstone Planning Scheme 2018 Version 3 Page P8-12</div> </div>  <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution</u> Make updates to D1 to provide general guidance and help to support and direct better outcomes in relation to wildlife corridors. Additional more specific information to be provided at a later date if there is a demand or requirement.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u> Document updates in progress.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard advised updates are ongoing and will be circulated for review by the committee. 	
M24.08.01	<p>CCTV Survey for new sewers Extract from industry notification from RRC:</p> <p>Rockhampton Regional Council is introducing a new requirement for CCTV inspections of all gravity sewer mains (including property connections) before the 'Works Acceptance' inspection (either On Defects or Final inspection) for all developments. This requirement will be effective from October 14, 2024, and will be conditioned in all Sewerage Operational Works Decision Notices issued from that date.</p> <p>The decision to implement this measure stems from a number of instances of damage or bowing in newly constructed sewer mains, which have been identified after the defect liability period and required costly repairs. Additionally, more than half of the Local Councils that follow the Capricorn Municipal Development Guidelines (CMDG) already require CCTV inspections as part of their sewer works inspection process.</p> <p><u>Currently included in D12 – Sewerage Design of the CMDG under Asset Inspection and Testing, is the following item:</u> D12.26.04. For CCTV, flushing of the system must be completed and the CCTV procedure must be completed when all other tests have been completed. A digital copy of the CCTV footage and the consultant's assessment report is to be submitted to the Sewerage Service Provider as part of the certification of the pipe system.</p> <p><u>Proposed Inclusion:</u> The requirement will be reflected in the Decision Notice for Operational Works with a note included in the Inspection Requirements and a condition in the Sewer. The condition will be: <i>All gravity sewer mains are to have CCTV inspections completed and a report given to Council at least 10 days prior to the 'Works Acceptance' Inspection. CCTV is to be completed after all underground service mains have been installed.</i></p> <p>Tables to be updated as required.</p>	

	<p><u>Comments:</u> Are LSC and IRC also considering implementing the requirement for CCTV of new sewers? Noting that GRC, CHRC, BSC and MRC already have this requirement.</p> <p>For discussion</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Suggested Resolution</u> D12 and CP1 to be updated to suit changed CCTV survey requirements.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates to D12 required to reference the need for CCTV survey. • D12 and CP1 updates are to clarify the CCTV procedure required. Reference WSA 05-2020 Conduit Inspection Reporting Code of Australia. • D12 updates to define 'ponding'. • Update to include RRC, LSC & IRC – Yes, CCTV to be implemented. • MCE to complete a general review of CP1. <p>Revised wording: D12.26.04 For CCTV, flushing of the system and the CCTV procedure must be completed when all other <i>sewer main</i> tests have been completed. A digital copy of the CCTV footage and the consultant's assessment report <i>of all gravity mains</i> are to be submitted to the Sewerage Service Provider as part of the certification of the pipe system <i>at least 10 days prior to the 'Works Acceptance' Inspection. CCTV is to be completed after all underground service mains have been installed.</i></p> <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u> Document updates in progress.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard advised updates are ongoing and will be circulated for review by the committee. <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M24.08.02	<p>Changes to drawing applicability table Numerous queries have been received by MCE in relation to the meaning of the "Applicable DWG" reference in the applicability table. There is also confusion as to what the table means.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Discussion</u> The issue of potential misinterpretation was discussed. Generally it was discussed that the risk of the misinterpretation was low and therefore did not warrant updates to all drawings. It was discussed however that there may be a benefit to making the presentation of the table more clear to reduce the chance of missing the table altogether. Suggested adding the word "Drawing" to the Applicability Table title and changing "Applicability Table" row heading to "Alternate Drawing".</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution</u> MCE to provide a draft update for consideration to make the table clearer.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Suggested Resolution</u> The following is provided as a draft update to all drawing applicability tables for consideration. Adoption of this moving forward is suggested as the resolution to this item.</p>

DRAWING APPLICABILITY TABLE

Council	BSC	CHRC	GRC	IRC	LSC	MRC	RRC
Applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALTERNATE DRAWING		CMDG-R-040A					

Following adoption, it is suggested that all drawings be revised (where possible) to update this.

M2025.01 Resolution

- Agreed to adopt and update drawings progressively.
- Discussed policy reference on drawings for GRC – also agreed to address on a case-by-case basis.

Action By:

MCE

M24.09.02

Street Tree Planting – No resolution at meeting M2025.01

Street trees are a requirement of the State Planning Regulations:

Planning (Walkable Neighbourhoods) Amendment Regulation 2020

[s 6]

does not exceed the lesser of—

- (a) a maximum length for a boundary of a block stated in a local assessment benchmark for the reconfiguration; or
 - (b) 250m.
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to a block for the reconfiguration that the development application for the reconfiguration states will be subdivided as part of a future stage of development.

6 Street trees

The reconfiguration provides shade for comfortable walking by—

- (a) if a local assessment benchmark for the reconfiguration requires the planting of more than 1 tree per 15m on each side of a new road—complying with the local assessment benchmark; or
- (b) otherwise—ensuring at least 1 tree is planted per 15m on each side of a new road.

Requirement is for trees at 15m spacing.

Some LGAs are currently enforcing this. MCE have completed some sketches of available space with offsets in accordance with the clearances shown on G-016 and in the revised D15 document. Refer ~~Attachments G1 and G2.~~

There are difficulties with fitting trees, footpath and infrastructure within the current 4m (typical) minimum verge.

One solution is to increase the minimum verge width to 5m. Note that this may require increase road reserved widths in some cases.

For discussion.

M2024.09 Discussion:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree to be 2m from driveway not 4.5m. Post meeting note – D15 content has 1m clearance to tree or canopy below 2m. Suggest matching to this: • Verge width likely are required to be increased to 4.5m minimum to accommodate. • LSC and RRC need to increase verge widths to accommodate – to be addressed in D1 updates. • Agreed that a reduced light pole clearance is necessary to accommodate the tree spacing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ MCE to investigate a reasonable reduction. • Discussed pedestrian sight from the pram ramp and relevant tree offset. Scott McDonald (SMcD) suggested 5m might be reasonable. • Boundary clearance to driveway to remain 2m (as per D15) to leave space for driveway wings in the situation where driveways are located on the same boundary. • SMcD suggested that it may be reasonable to adopt a density vs a spacing – e.g. 2 trees in 30m vs 1 tree per 15m. • Richard Bywater (RB) raised that it may be worthwhile creating a standard tree planting drawing. IPWEAQ drawing may be suitable. <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate reasonable lightpole offset reduction. Consider 3m minimum with 9m desirable? • Ensure that limitation on the reduced offset to infrastructure is limited to street trees. • 1m from back of kerb to tree to be adopted. • Update drawing CMDG-G-016. • Ensure D10 and D15 content matches with the street tree drawings. <p><u>M2025.01 Update</u></p> <p>MCE have investigated various aspects of this item and have the following advice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS1158.3 does not provide specific guidance on street lighting offsets for vegetation, and instead recommends that a policy be created to manage the issue for new installations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A desktop review of new large-scale developments in the SEQ area shows ~9m offset to vegetation could be appropriate and has generally been adopted. ◦ A review of a typical 7.5m street lighting pole isolux contours for ground illuminance vs ~9m spacing shows that the degree of obstruction for mature trees should be fairly minimal. ◦ Therefore, suggest maintaining 9m as a desirable minimum. • AS1158.3 suggests 0.7m clearance from back of kerb to road lighting poles. MCE have cross-checked this with BCC's standard street tree drawing, which shows <0.7m clearance to street trees from back of kerb. In order to adopt a common approach between street trees and road lighting poles, suggest adopting 0.7m clearance from back of kerb to street tree. This works well with other considerations such as footpath offsets to maintain roof drainage cover etc. • Updates to CMDG-G-016, D10 and D15 to be carried out on confirmation of the above. <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M24.09.04	<p>Design of Local Roads – No resolution at meeting M2025.01</p> <p>Richard Bywater (RB) raised the increasing prevalence of traffic (speed/volume) issues within master-planned subdivisions, noting that CMDG does not offer any guidance in terms of best practice for master planning – e.g. limiting lot distance to a higher order road to reduce the occurrence of 'rat running'. The subject was tabled for discussion and to gauge the Committee's appetite to incorporate a future section within D1 addressing the topic.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Discussion</u></p> <p>Discussed the need for implementing a section within CMDG regarding the 'strategic planning' of the road network to better manage speed and function of road networks. The topic of operational speed was discussed with regards to the planning of the subdivision road layout, noting that there</p>

	<p>are minimal opportunities post-approval to reduce operational speed and that better application of the road hierarchy prior to approval is one way to achieve the desired outcome.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution</u> MCE to draft a 'strategic planning' section to add to D1 with regards to pre-approval requirements to achieve sound traffic outcomes.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Suggested Resolution</u> Refer to the attached Attachment E for the suggested section to be added to D1.</p> <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>
M24.09.05	<p>List of Specifications – No resolution at meeting M2025.01 Jarvis Black (JB) requested a list of specifications to be created. To incorporate all documents/drawings etc. To be created to allow for use as a 'for project use' annexure.</p> <p><u>M2024.09 Resolution</u> A document/drawing list is to be created.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Suggested Resolution</u> The drawing register, provided as Attachment F of the meeting agenda, contains the proposed updated drawing register. It is suggested that this be adopted moving forward, with a word document version to be hosted on the website for use as an annexure to contracts in a similar format to the MRTS annexure system. Some detail will be removed from the register, namely the detail that relates to revision tracking history etc, as part of the final register to be uploaded.</p> <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>
M25.01.01	<p>Amendment to PS-11 – No resolution at meeting M2025.01 In order to clarify the difference between ductile and cast iron in terms of approved body casting materials, it is proposed that "ductile iron or" be added to PS-11 – refer to Attachment G.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Suggested Resolution</u> That the proposed changes be adopted.</p>
M25.01.02	<p>Tandem Parking Scott raised the issue of tandem parking arrangements and queried if other councils have had the same issue. Jamie advised they have had a few cases.</p> <p>Todd advised that it's predominantly for childcare centres and provided some history on the matter. In summary developers are trying to maximise use of the land and in some cases over use it. Thoughts are that in certain situations, e.g. employee only, tandem parking could be acceptable but use should be limited.</p> <p>Nathan advised BCC sets out rates on a use basis.</p> <p><u>M2025.01 Discussion</u> General agreement that use of tandem parking should be limited and CMDG should include some additional guidance on this without introducing any contradiction with LGA planning schemes. MCE to provide wording to limit to a reasonable use of shared parking and incorporate into D1 for a suggested addition.</p> <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>