

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

2025 MEETING 4 MINUTES

Venue: Teams
Date and Time: 17th July 2025 at 11am

Item																																
1	Welcome Attendance: Brendan Fuller (GRC) Mohit Paudyal (RRC) Grant Vaughan (RRC) Nathan Garvey (BSC) Todd Lisle (MCE) Richard Bywater (MCE) Scott McDonald (GRC) Sarah Banda (CHRC) Jarvis Black (MRC) Bradley Dinsdale (LSC) Michael Stanton (IRC)																															
2	Apologies: Chandrasiri Jayalath (BSC) Jon Ashman (LSC) Anthony Lipsys (BSC) Cameron Hoffman (MRC) Jamie McCaul (RRC) Frans Krause (GRC)																															
3	True and correct record of minutes from previous meeting Refer Attachment A Meeting M2025.03 minutes have been uploaded following 2 week review period by committee and no comments.																															
4	Terms of reference and Budget CMDG Governance and Tender documents currently under review. Jamie to provide update if available. <u>M2025.04 Update</u> CMDG tender has gone out and is closed. Governance document has been finalised prior to the tender going out.																															
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. New wording: This includes items which still require discussion or direction from the committee or items not considered previously due to time constraints.																															
	<table> <tr> <th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr> <tr> <td>M24.06.03</td><td>Erosion and Sediment Control Documents</td><td>RRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M24.06.05</td><td>D10 Landscaping Design</td><td>RRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.02.02</td><td>Minimum Watermain Size</td><td>LSC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.03.01</td><td>Drawing D-032 Additional Details</td><td>LSC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.03.02</td><td>Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.03.03</td><td>Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.03.04</td><td>Industrial Sewer Loading</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.03.05</td><td>Manual for Guardrail</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Item number	Item	Proponent	M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC	M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC	M25.02.02	Minimum Watermain Size	LSC	M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details	LSC	M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist	MCE	M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2	MCE	M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading	MCE	M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail	MCE				
Item number	Item	Proponent																														
M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC																														
M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC																														
M25.02.02	Minimum Watermain Size	LSC																														
M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details	LSC																														
M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist	MCE																														
M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2	MCE																														
M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading	MCE																														
M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail	MCE																														
6	New Agenda Items <table> <tr> <th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>		Item number	Item	Proponent																											
Item number	Item	Proponent																														

Item	
7	General Business Scott provided an update on the website with regards to the Granicus migration. Noted that the migration is underway. Richard queried if there would be updates to the website processes and Scott advised that training on the website operation would be required.
8	Next Meeting Next meeting to be Thursday 28 th August at 11am via teams.
9	CMDG Action Register The latest register is Attachment B Richard suggested to move Agenda Item 9 before current Item 4 to streamline the presentation of the action register. Queried if anyone would like to review draft agenda prior to incorporating into the next meeting. Scott provided a rundown of the proposed suggestions to update the action register. Suggested that statuses are better captured. Agreed that we continue to remove items from the agenda to the action register as they progress. MCE will make some updates/ improvement to the register and circulate with the agenda for the next meeting. Brendan suggested that the wording in the agenda could be updated to better clarify the intent of the items within the agenda. I.e. any items in Item 5 are items with no assigned action. CMDG Trial Register The latest register is Attachment C Schedule 1 The latest schedule is Attachment D
10	Meeting closed at: 12PM

Agenda Items Detail

Item No.	Item Details
M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents In progress <u>M2025.02 Discussion</u> Jamie McCaul provided an update on the progress of the documents. RRC has progressed the documentation and will provide a policy document to the ESC sub-committee before providing to the CMDG committee for information. It was advised that sites greater than 2500m ² were being treated on a case-by-case basis in terms of the need for a HES basin and that low risk sites as determined by the RUSLE equation may not require a HES basin. The policy will also include a section for asset handover. For bio basins on sites smaller than 2ha that are not staged it is expected that the policy will require the developer to construct the under drainage, cap the filter media and pay contributions towards planting. <u>M2025.03 Update</u> A draft has been provided by Jamie which has been reviewed by MCE and GRC. Proposed updates have been actioned and the draft D7 document has been attached as Attachment E for discussion. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Proposed that the two-week review period be started 08/05/2025. Richard advised that MCE will provide a summary of revisions email. Jamie questioned if the asset handover documentation has been incorporated into the main document. Confirmed it has been kept separate. Scott advised it would be best to keep LGA specific process outside of the main document however additional feedback on the matter would be provided at a later date.

	Jamie advised he had considered putting together a separate guideline regarding water quality that could cover asset handover however noted the complexity of this and that it may not be directly correlated with ESCP (construction). Jamie confirmed that he would begin compiling this document and provide to the committee for review at a later date. Richard put to the committee if there was any additional feedback on the matter. • GRC – confirmed to keep the ESCP doc separate to the asset handover doc in order to get the content into circulation. • MRC – requested summary of what precipitated the changes. • No other feedback provided. <u>M2025.03 Actions</u> • MCE to send separate email with changes and include a summary of why the changes have happened. • Jamie to begin compiling separate document regarding operational and asset handover. <u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Discussed changes received by committee. Key feedback from MRC suggested that that a new introduction section is required to better clarify the application of the document. General agreement from the committee to include this. Agreed that a 5 working day review period for the revised document. Mohit suggested that this is too long and requested to send the document as is. Richard suggested that we incorporate the new section and send to industry for review concurrently with the committee review. Jarvis suggested that a flowchart would help direct the use of the document as part of the new section. <u>M2025.04 Resolution</u> • Incorporate new section. • Send to industry for review in tandem with committee review. <u>Action By</u> MCE
M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design In progress <u>M2025.02 Update</u> Grant Vaughan advised that the review committee may be recommending changes to planting near intersections. Discussed that this item was being addressed separately as part of M24.09.02. Ongoing and no further resolution. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Grant advised no additional updates. Progress is still underway however it is being slowed by interlinking with other policies etc. <u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Grant advised that no updates are able to be provided. No further discussion. <u>Action By</u> RRC
M25.02.02	Minimum Watermain Size Livingstone Shire Council have proposed to update the minimum pipe size of water mains, from 100mm to 150mm due to input from various internal stakeholders. Clause D11.09.04 refers.

	D11.09.04. The minimum water main size shall be 100mm nominal diameter (DN) in residential areas and minimum 150mm DN in industrial/commercial areas, with the exception of 63OD poly in residential cul-de-sac loop-mains, if permitted by the Water Supply Service Provider. In all cases, pipe sizes and residual pressures shall be designed to cater for firefighting flows. Minimum Pipe Size This will also impact some of the standard drawings. Allen will provide some further information and justifications. The construction cost increase is approximately 20% from 100mm to 150mm so there may be some questions from industry, but this cost is small in the scheme of a typical development. <u>M2025.03 Suggested Resolution</u> Update the text in clause D11.09.04 or update the text and add a table of difference. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Richard noted that the larger diameter may have an impact on water quality in some scenarios due to lower velocity and longer retention. Watermain sizing is typically bespoke and modelled for each development to determine the size requirements. Jamie noted that RRC has an extensive amount of 100mm on the network without issue, likely similar to other LGAs. Allen advised further information is required from LSC Water and Wastewater internally. Allen confirmed no actions and suggested resolution should wait. <u>M2025.03 Action</u> Allen to provide further information. <u>M2025.04 Update</u> MCE held a meeting with LSC to further discuss the matter. The following is a brief record off the discussion: • The request to increase minimum water main size from DN100 to DN150 is mainly due to requests from LSC Operations. • Issues arising from DN100 mains that result in the desire to increase to DN150 are predominantly: ○ DN150 provides additional capacity to achieve fire flows. ○ DN100 and DN150 interface has created a choke point in some instances throughout the network. It was ultimately agreed by LSC that while they had expressed interest in the change, they would only be interested in adopting the increase in minimum diameter should that be the consensus of the greater CMDG committee. It was discussed that a qualifying statement could be added to D12 in lieu of the change to give the LGA a chance to request the larger minimum diameter from a developer should they wish to do so. <u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Bradley advised that he had not discussed this item with the wider LSC team prior to the meeting and that he would require further time to form an opinion on the matter. Richard advised that MCE had discussed with LSC Infrastructure Planning and Development Engineering Team and summarised that discussion. Committee advised they didn't have any interest in adopting a change. <u>M2025.04 Resolution</u> Agreed to close this item out.
--	--

M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details Additional details have been requested to be provided on CMDG Standard Drawing D-032: • Square opening on roof slab detail. • Cast-insitu chamber details (including reinforcement) up to and including 3000x3000. An example of such details are provided by Bundaberg Regional Council standard drawings D2101, D2102, D2201, D2202, D2301 and D2302 – refer to Attachment E. <u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Richard provided background on this item noting that a range of cases should have a custom design provided that doesn't typically happen. Noted that Attachment E provides an example of the proposed changes to cover more information (i.e. reinforcement, sizes, penetration details etc). Brendan advised that IPWEA withdrew their drawings for rectangular access covers. The risk of no design being provided was discussed and that providing drawings would assist to ensure this is mitigated. Grant advised that preference would be to not providing overarching certification with disclaimers as such, or alternatively, provide a specific certification by an RPEQ on the drawings. Scott suggested that the RPEQ certification could be covered by the existing CMDG form process. It was discussed whether or not this item should be a priority in reference to other drawing updates underway. Richard suggested MCE could request the drawing files from Bundaberg Regional Council to assist in expediting the updates. Consensus was that the information would be beneficial to the committee. Scott suggested that this could be applied as a job to maintain workload as necessary. <u>M2025.04 Resolution</u> • MCE to request the drawing files from Bundaberg Regional Council. • MCE to provide a fee proposal to provide the design/s. <u>Action By:</u> MCE
M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist CMDG has recently included LSC's SPS Commissioning Checklist as a 'Council Specific' document. If any other LGA would like to use this document, it can be generalised and included in an overarching document (e.g. CP1). <u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Richard provided background info on this item noting that Brendan had noticed the pre-commissioning checklist has not been provided by LSC. Mohit advised RRC is in the process of making their own checklist. Bradley advised he'd follow up internally to try get access to the pre-commissioning checklist and provide to the committee. <u>M2025.04 Resolution</u> No resolution. Further discussion to be had at the next meeting.

M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2 This item was not discussed at M2025.04 The procedure to quantify the effect of climate change on rainfall depths and other hydrologic processes has been updated with ARR V4.2. The results are a significant increase in magnitude as compared to the previous climate change factors – in Rockhampton for example this is a 3x increase, from 20pct to 60pct increase in rainfall depths (particularly for smaller catchments – e.g. local creek catchment flooding). Currently, the State and overarching authorities have not provided any guidance on the adoption of these new factors. MCE have noticed some movement in industry as various LGA's start to broach the adoption of these changes. It is suggested that a sub-committee be formed to investigate and provide recommendations to the Committee on how D5 should address these changes. <u>M2025.04 Suggested Resolution</u> That the Committee resolve to form a sub-committee to inform future discussions on how D5 should be updated in regard to ARR V4.2. <u>Action By</u>
M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading This item was not discussed at M2025.04 It has been identified that the industrial sewer loading rate provided by D12 is illogical when compared with the water loading rate provided by D11 – i.e. D12 specifies 73.06 EP/ha compared to D11 which specifies 56 EP/ha. The source of this sewer loading rate is not immediately apparent and it is suggested that the suitability of this loading rate be discussed. There are some cases where the use of the default water/ sewer rates may not provide LGAs with the best outcome. E.g. oversized sewer pumpstation. Consider adding text noting that reduced water and sewer loading rates may be suitable for some developments with prior agreement from the LGA. <u>M2025.04 Suggested Resolution</u> Update D11 water rate to align with D12 sewer loading rate or vice versa. <u>Action By</u> MCE
M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail This item was not discussed at M2025.04 TMR are moving towards MASH end terminals in lieu of MELT terminals. The currency of C264 has been queried as it offers conflicting information. It is suggested that C264 be reviewed and updated in line with the document 'TMR Accepted Road Safety Barrier Systems and Devices'.