

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

2025 MEETING 3 MINUTES

Venue: Teams
Date and Time: 8th May 2025 at 11am

Item																										
1	Welcome Attendance: Jamie McCaul (RRC) Grant Vaughan (RRC) Scott McDonald (GRC) Brendan Fuller (GRC) Jarvis Black (MRC) Nathan Garvey (BSC) Sarah Banda (CHRC) Jon Ashman (LSC) Allen Chen (LSC)																									
2	Apologies: Anthony Lipsys (BSC) Frans Krause (GRC) Michael Stanton (IRC) Cameron Hoffmann (MRC) Mohit Paudyal (RRC) Mark Ware (IRC) Leonardo Hurtado Stagnaro (MRC) Chandrasiri Jayalath (BSC)																									
3	True and correct record of minutes from previous meeting Refer Attachment A Meeting M2025.02 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>M2025.03 Update</u> Jarvis advised that the governance document is with the Maranoa CEO for signing.																									
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>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>M24.09.05</td><td>List of Specifications</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.01.01</td><td>Amendment to PS-11</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.01.02</td><td>Shared Parking</td><td>GRC</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.02.01</td><td>Use of Polyethylene Drainage Pipe</td><td>MCE</td></tr> <tr> <td>M25.02.02</td><td>Minimum Watermain Size</td><td>LSC</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Item number	Item	Proponent	M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC	M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC	M24.09.05	List of Specifications	MCE	M25.01.01	Amendment to PS-11	MCE	M25.01.02	Shared Parking	GRC	M25.02.01	Use of Polyethylene Drainage Pipe	MCE	M25.02.02	Minimum Watermain Size	LSC
Item number	Item	Proponent																								
M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC																								
M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC																								
M24.09.05	List of Specifications	MCE																								
M25.01.01	Amendment to PS-11	MCE																								
M25.01.02	Shared Parking	GRC																								
M25.02.01	Use of Polyethylene Drainage Pipe	MCE																								
M25.02.02	Minimum Watermain Size	LSC																								
6	New Agenda Items <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <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>M25.03.06</td><td>In Person Meetings Only</td><td>MCE</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Item number	Item	Proponent	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	M25.03.06	In Person Meetings Only	MCE			
Item number	Item	Proponent																								
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																								
M25.03.06	In Person Meetings Only	MCE																								

Item			
	M25.03.07	New Agenda Items Process	MCE
7	General Business		
8	Next Meeting Next meeting to be Thursday 17 th July 2025 via teams. (Timing of next in-person meeting should be based when large discussion is required on agenda items such as the D10 landscaping document review)		
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: 12:03 PM		

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 2500m² 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. Action By RRC, 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. Action By RRC																																																																																											
M24.09.05	List of Specifications 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. <u>M2024.09 Resolution</u> A document/drawing list is to be created. <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. <u>M2025.02 Suggested Resolution</u> Refer to Attachment G and previous meeting suggested resolution. <u>M2025.02 Discussion</u> - Brendan Fuller requested to check TMR doc 7825 and include checkbox functionality. <u>M2025.03 Update</u> TMR doc 7825 does not include checkbox functionality. However, an example of checkbox implementation is shown below. GRC to confirm if this is to be included in the document. <table><tr><th colspan="13">CMDG DRAWING SUMMARY REGISTER</th></tr><tr><th>Drawing No.</th><th>Drawing Name</th><th>Revision</th><th>Revision Note</th><th>Revision Date</th><th>BSC</th><th>CHRC</th><th>GRC</th><th>IRC</th><th>LSC</th><th>MRC</th><th>RRC</th><th>Status</th></tr><tr><td>I-001</td><td>Index - Standard Drawings</td><td>M</td><td>UPDATED ROAD DRAWINGS</td><td>Mar-24</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Published</td></tr><tr><td colspan="13">Water</td></tr><tr><td>W-005</td><td>Watermain Information Fitting and Bend</td><td>E</td><td>STYLE & NOTE CHANGED, SEPARATED FROM S-005</td><td>Mar-24</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Published</td></tr><tr><td>W-010</td><td>Air Valve Pit 500 and 800 Air Valves</td><td>E</td><td>REINFORCING DETAILS AMENDED</td><td>Dec-17</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Draft</td></tr><tr><td>W-020</td><td>Water Reticulation - Sample as</td><td>F</td><td>POLY PIPE CLASS AMENDED FOR LSC</td><td>Aug-23</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Published</td></tr></table> <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Discussed overall changes and proposed that it is uploaded to the guidelines page of the website under a separate tab. Scott confirmed agreeance. No further feedback provided. <u>M2025.03 Resolution</u> - MCE to upload to the website as discussed. Action By: MCE	CMDG DRAWING SUMMARY REGISTER													Drawing No.	Drawing Name	Revision	Revision Note	Revision Date	BSC	CHRC	GRC	IRC	LSC	MRC	RRC	Status	I-001	Index - Standard Drawings	M	UPDATED ROAD DRAWINGS	Mar-24								Published	Water													W-005	Watermain Information Fitting and Bend	E	STYLE & NOTE CHANGED, SEPARATED FROM S-005	Mar-24								Published	W-010	Air Valve Pit 500 and 800 Air Valves	E	REINFORCING DETAILS AMENDED	Dec-17								Draft	W-020	Water Reticulation - Sample as	F	POLY PIPE CLASS AMENDED FOR LSC	Aug-23								Published
CMDG DRAWING SUMMARY REGISTER																																																																																												
Drawing No.	Drawing Name	Revision	Revision Note	Revision Date	BSC	CHRC	GRC	IRC	LSC	MRC	RRC	Status																																																																																
I-001	Index - Standard Drawings	M	UPDATED ROAD DRAWINGS	Mar-24								Published																																																																																
Water																																																																																												
W-005	Watermain Information Fitting and Bend	E	STYLE & NOTE CHANGED, SEPARATED FROM S-005	Mar-24								Published																																																																																
W-010	Air Valve Pit 500 and 800 Air Valves	E	REINFORCING DETAILS AMENDED	Dec-17								Draft																																																																																
W-020	Water Reticulation - Sample as	F	POLY PIPE CLASS AMENDED FOR LSC	Aug-23								Published																																																																																

M25.01.01	Amendment to PS-11 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. <u>M2025.01 Suggested Resolution</u> That the proposed changes be adopted. <u>M2025.02 Suggested Resolution</u> Refer to Attachment H and previous meeting suggested resolution. <u>M2025.03 Update</u> Brendan provided a recommendation to reference AS 4956 and removing the reference to ‘not cast iron’ and ‘not rubber’. This has been incorporated as below: AIR VALVES FOR WATER SUPPLY PURPOSES <u>1.0</u> Air valves shall comply with AS 4956. <u>2.0</u> Air valves are to be 'Combination or Double Purpose' type ie. combination of large orifice and small orifice to allow the exit/entry of air from/to water mains during filling/operation/emptying. <u>3.0</u> Minimum Ppressure rating 1000 kPa, above-ground conditions. <u>4.0</u> Body castings can be either ductile iron or glass reinforced plastic (GRP) or gunmetal material or corrosion resistant material. Not cast iron. <u>5.0</u> Floats can be either GRP or polypropylene or stainless steel or other corrosion resistant material. Not rubber. <u>6.0</u> Seals can be either rubber or polyurethane. 6.07.0 Connection to be BSP male thread. Sizes 25mm or 50mm. <u>8.0</u> Nominal sizes larger than 50mm to be in accordance with WSAA Purchase Specification WSA PS-265. <u>9.0</u> This specification takes precedence, but where this specification is silent on a matter then the order of priority for reference shall be the relevant Australian Standard, and then the relevant WSAA Purchase Specification. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Discussed the changes proposed. Scott requested two weeks review period. No further feedback provided. <u>M2025.03 Resolution</u> • MCE to send an email regarding PS-11 two week review period.
M25.01.02	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. 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. Nathan advised BCC sets out rates on a use basis. <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.

M2025.02 Update

MCE has reviewed the LGA's planning schemes for existing reference to tandem or shared parking. BSC, CHRC, LSC and RRC all reference tandem or shared parking in a residential use setting only. There is no precedent or reference to commercial use.

We have also reviewed Brisbane City Council, Gold Coast City Council and Moreton Bay City Council to gauge what precedent may exist outside the CMDG:

- BCC refers to '60% of spaces are for staff and can be provided in tandem' for childcare centres. This is the only reference to commercial tandem or shared parking use.
- GCCC does not refer to tandem or shared parking in a commercial use.
- MBCC does not refer to tandem or shared parking at all.

It appears that the issue requires additional consideration on a LGA by LGA basis.

M2025.03 Suggested Resolution

The following be added to CMDG D1:

Tandem Parking

Tandem parking (the parking of two vehicles in a single double-length parking space) for commercial uses may be approved by the LGA on a project specific basis. To assist in guiding the application of tandem parking, refer to table xyz.

Table xyz – Tandem Parking Approval and Arrangement

Local Government	Tandem Parking Arrangement
Banana Shire	
Central Highlands Regional	
Gladstone Regional	
Isaac Regional	
Livingstone Shire	
Maranoa Regional	
Rockhampton Regional	

LGA's to provide information to fill the table.

M2025.03 Discussion

Scott discussed that this should be residential only for GRC. Recommended that if all LGA's are in agreement that this should be the blanket proposal.

Jamie advised that RRC may support other than residential tandem parking and therefore supports a table of difference. Jamie also questioned the 'residential' case in terms of being misused for high density residential. Therefore suggest 'low-density residential' is the wording.

Nathan advised he might know of a limit BCC provides and would check.

Scott confirmed preference is 'residential only' and not in a table of difference format.

Jamie confirmed RRC would consider further, noting that they have internal documentation that could be used. Jamie to advise further.

M2025.03 Actions

- MCE to provide an email for feedback on table of difference.
- Nathan to provide BCC information if possible.

Action By:
MCE, BSC

M25.02.01

Use of Polyethylene Drainage Pipe

We have been approached by Vinidex in relation to the use of polyethylene stormwater pipes. This relates to their StormFLO product (details here: <https://www.vinidex.com.au/products/stormwater-and-underground-drainage-systems/stormflo-civil-sn8/>)

	D5 Stormwater Drainage Design clause D05.18.01 would need to be updated: D05.18. PIPE MATERIAL D05.18.01. The following pipe materials are approved subject to minimum cover and installation requirements stated by the manufacturer: <i>Pipe material</i> • Steel reinforced concrete pipe and culverts to AS4058; and • Fibre Reinforced pipes to AS4139.; and • Corrugated polypropylene pipes to AS/NZS 5065. Up to 600mm maximum diameter. For use in urban areas only. • Unplasticised Poly Vinyl Chloride (uPVC) pipes to AS/NZS 1254. • Other pipes will be considered subject to individual Local Government Authority approval. The original intent behind discussions and the resolution on the use of plastic stormwater pipes was never meant to preclude the use of specific material types, rather the market at the time seemed more focused around polypropylene pipes e.g. Iplex BlackMax. <u>M2025.03 Suggested resolution</u> Update D5 to allow the use of PE stormwater drainage pipes <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Richard discussed the context and advised the performance characteristics appeared similar to other pipe materials. Scott advised the size (600mm) limit was based on previous discussion on vandalism of pipes. Further, advised with regards to driveway applications (rural), noting standard drawing notes RCP and questioned if a property owner could nominate to use plastic pipes. Raised if there should be an exception should be allowed. Grant discussed the need to specify 'installation in accordance with manufacturers' specifications' in order to manage risk of suitability based on cover etc. Discussed the urgency of the change and Jamie confirmed RRC's opinion is that it is urgent enough to get the PE pipe change out the door. Jarvis requested a separate email with suggested wording of the change to be sent with a review period of 1 week. Scott requested drawing changes to be actioned at the same time (CMDG-R-040). <u>M2025.03 Actions</u> • Include change as per suggested resolution. • Change 'For use in urban areas only' to 'For use in urban areas only, or for rural property driveways where installed in accordance with manufacturers specifications'. • Provide a review email. • Action drawing changes related to this. <u>Action By:</u> MCE
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. <i>Minimum Pipe Size</i>

	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>Action By:</u> LSC
M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details This item was not discussed at M2025.03 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 G. <u>M2025.03 Suggested Resolution</u> To provide details requested on the drawings (and include new drawings to accommodate as required) for chambers up to and including 3000x3000. Discussion and resolution on disclaimer of use required to ensure CMDG liability is limited.
M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist This item was not discussed at M2025.03 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>M2025.03 Suggested Resolution</u> To determine if any LGA's would like to utilise this document and if so, to generalise into a standard format and circulate for adoption.
M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2 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>M2025.03 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.
M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading This item was not discussed at M2025.03 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.
M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail This item was not discussed at M2025.03 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'.
M25.03.06	In Person Meetings Only It is proposed that all future meetings are held in-person only at a frequency elected by the committee. This is proposed in order to optimise the efficiency and productivity of the meeting process. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Suggested based on the new agenda item process the frequency of meetings could be reduced. Grant supported the reduction due to the reduced backlog. Frequency could be based on workload and kept flexible. Scott agreed that frequency could be scaled with workload. Trigger for discussion at a meeting should be raised in response to an email change or resolution. Teams meetings may still be appropriate and Teams/ vs in person can be decided on a case by case basis depending on the amount of content requiring discussion.
M25.03.07	New Agenda Item Process Priority to resolving items out of meetings will be given where possible. 'New agenda items' should be sent via email to the CMDG email and where possible a resolution will be sought to speed up the approval and adoption process. <u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Richard advised that based on discussions with Scott, the suggestion is that some items may not need to be debated at the meeting and therefore a summary email should be sent with the proposed change and a review period be applied outside of the meeting. Scott raised in terms of communication with individual items and the need for traceability. Richard advised a meeting item number might be appropriate. Agreed MCE would trial sending more emails to achieve resolutions outside of meetings if possible.