



NA

Scale:

Job No: P0902346

martens



NA

Scale:

Job No: P0902346



NA

Scale:

Job No: P0902346



BETWEEN DEVELOPED (M2a) AND EXISTING (M1a) WITH MEAN RAINFALL CONDITIONS

26.11.2012

NA

Date: Scale:



Martens & Associates Pty	Ltd ABN 85 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management							
Drawn:	GMH								
Approved:	DMM	GROUNDWATER HEAD EQUIPOTENTIAL DRAWDOWN PLOT BETWEEN DEVELOPED MEAN RAINFALL (M2a) &WET	Figure 12						
Date:	26.11.2012	RAINFALL CONDITIONS (M2b)							
Scale:	NA		Job No: P0902346						



Martens & Associates Pty	Ltd ABN 85 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management							
Drawn:	GMH								
Approved:	DMM	GROUNDWATER HEAD EQUIPOTENTIAL DRAWDOWN PLOT BETWEEN DEVELOPED (M2c) & EXISTING (M1c) WITH MEAN	Figure 13						
Date:	26.11.2012	RAINFALL CONDITIONS & SEA LEVEL RISE							
Scale:	NA		Job No: P0902346						



Martens & Associates Pty	Ltd ABN 85 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management						
Drawn:	GMH							
Approved:	DMM	GROUNDWATER HEAD EQUIPOTENTIAL DRAWDOWN PLOT BETWEEN DEVELOPED MEAN RAINFALL WITH (M2c) &	Figure 14					
Date:	26.11.2012	WITHOUT (M2a) SEA LEVEL RISE						
Scale:	ΝΑ		Job No: P0902346					





martens



Scale:

NA

Job No: P0902346

S
Φ
Ļ
Π

/	0	0.05	green 248	
_/	0.05	0.10	green 216	
	0.10	0.15	green 200	
/	0.15	0.20	green 184	
	0.20	0.25	green 168	
/	0.25	0.30	green 152	
_/	0.30	0.35	green 136	
	0.35	0.40	green 120	
/	0.40	0.45	green 104	
	0.45	0.50	green 088	
	0.50	0.55	blue 248	
	0.55	0.60	blue 216	
	0.60	0.65	blue 200	
	0.65	0.70	blue 184	
	0.70	0.75	blue 168	
	0.75	0.80	blue 152	
	0.80	0.85	blue 136	
	0.85	0.90	blue 120	
	0.90	0.95	blue 104	
	0.95	1.00	blue 088	
	1.00	1.05	cyan 248	
	1.05	1.10	cyan 216	
	1.10	1.15	cyan 200	
	1.15	1.20	cyan 184	
	1.20	1.25	cyan 168	
	1.25	1.30	cyan 152	
	1.30	1.45	cyan 136	
	1.45	1.50	cyan 120	
	1.50	1.55	cyan 104	
	1.55	300	cyan 088	
_				

Martens & Associates Pty	Ltd ABN 85 070 240 890	Environment Water Wastewater Geotechnical Civil Management							
Drawn:	GMH								
Approved:	DMM	GROUNDWATER MODELING DESIGN SURFACE DEM Vs DESIGN GROUNDWATER MEAN	Figure 18						
Date:	26.11.2012	CONDITIONS (M2a) DEM							
Scale:	NA		Job No: P0902346						

-1.00

-0.95

-0.90

-0.85

-0.80

-0.75

-0.70

-0.65

-0.60

-0.55

-0.50

-0.45 -0.40

-0.35

-0.30

-0.25

-0.20

-0.15

-0.10

-0.05 0

-0.95

-0.90

-0.85

-0.80

-0.75

-0.70

-0.65

-0.60

-0.55

-0.50

-0.45 -0.40

-0.35

-0.30

-0.25

-0.20

-0.15 -0.10

magenta 088

magenta 104

magenta 120

magenta 136

magenta 152

magenta 168

magenta 184

magenta 200

magenta 216

magenta 248

red 088

red 104

red 120 red 136

red 152

red 168

red 184

red 200

red 248

-0.05 red 216

19 Attachment 4B – Groundwater Level Data



1 - lost or destroyed sometime between 2004 and 2007. 2 - installed by BR. 3 - ground elevations taken from Martens (july, 2009)

		1	1	1														2	2	2	2			
	GMB	GMB1	GMB2	GMB3	GMB4	GMB5	GMB6	GMB7	GMB8	GMB9	GMB10	GMB11	GMB12	GMB21	GMB22	GMB23	GMB24	GMB1A	GMB2A	GMB25	Lake 26	GMB201	GMB202	GMB203
	Ground level (mAHD)	1.020	2.370	0.845	2.045	2.608	0.861	2.963	2.598	2.859	1.490	3.395	3.261	1.026	1.095	1.111	0.834	1.708	2.479	1.798	0.492	2.740	3.690	5.140
	Concrete cap level (mAHD)	1.020	2.375	0.840	2.131	2.638	1.020	3.163	2.598	2.909	1.310	3.547	3.311											
Source	Date																							
	8/11/1994	0.570	0.850			1.488			1.388	1.459	0.700	1.837	1.951									-		
	24/11/1994	0.410	0.785	0.260		1.338		1.713	1.268	1.319		1.657	1.761											
	6/12/1994	0.300	0.735	0.300		1.268		1.593	1.188	1.319		1.597	1.621											
	22/12/1994	0.250	0.685	0.060		1.188		1.553	1.108	1.229	0.390	1.457	1.481											
	6/01/1995	0.650	0.835	0.720		1.298		1.733	1.258	1.449	0.620	1.437	1.591											
	21/02/1995	0.570	0.765	0.550		1.138		1.563	1.078	1.329	0.480	1.347	1.371											
	8/03/1995	0.240	1.525	0.550		1.658		2.568	0.728	1.159	0.760	2.047	2.332											
	14/03/1995	0.855	1.295	0.780		2.278		2.593	2.098	1.749	0.800	2.127	2.421											
	31/03/1995	0.595	1.020	0.660		1.713		2.243	1.578	1.549	0.615	1.952	1.921											
	19/04/1995	0.440	0.985	0.525		1.433		1.938	1.328	1.399	0.485	1.717	1.646											
	2/05/1995	0.370	0.800	0.250		1.363		1.803	1.218	1.329	0.395	1.562	1.486											
	17/05/1995	0.910	0.995	0.760		1.823		2.133	1.628	1.429	0.830	1.697	1.831											
	18/05/1995	0.930	1.375	0.760		2.328		2.403	2.258	1.699	0.910	2.237	1.601											
Coffey (feb, 1996)	19/05/1995	0.900	1.365	0.760		2.358		2.443	2.208	1.699	0.890	2.067	1.681											
	22/05/1995	0.925	1.795	0.790				2.703	2.458	1.859	1.110	2.257	2.761											
	23/05/1995	0.920	1.825	0.780		2.558		2.723	2.408	1.899	1.070	2.337	2.971											
	24/05/1995	0.920	1./15	0.780		2.538		2.733	2.368	1.859	1.030	2.337	3.051											
	25/05/1995	0.910	1.685	0.780		2.548		2.763	2.348	1.839	1.020	2.477	2.931											
	26/05/1995	0.920	1.695	0.770		2.548		2.743	2.368	1.829	1.050	2.447	2.951											
	21/06/1995	0.880	1 965	0.785		2 228		2.803	2.428	1.969	1.210	2.777	3.041											
	26/07/1995	0.710	0.025	0.760		1 909		2./15	1 059	1.959	1.250	2.747	2.721											
	11/08/1995	0.040	0.925	0.740	1 071	1.608	0.670	2.413	1.558	1.749	0.970	1 967	2.521											
	28/08/1995	0.510	0.025	0.460	0.821	1.000	0.280	1 953	1 528	1.715	0.760	1 837	2.201											
	19/09/1995	0.600		0.740	0.021	2.328	01200	2.423	2.328	1.869	1.160	2.377	2.491											
	20/09/1995	0.620		0.750	1.301	1.598	0.750	2.603	2.278	1.929	1.140		2.641											
-	Late July 1994 - mid Nov 1994						0.500															-		
-	Late July 1994 - late Sept 1994				1.100																	-		
	7/04/2004			0.298	1.144	2.043	0.768	2.816	2.314	2.111	1.101	2.562	2.708									-		
Coffey (Oct, 2007)	11/05/2004			0.232	0.928	1.451		2.081	1.774	1.880	0.836	1.939	2.120	0.778	0.876	0.930	0.681							
	29/03/2007				0.823	1.303			1.534	1.657	0.541	1.689	1.655	0.813	0.826	0.760	0.628							
Martens & Associates (July, 2009)	04/06/2009 - 6/7/2009							2.891		2.375						1.270		0.838	1.198	0.872	0.708			
Martens & Associates (Early Sept 2012)	03/09/2012 or 04/09/2012			0.745	0.985	1.928	0.743	2.383	2.268	2.059	0.975	2.495	2.541	0.803	0.766	0.831	0.834	0.738		0.753		_		
Martens & Associates (Late Sept 2012)	25/09/2012 & 26/09/2012				0.905	1.748	0.563	2.233	2.098	1.959	0.890	2.295										2.08	1.00	4.11
Tattersall Lander (Oct 2012)	11/10/2012																					1.90	0.90	3.82
	Minimum Level (mAHD)	0.24	0.69	0.06	0.82	1.14	0.28	1.55	0.73	1.16	0.39	1.35	1.37	0.78	0.77	0.76	0.63	0.74	1.20	0.75	0.71	1.90	0.90	3.82
	Median Level (mAHD)	0.63	1.02	0.74	0.99	1.71	0.67	2.41	1.96	1.73	0.89	2.06	2.19	0.80	0.83	0.88	0.68	0.79	1.20	0.81	0.71	1.99	0.95	3.97
	Mean Level (mAHD)	0.66	1.24	0.61	1.01	1.81	0.61	2.31	1.83	1.69	0.86	2.08	2.20	0.80	0.82	0.95	0.71	0.79	1.20	0.81	0.71	1.99	0.95	3.97
	Maximum Level (mAHD)	0.93	2.02	0.79	1.30	2.56	0.77	2.89	2.46	2.38	1.23	3.01	3.05	0.81	0.88	1.27	0.83	0.84	1.20	0.87	0.71	2.08	1.00	4.11
	Min Depth (m) to GW	0.09	0.36	0.06	0.74	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.48	0.26	0.39	0.21	0.21	0.22	-0.16	0.00	0.87	1.28	0.93	-0.22	0.66	2.69	1.03
	Depth range	0.69	1.33	0.73	0.48	1.42	0.49	1.34	1.73	1.22	0.84	1.66	1.68	0.03	0.11	0.51	0.21	0.10	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.18	0.10	0.29
	Mean Depth (m) below Ground level	0.36	1.13	0.24	1.04	0.80	0.25	0.65	0.77	1.17	0.63	1.32	1.06	0.23	0.27	0.16	0.12	0.92	1.28	0.99	-0.22	0.75	2.74	1.18

estimated median based on visual observation of plot

mean from martens diver monitoring

20 Attachment 4C – Groundwater Quality Data



Source	Sample date		GMB1	GMB2	GMB3	GMB4	GMB5	GMB6	GMB7	GMB8	GMB9	GMB10	GMB11	GMB12	GMB13	GMB21	GMB22	GMB23	GMB24	GMB1A	GMB2A	GMB25	Lake 26	Lake	GMB201	GMB202	GMB203
		рН	6.40	5.30	6.20			6.00				5.60	6.00	5.30													
		TDS (mg/L)	490.00	190.00	13900.00			1900.00				420.00	2300.00	220.00													
Coffey	Average result	Chloride (mg/L)	220.00	82.00	7600.00			1100.00				150.00	1200.00	60.00													
(Feb, 1996)	13/12/94 to 29/8/1995	Sulphate (mg/L)	33.00	16.00	1200.00			170.00				5.00	170.00	25.00													
	20,0,2000	Magnesium (mg/L)	36.00	6.00	540.00			76.00				8.40	85.00	5.20													
		Calcium (mgLL)	9.00	1.20	160.00			33.00				7.20	22.00	2.20													
		рН				5.32								5.02		5.62	6.05	5.60	5.46								
		TDS (mg/L)				155.00								1210.00		11500.00	1350.00	212.00	2250.00								
		Chloride (mg/L)				50.40								64.60		5300.00	430.00	58.70	800.00								
		Sulphate (mg/L)				10.00								22.00		702.00	39.00	6.00	344.00								
Coffey (Oct, 2007)	29/03/2007	Magnesium (mg/L)				4.00								6.00		420.00	23.00	7.00	54.00								
		Calcium (mgLL)				2.00								2.00		126.00	11.00	3.00	31.00								
		EC (us/cm)				202.00								268.00		15500.00	1610.00	234.00	2730.00								
		TN (mg/L)				0.93								3.07		12.13	7.24	2.51	9.33								
		TP (mg/L)				0.14								0.76		1.38	0.79	0.32	1.12								
		рН									3.99													5.83			
		TDS (mg/L)									200.00													129.00			
		Chloride (mg/L)									34.40													37.40			
		Sulphate (mg/L)									13.00													12.00			
Coffey	30/03/2007	Magnesium (mg/L)									3.00													3.00			
(000, 2007)		Calcium (mgLL)									1.00													8.00			
		EC (us/cm)									178.00													182.00			
		TN (mg/L)									2.53													0.72			
		TP (mg/L)									1.00													0.08			
		рН									4.30							5.70		6.20	5.10	5.60	6.30				
		TDS (mg/L)									96.00							180.00		170.00	120.00	160.00	11000.00				
		Chloride (mg/L)									37.00							65.00		30.00	50.00	25.00	5800.00				
Martens and		Sulphate (mg/L)									5.00							5.00		39.00	5.00	5.00	850.00				
Associates (July,	6/07/2009	Magnesium (mg/L)									2.90							7.80		8.20	3.40	4.40	360.00				
2009)		Calcium (mgLL)									0.30							3.60		5.60	1.20	3.60	110.00				
		EC (us/cm)									160.00							280.00		280.00	200.00	260.00	14000.00				
		TN (mg/L)									1.00							0.60		7.10	3.80	30.00	0.60				
		TP (mg/L)									1.90							0.05		6.10	2.80	1.20	0.05				
		рН			6.7	6.20	6.30	6.40		5.80	4.00		6.10									6.30	7.30				
		TDS (mg/L)			7300	120.00	200.00	3500.00		200.00	160.00		2800.00									130.00	10000.00				
		Chloride (mg/L)			5500	75.00	49.00	1700.00		62.00	27.00		1300.00									36.00	4900.00				
Martens and		Sulphate (mg/L)			760	4.00	10.00	210.00		20.00	1.00		170.00									1.00	600.00				
Associates (Sept,	4/09/2012	Magnesium (mg/L)			370	6.10	2.10	130.00		4.80	3.10		77.00									4.20	300.00				
2012)		Calcium (mgLL)			110	2.40	0.90	49.00		2.80	0.50		18.00									4.20	97.00				
		EC (us/cm)			18000	320.00	260.00	6400.00		310.00	170.00		4700.00									240.00	16000.00				
		TN (mg/L)			2.2	1.90	1.90	0.90		1.90	2.80		0.70									5.30	0.90				
		TP (mg/L)			0.05	0.05	0.09	0.05		0.10	1.30		0.50									0.20	0.05				
		рН					5.80	5.70	5.50	5.20	4.10	6.00	5.60												5.30	5.40	5.30
		TDS (mg/L)					180.00	4900.00	120.00	160.00	150.00	160.00	2700.00												65.00	1200.00	110.00
		Chloride (mg/L)					44.00	2900.00	38.00	71.00	29.00	53.00	1400.00												640.00	18.00	43.00
Martens and		Sulphate (mg/L)					10.00	360.00	7.00	24.00	1.00	3.00	180.00												26.00	5.00	5.00
Associates (Sept,	27/09/2012	Magnesium (mg/L)					1.50	170.00	3.70	5.00	3.10	10.00	87.00												42.00	1.90	4.00
2012)		Calcium (mgLL)					0.60	67.00	3.60	3.10	0.50	6.20	21.00												13.00	1.70	1.10
		EC (us/cm)					230.00	8400.00	200.00	320.00	170.00	300.00	4600.00												2000.00	110.00	190.00
		TN (mg/L)					1.10	1.20	3.00	1.60	1.90	1.60	0.70												9.90	3.30	4.10
		TP (mg/L)					0.05	0.05	0.20	0.30	1.30	0.10	0.07												1.20	0.30	0.60

Value is less than laboratory PQL

21 Attachment 4D – Hydraulic Conductivity Test Results









					(0
Single Bo	ore Slug Test (Risin	g or Falling)			eers
Method ST-13 Revised	d 7.3.2007				S under the second se
Note - logger no	ot used. Data quality poor. Permea	pility probbaly higher than test indic	ates		
PROJECT DETAILS	5				
Project Project Ref Borehole Ref	P902346 - Riverside P902346JS31V01 GMB5 (2)			Test Date 25.09.12 Field Testing G. Harlow Data Analysis G. Harlow	
Method	Hvorslev (1981)			Reviewed Dr D. Martens	
FIELD TEST DATA Screened mater	ial - clay				
FACTOR H - Initial water let h _o - Water level r r - Casing radius R - Bore radius L - Length of ope T _o - Length of ch K _{sat} - Saturated h	evel reading (mH2O pressure) reading at time = 0 (mH2O pressure en screen haracteristic time hydraulic conductivity	Enter Data Unit 13.17 mBTOP 14.34 mBTOP 0.030 m 0.030 m 2.00 m 0.07 minutes 18.42 m/d			Ground surface Casing Capping Borehole Screen Filter Pack
	0.100			R ² = 0.9942	Saturated zone
	S 0.010				



























Sinale Ba	ore Slug Test (R	ising or Fallin	a)				S
Method SI-13 Revised			9/				inee O
	,						
Note - logger no	t used. Data quality poor. Pe	ermeability probbaly highe	er than test indicates				
PROJECT DETAILS							rt (
Project	P902346 - Riverside				Test Date	26.09.12	
Project Ref	P902346JS31V01				Field Testing	G. Harlow	
Borehole Ref	GMB201 (2)				Data Analysis	G. Harlow	
Method	Hvorslev (1981)				Reviewed	Dr D. Martens	
FIELD TEST DATA							
Screened materi	al - clay						
FACTOR		Enter Data	Unit				
H - Initial water le	evel reading (mH2O pressure) 13.91	mBTOP				
h _o - Water level r	eading at time = 0 (mH2O p	ressure) 14.84	mBTOP			•	Ground surface
r - Casing radius		0.030	m				Casing
R - Bore radius		0.030	m	t			Capping
L - Length of ope	en screen	3.00	m				Borehole
T_{o} - Length of cho	aracteristic time	0.21	minutes	н ↑			Derentele
		<u> </u>	4				Screen
K_{sat} - Saturated h	ydraulic conductivity	4.81	m/d	h	↑		Filter Pack
				h		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
DATA PLOT				↓ ↓		<u> </u>	
	1.000					R	Saturated zone
	0.100						
						R² = 0.9951	
	<u>ې</u> 0.010		+				





		_	Ś
Single Bo	ore Slug Test (Rising o	r Falling)	
Method ST-13 Revised	7.3.2007		
Note - logger no	t used. Data quality poor. Permeability pr	obbaly higher than test indicates	
PROJECT DETAILS			
Project	P902346 - Riverside		Test Date 26.09.12
Project Ref	P902346JS31V01		Field Testing G. Harlow
Borehole Ref	GMB203		Data Analysis G. Harlow
Method	Hvorslev (1981)		Reviewed Dr D. Martens
FIELD TEST DATA			
Screened materi	al - clay		
FACTOR		Enter Data Unit	
H - Initial water le	evel reading (mH2O pressure)	13.76 mBTOP	
h _o - Water level r	eading at time = 0 (mH2O pressure)	15.14 mBTOP	Ground surface
r - Casing radius		0.030 m	Casing
R - Bore radius		0.030 m	Capping
L - Lengin of ope		3.00 m	Borehole
T_o - Length of ch	aracteristic time	0.25 minutes H	
			Screen
K _{sat} - Saturated h	ydraulic conductivity	3.97 m/d h _t	Filter Pack
			1 <u></u>
DAIA PLOI		+ +	↓ ↓ [
	1.000		Saturated zone
	0		
	0		
			R ² = 0.9 1 7
		°°°°	
		Ŭ°°°,	
	\$ \$ \$		



22 Attachment 5 – Concept Drainage Layout Design and Flood Assessment (Tattersall Lander Pty Ltd)





STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT for CONCEPT PLAN APPLICATION

RIVERSIDE ESTATE TEA GARDENS

PREPARED BY TATTERSALL LANDER PTY LTD DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS January 2013

DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS IN ENGINEERING, SURVEYING, PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL Tattersall Lander Pty Limited ABN 41 003 509 215 2 Bourke Street, RAYMOND TERRACE 2324 All mail to: PO Box 580 Telephone: (02) 4987 1500 Fax: (02) 4987 1733 Email: admin@tatland.com.au www.tatland.com.au



1.0	INTRODUCTION	5
	1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
	1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION	6
		_
2.0	DRAINAGE DESIGN	7
	2.1 MINIMUM DISCHARGE LEVEL	9
	2.2 INTERCEPTION OF UPSTREAM FLOWS – THE EAST-WEST BRANCH FLOODWAY	9
	2.3 MAIN TRUNK DRAINAGE LINE – THE WEST BRANCH FLOODWAY	9
	2.4 DISTRIBUTING SITE DISCHARGES ALONG THE FULL WETLAND FRONTAGE	10
	2.5 SOUTH BRANCH FLOODWAY	10
	2.6 MONKEY JACKET BRANCH FLOODWAY	11
	2.7 BIO-FILTRATION SWALES	11
	2.8 SITE FILLING/ROAD AND STREET DRAINAGE DESIGN	13
3.0	FLOODING AND DRAINAGE ASSESSMENT	14
	3.1 BACKGROUND	14
	3.2 Previous Studies	14
	3.3 CATCHMENTS	15
	3.3.1 MYALL STREET CULVERTS	16
	3.4 RAINFALL INTENSITIES	16
	3.5 LANDUSE CATEGORIES, RAINFALL LOSSES & IMPERVIOUSNESS	17
	3.6 TAILWATER CONDITIONS	20
	3.7 1D/2D MODELLING AND DTM CREATION	21
	3.7.1 EXISTING STATE MODEL	23
	3.7.2 DESIGN STATE MODEL	26
	3.8 HYDRAULIC CATEGORY MAPPING	30
	3.9 Design Storm/Tailwater Conditions	33
	3.9.1 ENVIRONMENTAL FLOWS – REPLICATING MINOR/REGULAR RAINFALL	
	Events	34
	3.9.2 WETLAND BUFFER PEAK FLOWS – MAJOR/RARE RAINFALL EVENTS	36
	3.9.3 IMPACT ON FLOODING OF ADJOINING LAND	38
	3.9.3.1 UPSTREAM NORTHERN CATCHMENT	38
	3.9.3.2 ADJACENT WESTERN LANDS	39
	3.9.3.3 ADJACENT SOUTHERN LANDS	40
	3.9.4 100YR FLOOD PLANNING LEVEL	41
	3.9.4.1 SENSITIVITY TO DESIGN STORM INTENSITY INCREASES	46
	3.9.5 PUBLIC SAFETY ASSESSMENT	48
	3.9.5.1 FLOOD HAZARD DEFINITIONS	49
	3.9.5.2 MINOR STORM ASSESSMENT	50
	3 9 5 3 MAJOR STORM ASSESSMENT	51
	3.9.5.4 PMF ASSESSMENT	52
40	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	56
4.0		50
5.0	REFERENCES	57
APP	ENDIX A: PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE DESIGN DETAILS PLAN	58
APF	PENDIX B: GREAT LAKES COUNCIL IFD DATA	59



	APPENDIX	C: GREAT LAKES COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE RE FLOOD LEVELS AND PROBABILITY COMBINATIONS	60
	APPENDIX	D: PMF GENERALISED SHORT-DURATION METHOD CALCULATION SHEET	61
	APPENDIX	E: PMF FLOOD HAZARD AND FLOOD DEPTH MAPPING RESULTS	62
LI	ST OF FIGU	RES	
	FIGURE 1 –	LOCALITY SKETCH	5
	Figure 2 –	DRAINAGE CONCEPT PLAN	8
	Figure 3 –	WEST BRANCH FLOODWAY PRELIMINARY CROSS SECTION	9
	Figure 4 –	TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL STREET PROFILE INCLUDING ALL SERVICES AND	
		BIOFILTRATION SWALES	12
	FIGURE 5 –	TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL STREET DETAIL INCLUDING ALL SERVICES AND	
		BIOFILTRATION SWALES	12
	FIGURE 6 –	SITE CUT-FILL PLAN ILLUSTRATING PROPOSED EARTHWORKS	13
	FIGURE 7 –	DTM AND MODELLED CATCHMENT EXTENT	15
	FIGURE 8 –	EXISTING STATE MODEL ROUGHNESS VALUES	18
	FIGURE 9 –	DESIGN STATE MODEL ROUGHNESS VALUES	19
	FIGURE 10 –	HEAD/VELOCITY SAMPLE POINTS AND FLOW LINES	22
	FIGURE 11 –	FLOOD CONTOURS/VELOCITY ARROWS ACROSS THE EXISTING SITE	24
	FIGURE 12 –	FLOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITY ARROWS AT THE EXISTING 'BEBO' BRIDGE AND	
		ADJACENT BASINS/SPILLWAYS	24
	FIGURE 13 –	FLOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITY ARROWS AT AN EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL	25
	FIGURE 14 –	TYPICAL FLOW LINE DISCHARGE HYDROGRAPH – WETLAND 2 100YR 12HR	
		STORM	25
	FIGURE 15 –	PRELIMINARY DESIGN DTM ILLUSTRATION	27
	FIGURE 16 –	SAMPLE DETAILED PRELIMINARY DESIGN DTM ILLUSTRATION	27
	FIGURE 17 –	FLOOD LEVELS ACROSS PRELIMINARY DESIGN RIVERSIDE SITE – 1YR 2HR	~~
	E	STORM, U.5M I AILWATER	28
	FIGURE 18 –	FLOW DEPTHS ACROSS PRELIMINARY DESIGN RIVERSIDE SITE – 1 YR 2HR	~~
		STORM, U.SM TAILWATER	28
	FIGURE 19 -	FLOW DEPTHS/VELOCITY ARROWS AT DISCHARGE CULVERTA - TYR ZHR	20
	FIGURE 20	STORM, U.3M TAILWATER	29
	FIGURE 20 -		29
	FIGURE 21 -		ง วา
	FIGURE 22 -		JZ
	FIGURE 23 -	1VD 6UD STODM	35
	FIGURE 24 -	EXAMPLE DESIGN DISCHARGE HYDROGRAPH - WETLAND 2 FLOW LINE	55
		1vp Aud Stodm	35
	FIGURE 25 -	CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITIES AT EXISTING DRAIN WETLAND	00
		OUTLET – 2HR 100YR STORM CURRENT MHW TAIL WATER	36
	FIGURE 26 -	CRITICAL ELOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITIES AT DISCHARGE CUI VERT A – 2HR	00
		100YR STORM. CURRENT MHW TAII WATER	37
	FIGURE 27 –	CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITIES AT EXISTING DRAIN WETLAND	
		OUTLET – 9HR 100YR STORM. CURRENT MHW TAILWATER	37
S:\pr	ojects\Riverside\Correspo	ndence\201479-R009004 Flood Study	3



FIGURE 28 – CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTHS/VELOCITIES AT DISCHARGE CULVERT B – 9HR	
100 YR STORM, CURRENT MHW TAILWATER	37
FIGURE 29 – PRE DEVELOPMENT CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTHS AT EXISTING TOONANG	
DRIVE CULVERTS - 2HR 100YR STORM, 2100 5YR TAILWATER	38
FIGURE 30 – POST DEVELOPMENT CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTHS AT EXISTING TOONANG	
DRIVE CULVERTS - 2HR 100YR STORM, 2100 5YR TAILWATER	38
FIGURE 31 – RECOMMENDED FLOOD PLANNING LEVELS	43
FIGURE 32 – FLOOD DEPTHS ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE SITE – EVENT 1	
CRITICAL 2HR STORM – 100YR STORM, 2100 5YR TAILWATER	44
FIGURE 33 – FLOOD LEVEL CONTOURS ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE SITE –	
EVENT 1 CRITICAL 2HR STORM – 100YR STORM, 2100 5YR TAILWATER	44
FIGURE 34 – FLOOD DEPTHS ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE SITE – EVENT 2	
CRITICAL 2HR STORM – 5YR STORM, 2100 100YR TAILWATER	45
FIGURE 35 – FLOOD CONTOURS ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE SITE – EVENT 2	
CRITICAL 2HR STORM – 5YR STORM, 2100 100YR TAILWATER	45
FIGURE 36 – HAZARD DETERMINATION	49
FIGURE 37 – FLOW HAZARD REGIME FOR INFANTS, CHILDREN AND ADULTS	50
FIGURE 38 – CRITICAL FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE	
SITE – 2HR 5YR STORM, 2100 MHW TAILWATER	50
FIGURE 39 – CRITICAL FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE	
SITE – 2HR 100YR STORM, 2100 5YR TAILWATER	51
FIGURE 40 – CRITICAL FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING ACROSS THE DEVELOPED RIVERSIDE	
SITE – 1HR PMF STORM, 2100 100YR TAILWATER	53
FIGURE 41 – CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTH/VELOCITY MAPPING ACROSS THE DEVELOPED	
RIVERSIDE SITE – 1HR PMF STORM, 2100 100YR TAILWATER	53
FIGURE 42 – CRITICAL FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING ACROSS THE WEST BRANCH	
CROSSING – 1HR PMF STORM, 2100 100YR TAILWATER	54
FIGURE 43 – CRITICAL FLOOD DEPTH/VELOCITY MAPPING ACROSS THE WEST	
BRANCH CROSSING – 1HR PMF STORM. 2100 100YR TAILWATER	54
FIGURE 44 – CRITICAL FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING ACROSS THE EAST-WEST BRANCH	
FLOODWAY LINKING TO THE MONKEY JACKET PRECINCT – 1HR	
PMF STORM. 2100 100YR TAIL WATER	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 – SURFACE ROUGHNESS VALUES	17
TABLE 2 – TAILWATER CONDITIONS	20
TABLE 3 – HEAD/VELOCITY SAMPLE POINTS	21
TABLE 4 – FLOW LINE SECTIONS	22
TABLE 5 – PRE AND POST DEVELOPMENT QUARTERLY PEAK FLOWS	34
TABLE 6 – PRE AND POST DEVELOPMENT ANNUAL PEAK FLOWS	35
TABLE 7 – PRE AND POST DEVELOPMENT 5YR PEAK FLOOD LEVELS	40
TABLE 8 – PRE AND POST DEVELOPMENT 20YR PEAK FLOOD LEVELS	40
TABLE 9 – DEVELOPED STATE 100YR PEAK FLOOD LEVELS	42
TABLE 10 – COMPARISON OF DEVELOPED STATE 100YR PEAK FLOOD LEVELS	
RESULTING FROM EXISTING AND POSSIBLE +30% INTENSITIES	47



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Riverside Estate proposal seeks to gain approval for a multi-staged Community Title subdivision on residentially zoned land at Tea Gardens. This would be made up of 13 residential stages, and one stage containing a small tourist facility. Ultimately the proposal would see land and services produced to cater for approximately 945 dwellings on the site.

Large portions of the site will remain undeveloped and set aside for various purposes, including environmental conservation, water management, public open space and recreation.

The site is bounded by Shearwater rural-residential estate to the north, Myall Street to the west, Myall Quays residential estate to the south, and the Myall River to the east.



Figure 1 – Locality Sketch



1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

Previously part of a large pine plantation, the site is currently predominately clear and currently used for cattle grazing. The majority of the site has sandy soils and is extensively flat, with a slight fall to the south and to the east. Several existing drains assist in draining water east towards an existing SEPP14 wetland and beyond to the Myall River.

Due to their small size, and being near-level, these drains do not have a large capacity, and during extended wet periods or large rainfall events, surface water can pond on the site before draining away or infiltrating.



Photograph 1 – Existing Site Conditions



2.0 DRAINAGE DESIGN

The Riverside proposal has been modified from the previous submission to address the issues raised during public exhibition. Modifications from the previous proposal include;

- Revised development layout, relocating the main development footprint further away from the SEPP14 wetlands, and an overall reduction in developable area
- Removal of the 'East Branch' floodway and reserve
- Removal of several basins, wetlands and lake structures
- Inclusion of bio-filtration swales for 'at source' water quality treatment, including necessary site regrading works required for successful installation
- Inclusion of additional constructed wetland in the northern 'Monkey Jacket' precinct
- Redesign of the East-West Branch floodway to limit disturbance of vegetation in the wildlife corridor

The drainage regime proposed for the Riverside Development is illustrated in the Drainage Concept Plan in Figure 2. The following summary describes the main drainage features in detail. Further specific technical details (modelled structure sizes, levels etc.) can also be seen in Appendix A.



→ 、、、	POST CLIMAT DISCHARGE AT MI	TE CHANGE N RL. 1.4m AHD
) BANK TO HI OFFSITE DENOTES D	ELP DIRECT RUNOFF DISCHARGE
	DENOTES CO UNLINED FLOW (TREATMENT SWA	NSTRUCTED CONVEYANCE & LES / CHANNELS
\mathcal{Q}	DENOTES II STRUC	NFILTRATION
	DENOTES EX WATER QU	KISTING LINED IALITY BASIN
	DENOT	ES FLOW CTION
नियो स्थल स्थल स्थल स्थित	BIOFILTI SWA	DSIDE RATION LLES
1:40	20 40 Pin 000 for A1 Size Plot	
N	COUNCIL GREAT LAKES	21000166
ODMENT	PARISH	SIZE A1
RDENS	SCALE 1:4000	SHEET No. 1 of 3
	DATE : Plo	otted 09:26 02/07/12
to sho jects trijeli dog	a long to ray intrenance DA I	and a north real a long



Specific features of the proposed drainage network are described in more detail below;

2.1 Minimum Discharge Level

The design philosophy to date for drainage works in Tea Gardens has been to have drainage structure outlet levels at or above Mean High Water Mark, adopted at 0.5m AHD. Discussions with Great Lakes Council have determined that approach should continue, but this minimum should now be adjusted by 0.9m to 1.4m AHD to account for the worst case 2100 sea level rise due to climate change. As such, low flow discharges from behind the level spreader will be set at a minimum 1.4m AHD.

2.2 Interception of Upstream Flows – The East-West Branch Floodway

The majority of upstream flows from the existing Shearwater Estate enter the Riverside site via a series of seven culverts under Toonang Drive. To limit the impact of this water on the proposed development, the East-West Branch will intercept flows from the five most easterly incoming culverts and divert these flows along the floodway and around the main development footprint. Doubling as a wildlife corridor, minimal disturbance will be allowed in this floodway. Instead of invert excavation, the design will instead form the floodway over the existing surface by construction of the adjacent perimeter road, with the incorporation of a raised flood mound. Grades will be substantially flat, and will result in an effective floodway of between 50-100m wide within the wildlife corridor of between 90-200m width.

2.3 Main Trunk Drainage Line – The West Branch Floodway

The remaining two (most westerly) Toonang Drive culverts are not able to be diverted around the site, and are instead directed to the top of the West Branch floodway. Running through the centre of the main portion of the development site, the West Branch has multiple functions which also includes acting to collect, detain, and infiltrate regular low flow discharges from the majority of the site, and convey high flow discharges to the downstream discharge structures, as well as providing areas of reforestation and public open space.



Figure 3 – West Branch/Monkey Jacket Branch Floodway Preliminary Cross Section



2.4 Distributing Site Discharges Along the Full Wetland Frontage

One of the main objectives for the design of the Riverside Estate is to minimise the impact on the adjacent downstream wetlands. The current proposal has further relocated the development footprint so that the main body of the development is now over 350m from the SEPP14 wetlands.

Post development, it will be important to both maintain the flow regime during regular rainfall events, and ensure that large events are not concentrated to the point that they result in scouring, high velocity flows. An important feature of the proposed development is a low level weir and level spreader along the full frontage between the development and the wetland buffer. Much of the low flow discharge from the existing site is via infiltration. In order to replicate this, post development low flows would be contained behind the proposed weir and allowed to infiltrate.

Larger storm events would top over this weir along the full frontage of the wetland buffer and distribute low velocity flows into the wetland buffer and on towards the wetland as would currently occur. In order for this arrangement to also provide peak flow attenuation, two low-flow outlets will be positioned where the existing surface drains currently deliver point source discharges into the wetland buffer area. It should be noted that the level spreader and low flow outlets are outside the wetland buffer area, and generally around 250m from the SEPP14 wetlands. An assessment of the effectiveness of this arrangement to replicate existing flows into the wetland buffer can be seen in Section 3.9.1.

The preliminary design modelled for this spreader includes a 2.5m wide weir crest at RL1.9m AHD, with the two low-flow discharge culverts at RL.1.4m. While it is expected that this design may be further refined during the detail design stage, modelling of this arrangement is intended to show that this approach will be suitable to replicate existing flow conditions in the wetlands.

2.5 South Branch Floodway

Primarily required to drain the future commercial area precinct (not part of this application) and draining south under the existing 'Bebo' bridge into the existing saline lake via a recently constructed basin structure, the South Branch is also connected to the West Branch via a high level overflow weir. Regular flows from the Riverside site will not enter the South Branch, but in rarer events peak flow will top the weir and the South Branch will provide an additional floodway discharge path, replicating existing flow conditions.

The South Branch has been designed and modelled in its finished configuration, despite its upstream development proposal requiring a separate application. This will ensure the current modelling will still be relevant and compatible with the future proposal. Construction of this floodway area will include the removal of an existing



temporary flood interception berm and haul road. It will also provide storage and infiltration capacity, and areas for reforestation and public open space.

2.6 Monkey Jacket Branch Floodway

In the eastern 'Monkey Jacket Precinct', upstream flows from Shearwater Estate will be intercepted by a collection drain above the development ring-road, and directed towards the Monkey Jacket Branch floodway that is central to this precinct. As with the West Branch, the Monkey Jacket Branch also has multiple functions which include acting to collect, detain, infiltrate and convey the development runoff.

Discharges from this branch will be initially into a downstream constructed wetland for water quality treatment before flowing into to the existing river inlet just as the existing drains do in this area of the site. This area will also provide areas for reforestation.

2.7 Bio-filtration Swales

Detailed discussions were held with Council engineers to develop a preferred approach to incorporating bio-filtration swales into the streetscape. A recent addition to the Riverside proposal to assist with urban pollutant removal, bio-filtration swales are a favoured treatment device of Great Lakes Council as they provide 'at source' water quality treatment. They are, however, a relatively new addition to the urban stormwater landscape, and are yet to be widely implemented in the GLC area. Council's Engineering Department had not yet developed standards for the implementation of bio-filtration swales until approached in regard to the Riverside development.

Significant efforts were made in conjunction with Council and local service authorities to adapt available bio-retention guidelines to the specific requirements of the Riverside site and Great lakes Council. Required modifications from previous Council standards include a single road crossfall, modified kerb types, relocation of the footpath and rearrangement of service locations and road verge widths. Figures 4 and 5 detail the proposed arrangements.





Figure 4 – Typical Residential Street Profile including all Services and Bio-filtration Swales



 Figure 5 – Typical Residential Street Detail including all Services and Bio-filtration Swales

 S:\projects\Wyall Quays\Correspondence\201479-R009004 Flood Study.docx
 12



2.8 Site Filling/Road and Street Drainage Design

In order to produce residential land suitable for future housing, the development footprint area of the site will be filled with imported material. Levels on all lots have been set to be free from the worst case 100yr flood levels. Minor roads adjoining floodways have been designed to be covered by a maximum of 0.3m of water by the worst case 100yr flood (see Figure 3).

Intersecting roads perpendicular to the floodway rise away at a minimum grade of 0.3%, the level controlled by the Great Lakes Council minimum stormwater pipe grade. The normal 0.5% minimum road grade is not relevant in this development as this is a kerb self-cleansing grade, and at Riverside the low side kerbs have now been replaced with bio-filtration swales.

Details regarding the extent of filling within the floodplain, and impact on flood behaviour are addressed in more detail in Section 3.8.



Figure 6 – Site Cut-Fill Plan Illustrating Proposed Earthworks



3.0 FLOODING AND DRAINAGE ASSESSMENT

3.1 BACKGROUND

The aims of this flood study include;

- determine appropriate floodway designs, and required fill levels within the proposed development,
- design a drainage system to mitigate post development impacts on receiving downstream environment,
- address the impact of the proposed development (including filling) on flood behaviour of the site and adjacent lands,
- determine the flood hazard within the proposed development, including egress and safety in extreme flood events

A hydrological model of the Riverside development and surrounding areas has been prepared utilising the XP-Storm 2D computer modelling software. Both existing and developed DTM scenarios were modelled with numerous storm events covering the full range of exceedance probabilities and durations.

3.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Several previous reports have been prepared for Crighton Properties by Cardno to support previous iterations of the Riverside proposal, the most recent of which was December 2011. Review of this report by various government agencies following public exhibition in April 2012 highlighted a number of issues that required further addressing, including Hydraulic Category mapping, Flood Hazard mapping, Probable Maximum Flood assessment, Flood Planning Level assessment, analysis of public safety and evacuation requirements and the inclusion of the Monkey Jacket precinct within the flood study.

Following further modification to the proposed development footprint and drainage strategy, this study is intended to provide similar analysis to the previous studies, incorporating the updated development proposal, data from more recent adjacent studies, utilising more detailed 2D modelling procedures and addressing the areas highlighted as deficient in the previous report.

While proposed flood control regime and modelling techniques vary significantly from Cardno's previous work, the results in this report have been compared with results seen in the previous studies where applicable (i.e. incoming upstream flows), and have been observed to be in general agreement.



3.3 CATCHMENTS

Previous studies on the site had utilised a 1D xprafts 'node and links' flood model, which requires the catchment to be broken up smaller sub-catchments and allocating indicative areas, widths, slopes, routing parameters etc. to attempt to replicate flow conditions. With the advent of 2D modelling, this approach is now unnecessary. In the models prepared for this report, rainfall was applied directly to the grid, which then flows across the model as directed by the underlying DTM.

The extent of the model stretches from the top of the watershed along Viney Creek Road above Shearwater Estate to the north, west to Myall Street, east across the SEPP14 wetlands to the Myall River, and south to Coupland Avenue. The extent of the 2D model is shown below in Figure 7. It can be seen the modelled catchment includes all upstream lands to the top of the catchment, the Riverside site and all adjoining downstream land potentially affected by flows from the site.



Figure 7 – DTM and Modelled Catchment Extent