Stormwater Water Management Strategy

# **Collison Estate**

# Collison Estate Group Incorporated

March 2021





# **Collison Estate**

# **Contents**

1.0	Introduction	.1
2.0	Site and Surrounds	.2
3.0	Precinct Catchments	.3
4.0	Melbourne Water Drainage Scheme	.5
5.0	Stormwater Capture – Proposed Drainage Network	.6
6.0	Stormwater Quantity – Detention	.7
	6.1. Proposed Storage Infrastructure	.7
	6.2. Channel Grading	.8
	6.3. Typical Channel Flow Depths	.9
	6.4. Effects of Scour on Channel	0
7.0	Water Quality – WSUD Options	1
	7.1. Treatment Train Analysis	2
Appe	ndix A Drainage Strategy Prepared by Incitus, Dated 12/03/2020 (REV4)	i
Appe	ndix B Catchment Plan	. ii
Appe	ndix C Layout Plan and Typical Sections	iii
Appe	ndix D Concept Design	iv
Appe	ndix E Neighbouring Estate Plans	. V

### Document Control

Date Prepared	Version Number	Author	Reviewed	Distributed	
				Internal	
02 March 2021	4	S.Young	R.Flack	Client	
				Council	

## **1.0 Introduction**

This report has been prepared to develop design concepts and further review feasibility for the proposed Stormwater Management Strategy of the Collison Estate as an extension of the previous report completed by Incitus. The inputs for the Incitus report are deemed to remain valid (the document is attached in Appendix A and is to be read in conjunction with the following KLMS Report).

A detailed strategy and concept design have been prepared based on the Incitus Report – Option 3 - Distributed Management. Detailed calculations, catchment analysis and 3d modelling has been undertaken for hydraulic, storage and treatment components to ensure their feasibility and spatial requirements.

The assessment has been conducted by experienced engineers from KLM Spatial, considering the Drainage Strategy, proposed development plan, and relevant feedback/advice from Council's planning and engineering departments, and Melbourne Water.

The report considers the following elements of the water cycle relevant to development of the site:

- Natural Catchments
- Stormwater Capture Proposed Drainage Network
- Stormwater Quantity Management
- Stormwater Quality Management/WSUD Options

## 2.0 Site and Surrounds

The proposed Collison Estate is an 82ha conglomerate of 94 low density residential allotments. The site is bounded by Mayfield Road to the west, Linsell Boulevard to the north, residential development to the east and Berwick-Cranbourne Road to the south. The site is traversed from north to south by Collison Road and east to west by Heather Grove and Garden Street.

The site is located approximately 45km south-east of Melbourne in Cranbourne East. The site is planning to re-develop to a standard and medium density residential area.

Figure 1: Aerial Image of Site and Surrounds





## 3.0 Precinct Catchments

The sites topography has been identified through LiDAR information, and generally falls from West to the East of the property. The site is generally flat, but there are several steep undulations, the largest being the rise at the Heather Grove and Collison Road intersection.

The site has 3 major catchments as shown in Figure 2 below. The northern, southern and central catchments. The catchment shown in red is an external catchment which bypasses the subject site.

Figure 2: Contour Plan





Each catchment will connect into existing infrastructure to the east. Minor flows to existing pipes, and major (gap) flows into existing road reserves. Some of these outfalls were designed with the proposed development in mind, while others were not. *Table 1* below provides a summary of the existing infrastructure.

CATCHMENT	OUTLET PIPE	ROAD	INVERT LEVEL	ALLOWABLE FLOW (cu.m/s)	CATCHMENT ALLOWANCE
Northorn	750mm dia.	Linsell Boulevard	31.400	0.583	Developed
Northern	525mm dia.	Garden Street	33.425	0.430	Developed
Middle	1350mm dia.	Rosina Street	32.455	1.909	Existing
Southern	900mm dia.	Buick Court	35.995	1.128	Existing

Table 1: Existing Outfalls

As KLM moved further into the detailed modelling of our distributed management approach these catchments have been further broken down into catchments A-J, please refer to *Appendix B* for catchment plan.

CATCHMENT		AREA (ha)	DEVELOPED FRACTION IMPERVIOUS	ALLOWABLE DISCHARGE 0.2 EY (cu.m/s)	ALLOWABLE DISCHARGE 1% AEP (cu.m/s)
Northorn	A1	7.359	0.7	0.583	1.444
northern	A2	5.252	0.7	0.430	1.070
	В	4.265	0.7	0.233	0.578
Middle	С	15.483	0.7	0.846	2.097
WILCULE	D	4.158	0.7	0.227	0.563
	E	10.022	0.7	0.548	1.357
	F	5.060	0.7	0.154	0.371
	G	8.071	0.7	0.246	0.592
Southern	Н	9.557	0.7	0.291	0.701
	<u> </u>	6.946	0.7	0.212	0.510
	J	5.623	0.7	0.171	0.412

Table 2: Catchment Analysis



## 4.0 Melbourne Water Drainage Scheme

The Collison Estate is located within the Melbourne Water drainage scheme "2371 Collison Road DS". However, with the exception of the northern catchment (catchments A1 & A2), there was no hydraulic or quality allowances made for the development of the Collison Estate.

Where sufficient hydraulic and treatment infrastructure has been provided for in the northern catchment (catchments A1 & A2), drainage scheme contributions will be payable to Melbourne Water. Current rates for the scheme as at 7/12/2020 are:

- Hydraulic Contributions = \$112,146/ha
- Water Quality Treatment = \$6,923/ha

Where hydraulic and treatment infrastructure was only provided to service the existing rural residential development under the scheme, contributions will not be payable, however, stormwater management measures will need to be undertaken on site to meet best practise objectives.



## **5.0 Stormwater Capture – Proposed Drainage Network**

The site layout and staging have been developed to ensure that stormwater management is considered and optimised as the development progresses.

The proposal attempts to equitably distribute the land required for drainage purposes for retardation to mitigate the flows discharging from the site to existing flow magnitudes, and treatment of the stormwater runoff from the site where required. It utilises linear drainage reserves distributed throughout the site to equally encumber each land-owner, but with sufficient size to create green spines throughout the estate and enhance liveability within the re-development.

The key to this being a digression from the conventional development with pipe drainage for minor drainage, instead providing direct house connections to the kerb and channel, and sheet flowing the runoff from each allotment into the green spines. Flows from the drainage reserve will be captured at the end point and conveyed by pipe for minor storms and road reserve for major storms into the existing outfall drainage.

For the small number of sites that do not directly front a channel, stormwater will have to flow across a small distance to the nearest channel. Due to the small distance and proposed road layout this grading will be easily achievable.

Due to low flow volumes and flat channel grades the shear stress on the low flow channels will be minimal. As such, it will be appropriate to line the channel with Jute Matting and Vegetation as opposed to rock.

The proposal gives flexibility for individual land parcels to develop out of sequence by partially building storage channels and using existing drainage easements for temporary outlets via interim pipe or existing channel - as may apply on a case-by-case basis.

For details of the proposed drainage strategy including layout plans and typical sections, please refer to *Appendix C*.



## 6.0 Stormwater Quantity – Detention

## 6.1. Proposed Storage Infrastructure

The proposed strategy uses a combination of rainwater tanks and linear drainage reserves to detain flows.

Detention will apply to the gap between the pre-development 1% AEP flows and post development 1% AEP flows. This will be reliant an appropriately sized overflow weir which will outfall to the adjacent road in the 1% event. For channels A, D, E, H and I where they back onto existing properties, the top water level in the event of this overflow would not achieve sufficient freeboard to the existing dwellings. In this case, additional storage will be provided to retard 1% AEP post-development flows back to 0.2 EY pre-developed flows. In this case, all water will outfall through the pipe-network, lowering the top water level to provide sufficient freeboard to the adjacent lots.

Storage calculations have been undertaken using Boyd's Formula. The table below provides a summary of storage requirements for each catchment.

CATCHMENT	AREA (ha)	STORAGE REQUIRED (cu.m)	DESIGN STORMS (cu.m)
А	12.611	1484	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall
В	4.265	392	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall
С	15.483	1419	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall
D	4.158	567	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 0.2 EY Outfall
E	10.022	1397	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 0.2 EY Outfall
F	5.060	898	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall
G	8.071	1389	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall
Н	9.557	1504	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 0.2 EY Outfall
I	6.946	1310	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 0.2 EY Outfall
J	5.623	727	1% AEP Flows Restriction Back to 1% AEP Outfall

Table 3: Storage Results

A conservative assumption on density would see a total 1,600 residential lots within the 82ha Collison Estate giving 19.5lots/ha. Current discussions with council indicate the ultimate density may be up to 1700 lots, however any additional lots above 1,600 would only provide additional storage. It is assumed each lot will install a 2kl tank which will have 30% capacity available for storage, giving 0.6kl storage per lot. This will equate to 11.7cu.m/ha of storage by the rainwater tanks.



KLM Spatial Reference: 8588 / Version Number: 4 / March 2021

7

Table 4: Storage Distribution

CATCHMENT	STORAGE TANKS (cu.m)	STORAGE CHANNEL (cu.m)
А	147	1337
В	49	343
С	181	1238
D	48	519
Е	117	1280
F	59	839
G	94	1295
Н	111	1393
	81	1229
J	65	662

Some catchments will not require the full depth of the channel to store flows. As freeboard is provided above the top of channel, this additional depth will minimise the freeboard required above the channel to finished lot levels.

For details of the concept design for these channels refer to *Appendix D*.

### 6.2. Channel Grading

Council have expressed concern around the grade of the channel.

We acknowledge that standards such as AustRoads will call for a minimum grade of 1in200, but this is for a road side table drain only capturing flow from a very small catchment off of the pavement.

As the proposed channels will take in a large-scale catchment on a neighborhood scale, we believe Melbourne Waters Waterway Standards would provide a more accurate portrayal of preferential grades.

In Melbourne Waters "Constructed Waterways Design Manual: Part D: Technical Design Elements" Section D1.6 sets the minimum grade at 1in800 and maximum grade at 1in200.

Our proposed grades are between 1in300 and 1in500 which are on the steeper side of Melbourne Waters standards.

Please refer below extract from the standard:

Longitudinal grade is a fundamental design criterion for constructed waterways, as it is for many other types of civil engineering infrastructure (e.g. roads). It is essential that the designer is aware of the contextual differences between waterway grades and grades appropriate for other infrastructure. For example, a road with a longitudinal grade of 1 in 100 is generally considered to be of relatively mild or gentle slope, whereas a longitudinal grade of 1 in 100 in a waterway is considered "steep" and likely to erode.

Due to the topography of the site the channels cannot be feasible steepened and still obtain sufficient depth and storage to allow to channel to function properly. Furthermore, steepening of the channels will increase shear stress and risk of erosion.

Due to the depth of the existing outfall drains, a diversion drain will not be able to be installed beneath the channels as it will be too low for the connection point. The only option would be to install a separate drain along-side the channel, however, this does not fit with the overall scheme where it is intended for water to flow overland to the channels. Where channels have flows coming in from both sides, drains would need to be duplicated on both sides as levels will not permit pipes to cross the channels. This would increase the cost of the scheme significantly.

This would also be a major digression from the originally proposed distributed management scheme proposed by Incitus where direct house connections would be provided to the kerb and channel, and sheet flow runoff from each allotment into the green spines.

Furthermore, if self-cleansing of the channel is of concern, we believe diverting flows away from the channels would only decrease the self-cleansing abilities of the channel.

In summary, we feel that the construction of the proposed additional drainage pipe does not provide any benefit to the scheme, but will incur a large unnecessary cost for the developers.

## 6.3. Typical Channel Flow Depths

Flows through the channel will be minimal in respect to the size of the channel. The channels have been sized with significant depth to provide storage, whereas the flow in major events would only require a small portion of the channel's capacity.

To demonstrate, the highest channel flow within the estate has been modelled in PC convey and the top water level would sit just above the top of the pilot channel. This is the worst-case scenario at the downstream outlet of the channel with the largest catchment. Most channels will have far smaller catchments and flows upstream of the outfall will be significantly lower.



Figure 3: Channel Flow Depths



### 6.4. Effects of Scour on Channel

As the major flows through the channel will be quite small, the shear stress on the channel base will be minimal.

Based on Melbourne Water procedures, Du Boys equation was used to calculate the shear stress on the channel. For the worst-case scenario as modelled above, Shear Stress would equate to 12.42N/m2.

 $\tau = \gamma RS$ Where  $\tau =$  shear stress (N/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\gamma =$  the specific weight of water (N/m<sup>3</sup>), R = hydraulic radius (m), and S = friction gradient (equal to channel bed gradient for uniform flow, m/m)

Based on "Melbourne Water's Constructed Waterways Design Manual – Table 18" which is included below. The shear stress on the channel would be well below the threshold for short native grass and no further armouring of the channel would be required.

The calculated worst-case section is close to the limit of 12N/m2 for stiff clay and alluvial silts which will be applicable for the duration of construction. As the calculation is based on the worst-case scenario, the majority of the channels with catchment areas significantly smaller than this would also be subject to significantly less shear stress and there would be no issues. However, it is recommended that each channel is reviewed thoroughly in detailed design, and, where shear stress is close the allowable threshold during construction, jute matting or similar is adopted to provide extra stability until vegetation can establish.

BOUNDARY CATEGORY	BOUNDARY TYPE	SHEAR STRESS EROSION THRESHOLD (N/M2)
Soils	Fine colloidal sand	1.5
	Alluvial silt and silty loam (non-colloidal)	3
	Firm loam and fine gravels	4
	Stiff clay and alluvial silts (colloidal)	12
Gravel/Cobble	25 mm, 51 mm, 152 mm, and 305 mm	16, 32, 96, and 192 respectively
Vegetation	Turf	45 to 177
	Long native grasses	80
	Short native and bunch grass	45

Table 5: Erosion Thresholds

# Table 18 - Erosion thresholds for different waterway boundary materials (Fischenich 2001)



# 7.0 Water Quality – WSUD Options

Stormwater quality measures are required to be applied to this site in accordance with the Clause 44 of the State Environmental Protection Policy (SEPP).

To meet minimum SEPP requirements, developments should meet the Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines for Urban Stormwater, available from CSIRO Publishing.

Best practice stipulates the following outcomes for both construction, and post-construction phases of the project:

### **Construction Phase**

Pollutant type	Receiving water objective	Current best practice performance objective
Suspended solids	Comply with SEPP	Effective treatment of 90% of daily run-off events (e.g. <4 months ARI). Effective treatment equates to a 50 percentile suspended solids concentration of 50 mg/L.
		This can be achieved by installing a sediment ponds to remove 95% of sediment down to 125 µm for a 1 year ARI.
Litter	Comply with SEPP	Prevent litter from entering the stormwater system. This requirement extends until 95% of the lots are constructed or a period of two years has passed.
Other pollutants	Comply with SEPP	Limit the application, generation and migration of toxic substances to the maximum extent practicable.

### **Post-construction Phase**

Pollutant type	Receiving water objective	Current best practice performance objective
Suspended solids (SS)	Comply with SEPP (not to exceed the 90th percentile of 80 mg/L) (1)	80% retention of the typical urban annual load
Total phosphorus (TP)	Comply with SEPP (base flow concentration not to exceed 0.08 mg/L) (2)	45% retention of the typical urban annual load
Total nitrogen (TN)	Comply with SEPP (base flow concentration not to exceed 0.9 mg/L) (2)	45% retention of the typical urban annual load
Litter	Comply with SEPP (No litter in waterways) (1)	70% reduction of typical urban annual load (3)
Flows	Maintain flows at pre-urbanisation levels	Maintain discharges for the 1.5 year ARI at pre-development levels



## 7.1. Treatment Train Analysis

Treatment sizing and effectiveness has been based on information within Incitus report included in *Appendix A*, which indicates 20sq.m of rain garden will be required per hectare of re-development.

Raingardens have been placed at the outfall end of each channel as an end of line treatment for individual catchments. The raingarden will be located within the base of the channel. The below table includes a summary of raingarden sizing.

CATCHMENT	AREA (ha)	RAINGARDEN REQUIRED (sq.m)	RAINGARDEN WIDTH (m)	RAINGARDEN LENGTH (m)
А	252	8.3	30.4	252
В	94	5.8	16.3	94
С	341	5.8	58.9	341
D	70	8.3	8.4	70
E	172	8.3	20.8	172
F	133	5.8	23.0	133
G	206	5.8	35.5	206
Н	134	8.3	16.2	134
	117	8.3	14.1	117
J	108	5.8	18.6	108

Table 6: Raingarden Sizing

Post-design a revised MUSIC model was produced confirming treatment areas provide sufficient treatment to meet best practise objects. Summary of treatment train effectiveness has been included below.

	Sources	Residual Load	% Reduction
Flow (ML/yr)	397	395	0.5
Total Suspended Solids (kg/yr)	75000	4140	94.5
Total Phosphorus (kg/yr)	156	49.7	68.2
Total Nitrogen (kg/yr)	1120	495	55.9
Gross Pollutants (kg/yr)	16500	0	100

Figure 4: MUSIC Results



# **Appendix A**

Drainage Strategy Prepared by Incitus, Dated 12/03/2020 (REV4)



# Collison Estate Cranbourne East

Stormwater Strategy

## **KLM Spatial**

12 March 2020 Revision: 4 Reference: 1741

# INCiTUS

# **Document control**

Document prepared by:

Incitus Pty Ltd

ABN 55 285 448 851 PO Box 7142 Richmond VIC 3121

- **T** 0414 404 730
- E nina.barich@incitus.com.au
- W www.incitus.com.au

#### Disclaimer

A person using Incitus documents or data accepts the risk of:

- Using the documents or data in electronic form without requesting and checking them for accuracy against the original hard copy version.
- Using the documents or data for any purpose not agreed to in writing by Incitus or KLM Spatial

Document control								
Report title		Stormwater Strategy						
Project number		1741						
File path		D:\Incitus\Barich Consulting - Incitus\Projects\1741 Collison Estate SWS\Documents\Stormwater Strategy Collison EstateRev4.docx						
Clien	t	KLM Spatial						
Rev	Date	Revision details/status	Author	Reviewed	Approver			
0	20 July 2018	Issued for client review	NJB	Reviewed 20.07.18	NJB			
1	16 November 2018	Issued for authority acceptance	NJB	Reviewed 16.11.18	NJB			
2 12 December 2018		Issued for authority acceptance	NJB	Reviewed 12.12.18	NJB			
3	29 April 2019	Issued for authority acceptance	NJB	Reviewed 29.04.19	NJB			
4	12 March 2020	Issued for authority acceptance	NJB	Reviewed 12.03.20	NJB			



# Contents

1	Introduction	
2	Catchment Characteristics	3
3	Stormwater Management Requirements	5
4	Proposed Development Layout	6
5	Stormwater Management	7
5.1	Stormwater Quantity	7
5.2	Overland Flow Safety	13
5.3	Stormwater Quality Treatment	13
6	Option 1 – Catchment Scale Management	15
7	Option 2 – At Source Management	18
8	Option 3 – Distributed Management	20
9	Outfall Arrangement and Staging	23
10	Conclusion	24
11	References	25
Арр	pendix A – RORB Parameters	26
Арр	pendix B – Intensity Frequency Duration Data	27
Cra	nbourne Intensity Frequency Duration Table	27
Арр	pendix C – Storage Calculations Catchment Scale Management	29
App	pendix D – Storage Calculations At-Source Management	32

Appendix E – Storage Calculations Distributed Management



34

# 1 Introduction

Incitus has been engaged to undertake a Stormwater Strategy for the development of Collison Estate, Cranbourne East. Collison Estate is an 82 ha conglomerate of 94 low density residential allotments. The site is bounded by Mayfield Road to the west, Linsell Boulevard to the north, residential development to the east and Berwick – Cranbourne Road to the south. The site is traversed from north to south by Collison Road and east to west by Heather Grove and Garden Street.



The site is illustrated in Figure 1.1 below.

Figure 1.1 Collison Estate, Cranbourne East

The site is located approximately 45 km south-east of Melbourne in Cranbourne East. The site is planning to re-develop to a standard and medium density residential area.

Urbanisation leads to an increase in stormwater runoff and a subsequent increase in pollutant wash-off. It also has detrimental effects on the receiving waterways. In determining the urban structure, it is critical that assets required for drainage purposes are determined early so that the impacts from the increase of stormwater runoff due to urbanisation can be mitigated and all new development can proceed without the risk of



flooding, of flooding neighbouring properties and without impacting on the natural environment, receiving waterways and ultimately, Westernport Bay.

Undertaking a drainage assessment of the catchment that identifies the quantity of runoff, the conveyance of this runoff, the need to retard the runoff and the treatment and / or reuse of the runoff will assist in determining the assets and / or land-take required for the stormwater management of this catchment. It will also identify the location of all stormwater assets.

Liveability and resilience should be incorporated into all new developments. With respect to stormwater management, this involves utilising the stormwater as an asset for the community whilst ensuring fundamentals such as flood protection, safety with respect to flow management and water supply security are maintained. This can be achieved through incorporation of best planning practices for stormwater management during the development of the urban structure.

This Stormwater Strategy for the re-development of Collison Estate, Cranbourne East outlines a management plan for the stormwater that is generated from the urbanisation of the land. It identifies the assets required to manage the increased surface water runoff from urbanisation and sets a framework to achieve the intent of the stormwater assets. The surface water management for the site has been optimised and designed to achieve multiple benefits for the community and the environment.



# 2 Catchment Characteristics

Collison Estate straddles Collison Road in Cranbourne East and is approximately 82.4 ha in size. The land was subdivided as low-density residential development decades prior to the urban growth encompassing Cranbourne East. The average annual rainfall for the region is approximately 800 mm.

The site has three distinct catchments, the smaller northern catchment discharging to Linsell Boulevard, the middle catchment to Heather Grove discharging east towards Clyde Creek and the southern catchment between Heather Grove and Berwick – Cranbourne Road discharging east towards the upper reach of Clyde Creek.

The topography and Melbourne Water hydrologic model indicates the site has an external catchment of approximately 295 ha contributing from Casey Fields and Blue Hills Rise Estate to the south, however the runoff from this catchment is conveyed around Collison Estate towards the upper reach of Clyde Creek via Ferrari Drive. An additional 67 ha contributes from the west and is conveyed through the site via a Q100 pipeline along Heather Grove. This catchment is retarded on the west of Casey Fields Boulevard (Mayfield Road) prior to entering the site. An un-retarded catchment of approximately 14 ha from west of Casey Fields Boulevard (Mayfield Road) is conveyed through the site via Garden Street.

Figure 2.1 depicts the general site characteristics.





Figure 2.1 Catchment Characteristics of Collison Estate, Cranbourne East



# 3 Stormwater Management Requirements

Whilst the site is located within Melbourne Water's Collison Road Development Services Scheme (DSS), the re-development of the site was not planned at the inception of the DSS and therefore no allowance has been made by the DSS for the conveyance and management of the stormwater runoff generated from the re-development of the site.

The re-development of Collison Estate will require:

- The construction all stormwater assets required for the site
- Maintain existing peak flows discharging from the site for all storm events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm
- Maintain existing external flows through the catchment
- Achieve best practice water quality objectives for the stormwater runoff generated from the site
- Allowance for safe conveyance of gap flows through the site utilising road reserves, both existing and proposed



# 4 Proposed Development Layout

The proposed development layout for Collison Estate consists of a mix of uses, predominantly residential, with additional road reserves to connect the new development with the existing development surrounding Collison Estate. The proposed development layout is illustrated in **Figure 4.1**.



Figure 4.1 Proposed Development Layout



# 5 Stormwater Management

The development of Collison Estate has the following stormwater management options:

- Option 1 Retardation and treatment utilising end-of-pipe, catchment scale methods with assets located prior to discharging from site
- Option 2 At-source treatment and retardation based on mandated rain water tanks
- Option 3 Distributed retardation and treatment of runoff with clusters of drainage assets distributed throughout the development

### 5.1 Stormwater Quantity

The drainage system for the re-development of Collison will be designed to prevent property flooding occurring in a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm event and the stormwater runoff can be safely conveyed through the development. To achieve this, the development will adopt a minor / major drainage system philosophy.

### 5.1.1 Minor Drainage System

The minor drainage system will consist of a subsurface pipe network designed to capture and convey all stormwater runoff generated from the catchment for rainfall events up to and including the 20% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) design storm for residential catchments.

The system will be designed in accordance with the Victorian Planning Authority's Engineering Design and Construction Manual.

### 5.1.2 Major Drainage System

The primary objective of the major drainage system is to provide flood protection for the allotments based on the 1% AEP storm event and to ensure the overland flow can be safely conveyed through the development. This will be via overland flow paths contained within road reserve.

There is an existing Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) within the site. For areas covered by the LSIO, the re-development of Collison Estate will be designed so that the new allotment levels are set to a minimum of 450 mm above the 1% AEP flood level, and the finished floor levels for new dwellings are set a minimum of 600 mm above the 1% AEP flood level associated with any drainage reserve or any existing LSIO.

For all other areas within the re-development of Collison Estate, the finished floor levels for new dwellings are to be set a minimum of 300 mm above the relevant 1% AEP flood level which is likely to be related to the overland flow path, and new garage finished floor levels are to be set a minimum of 150 mm above the relevant 1% AEP flood level.

The redevelopment of Collison Estate includes overland flow path connections to the neighbouring developments to ensure no unnecessary encumbrances on properties.



### 5.1.3 Peak 1%AEP Design Flows

The re-development of Collison Estate will increase the average portion of impervious surface within the site from 30%<sup>1</sup> to 70%. This will increase the volume and magnitude of runoff generated from the site. **Table 5.1** outlines the proposed catchments and the peak 1% AEP design flows for the catchments from the re-development without the inclusion of any on-site retardation. The proposed catchments are illustrated in **Figure 5.1**.

Catchment	Area (ha)	Existing Peak 1% AEP design flow (m³/s)	Peak 1% AEP design flow (m³/s)	Estimated Peak Overland Flow (m³/s)
External Catchment through Garden Street	13.960	2.73	2.73	1.64
Northern Catchment	14.080	3.85*	5.05*	3.03*
Middle Catchment	33.096	4.14	7.50	4.50
Southern Catchment	35.454	4.61	8.36	5.01

Table 5.1 Catchments and Peak 1% AEP Design Flows

\* includes the conveyance through the catchment along Garden Street of the external catchment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Average fraction impervious value applied in the hydrologic model for the Collison Road DSS





Figure 5.1 Collison Estate Catchments

Melbourne Water provided Incitus with the Collison Road DSS RORB model *Review\_SWS\_August\_09.cat*. This model relates to the review of the Collison Road DSS undertaken by Stormy Water Solutions in August 2009. This model has since been superseded by the Clyde Creek DSS RORB model which incorporates the Collison Road DSS catchment. The Clyde Creek DSS RORB model allows for the assessment of the flows to the proposed South East Wetland Retarding Basin (SE WLRB) located prior to the outfall of Clyde Creek to Westernport Bay.

The Clyde Creek DSS RORB model *Modified Clyde Creek July 2018.catg* was used as a base for the hydrologic modelling. An assessment of the catchments between the rail line and Cascades on Clyde retarding basin (Clyde Creek RB) was undertaken to validate the model to the topography and current land use. The assessment indicated that the fraction impervious value for the catchments encompassing Collison Estate are too low based on



the surrounding land use adopting a  $f_{imp} = 0.50$  (SWS Collison Road DSS 2009 Technical Review). These areas have been modified to adopt a  $f_{imp} = 0.60$  for the urbanised areas.

The model was then further modified to reflect the re-development of Collison Estate, increasing the  $f_{imp} = 0.30$  for Collison Estate (SWS Collison Road DSS 2009 Technical Review) to  $f_{imp} = 0.70$ .

The results of peak 1% AEP design flows extracted from the three models at various locations along Clyde Creek are listed in **Table 5.2**.

Location	Existing Model Peak 1% AEP design flow (m³/s)	Modified Model Peak 1% AEP design flow (m³/s)	Re-developed Model Peak 1% AEP design flow (m³/s)
Cascades on Clyde RB In	19.31	25.11	25.64
Cascades on Clyde RB Out	10.71	11.47	13.15
Clyde Creek at Tuckers Rd (Edgebrook Estate)	17.31	18.46	18.66
Clyde Creek at GGF	21.71	22.91	23.09
Clyde Creek at Ballarto Road	22.22	23.46	23.64
SE WLRB In	35.26	35.35	35.49
SE WLRB Out	31.61	32.08	32.14

Table 5.2 Peak 1% AEP Design Flows flor Clyde Creek

The results indicate that there is an increase in flow magnitude predominately due to the increase hydraulic efficiency in the modified model simulated by the increased fraction impervious value for the catchments. This is clearly demonstrated by the significant increase in peak flow entering the Cascades on Clyde retarding basin. However, the impact of this is mitigated as the flow is conveyed downstream due to the number of retarding basins it will pass through prior to discharging into Westernport Bay.

The increase peak 1% AEP design flow from the re-development of Collison Estate is less significant than the difference between the existing model and the modified model. The main concern is the peak flow discharging from the Cascades on Clyde retarding basin, with the re-developed model experiencing a 1.7 m<sup>3</sup>/s increase in peak flow discharging. The increase in peak flow due to the re-development of Collison Estate is fairly negligible further downstream.

The Technical Review of the Collison Road DSS undertaken by Stormy Water Solutions in August 2009 indicates that the pre-development 1% AEP flow at the Cascades on Clyde retarding basin is 12 m<sup>3</sup>/s and that the peak 1% AEP design flow discharging from this basin is 15.7 m<sup>3</sup>/s. The technical review indicates that this provides a 50 year flood protection for the downstream properties and that this has been deemed acceptable by Melbourne Water.



Clyde Creek on the east side of Berwick - Cranbourne Road has experience significant amounts of development since the August 2009 Technical Review of the Collison Road DSS. This includes the creek adopting a constructed form from Berwick - Cranbourne Road to the Growling Grass Frog (GGF) conservation zone located half way between Pattersons Road and Ballarto Road; and passing through four online wetland / retarding basin systems Figure illustrates DSS along the way. 5.2 the Clyde Creek from Berwick - Cranbourne Road to the GGF conservation zone.



Figure 5.2 Clyde Creek DSS



Hydraulic analysis has been undertaken on the section of Clyde Creek between Berwick – Cranbourne Road and Hardys Road using as constructed survey; and on Clyde Creek through Edgebrook Estate using the constructed waterway design (from Tuckers Road / Pattersons Road to the GGF zone). The analysis has compared the peak 1% AEP flood levels for the existing model, the modified model and the model with the redevelopment of Collison Estate.

The hydraulic analysis has indicated that the peak 1% AEP flood level in the creek has increased from the existing model flows to the re-development model flows by approximately 150 mm between Berwick – Cranbourne Road and Hardys Road, and by up to 100 mm in Edgebrook Estate. The analysis has also shown that the allotments abutting the creek will still achieve a 600 mm freeboard to the re-development model flows peak flood levels; and the main increase in flood level is between the modified model and the existing model.

**Figure 5.3** and **Figure 5.4** illustrate a typical section of Clyde Creek with the different 1% AEP flood levels for the section of waterway between Berwick – Cranbourne Road and Hardys Road; and the section within Edgebrook Estate.



Figure 5.3 Clyde Creek Constructed Waterway between Berwick - Cranbourne Road and Hardys Road



Figure 5.4 Clyde Creek Constructed Waterway within Edgebrook Estate

Despite the increase in imperviousness within Collision Estate having a negligible effect on the downstream system, the authorities require retardation within Collison Estate to mitigate the runoff to pre-development flow magnitudes. This is further discussed in the next sections.



## 5.2 Overland Flow Safety

It is imperative that the development conveys the overland flows safely along road reserves. This requires ensuring the overland flow along major flow paths complies with floodway safety requirements. The recommended safety limits for residential developments are as follows (from the *Guidelines for Development in Flood Affected Areas* and adapted from Australian Rainfall and Runoff):

At the entrance to lots and access ways:

- V.dmax <= 0.3 m<sup>2</sup>/s
- Vmax <= 2.0 m/s</p>
- dmax <= 0.30 m

For small cars and children:

- V.dmax <= 0.3 m<sup>2</sup>/s
- Vmax <= 3.0 m/s</p>
- dmax <= 0.30 m</p>

The re-development of Collison Estate must also ensure that any flows discharging from the site can be safely conveyed through existing developments.

## 5.3 Stormwater Quality Treatment

The State Environment Protection Policy (Waters of Victoria) defines the required water quality conditions for urban waterways. The aim of stormwater quality treatment is to reduce typical pollutant loads from urban areas to Best Management Practices as defined in the following targets:

Pollutant	Performance Objective
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	80% reduction from typical urban load
Total Phosphorous (TP)	45% reduction from typical urban load
Total Nitrogen (TN)	45% reduction from typical urban load
Gross Pollutants (GP)	70% reduction from typical urban load

Table 5.2 Best Practice Pollutant Reduction Targets

Source: Urban Stormwater: Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines – Victorian Stormwater Committee, 1999.

MUSIC (Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation) has been used to simulate the stormwater runoff and associated pollutant wash-off, together with the pollutant reduction performance of the nominated treatment system. MUSIC is an industry accepted software modelling tool for demonstrating compliance with stormwater quality targets.

Collison Estate is located in the Collison Road DSS. This scheme discharges into the Clyde Creek DSS. Both of these schemes provide catchment scale assets for treatment of runoff from the contributing catchments.



The Clyde Creek DSS MUSIC model had the whole catchment of Collison Road DSS with an average fraction impervious value of 50%. Analysis of the hydrologic model indicates that the average fraction impervious value for the Collison Road DSS based on current land use is 46% and post re-development of Collison Estate is 50%. Therefore, the treatment assets within the Clyde Creek DSS have been designed based on the additional runoff equivalent to the re-development of Collison Estate.

The Clyde Creek DSS MUSIC model indicates that the Cascades on Clyde Wetland achieves 94% of the best practice pollutant reduction targets with the re-development of Collison Estate. The wetland achieves 97% of the targets without the re-development.

The Cascades on Clyde wetland is performing well with an anticipated 42.3% total nitrogen reduction even with the re-development of Collison Estate. The small shortfall is accounted for in the SE WLRB.

Despite the Collision Estate having a negligible effect on the downstream treatment assets and the provision for this catchment to be re-developed in the construction of treatment assets downstream of Cascades on Clyde; the authorities require treatment within Collison Estate to achieve best practice pollutant reduction targets. This is further discussed in the next sections.



# 6 Option 1 – Catchment Scale Management

This option requires the redevelopment of Collison Estate to undertake on-site retardation to mitigate the flows discharging from the site to existing flow magnitudes, and treatment of the stormwater runoff generated from the site to best practice pollutant reduction targets, with the assets to be located prior to the outfalls from the development.

### 6.1.1 On-site Catchment Scale Retardation within Collison Estate

Catchment scale stormwater management for the re-development of Collison Estate includes the provision of on-site retardation to mitigate the flows to pre-development magnitudes for all events up to and including the 1% AEP design storm.

**Table 6.1** outlines the estimated volume of retardation required for Collision Estate to mitigate the flows discharging from the site to pre-development magnitudes all events up to and including the 1% AEP design storm.

Catchment	Northern Catchment	Middle Catchment	Southern Catchment
Post Development Peak 1% AEP design flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	5.05	7.50	8.36
Pre-Development Peak 1% AEP design flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	3.85	4.14	4.61
Storage Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	1,720	3,825	3,980
Drainage Reserve (ha)	0.25	0.5	0.5
Drainage Reserve (ha) Combined retardation / treatment	0.30	1.2	1.2

Table 6.1 Retarding Volumes to Mitigate Peak 1% AEP Design Flows to Pre-Development Magnitudes

**Figure 6.1** illustrates potential storage locations for the retardation within the proposed development. The size of the drainage reserves has accounted for all relevant safe batters to the base of the reserve. The size of the drainage reserve with the combined treatment and retardation should be capable of containing the treatment, dry-out areas, access tracks and safe batters.





Figure 6.1 Proposed Flood Storage Locations



### 6.1.2 On-Site Catchment Scale Treatment within Collison Estate

The development may provide catchment scale treatment combined with the catchment scale retardation.

Should the site provide on-site treatment, a holistic approach will be adopted where some catchments over-treat to compensate for short-falls elsewhere. **Table 6.2** outlines the proposed treatment assets and footprints required to achieve best practice pollutant reduction targets for the re-development of Collison Estate.

Parameter	Northern Catchment	Middle Catchment	Southern Catchment
Treatment Type	Sediment Pond	Constructed Wetland	Constructed Wetland
Treatment Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	700	6,500	6,700
Drainage Reserve (ha)	0.30	1.2	1.2

Table 6.2 Proposed Treatment for the Development

The size of the drainage reserve should be capable of containing the treatment, dry-out areas, access tracks and safe batters.

The performance results that are required of the proposed treatment for the development are listed in **Table 6.3**.

Pollutant	Source (kg/yr)	Load Reduction (kg/yr)	Overall % Reduction
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	75,800	14,000	82%
Total Phosphorous (TP)	160	50.5	68T
Total Nitrogen (TN)	1,140	625	45%
Gross Pollutants (GP)	16,700	0	100%

Table 6.3 Treatment Performance required for the Development

# 7 Option 2 – At Source Management

This option requires the redevelopment of Collison Estate to undertake at-source retardation to mitigate the flows discharging from the site to existing flow magnitudes, and at-source treatment of the stormwater runoff generated from the site.

As the development layout is unknown, the following assumptions, based on existing development surrounding the site, have been applied to the calculations:

- The total development area is 82.63 ha, with an average fraction impervious value of 70% once re-developed
- 4 ha of the site will be open space, with an average fraction impervious of 10%
- 23 ha of the site will be road reserves, with an average fraction impervious value of 70%
- The balance of the site will be residential with an average fraction impervious value of 75%
- Roof area within the residential will account for an average 70% of the total allotment imperviousness, equating to a total area of 38.941
- Rain water tanks will be mandated in the re-development with Estate design guidelines
- 50% of the roof area on all new allotments will be connected to a rain water tank
- the minimum rain water tank size to be 2 kL (to achieve 6-star housing rating) and connected for toilet flushing and laundry use
- Based on an average density of 20 allotments per hectare, the site assumes 1653 new dwellings with rain water tanks
- The site assumes that, whilst mandating the inclusion of rain water tanks, there will be an overall failure of 30% of tanks within the site

### 7.1.1 At-Source Retardation within Collison Estate

At-source stormwater management for the re-development of Collison Estate includes the provision of retardation at, or close to, the source of stormwater runoff to mitigate the flows to pre-development magnitudes for all events up to and including the 1% AEP design storm.

For the at-source management option, the site is assuming that rain water tanks will be mandated for the construction of new dwellings. In addition to the minimum 2 kL requirement for treatment and to achieve the 6-star rating, the tanks will be increased in size to accommodate mitigation of runoff.

An additional 2 kL of storage is required per 100 m<sup>2</sup> of roof area connected to the tank to reduce the runoff from the connected roof area to an equivalent discharge of a land-use with 10% average imperviousness for all events up to and including a 1% AEP storm. Accounting for a 30% failure rate in tanks, the retardation from the tanks reduces the average impervious value of the re-development to 55%. This is still higher than the allowable discharge which equates to an average fraction impervious value of 30%, hence the development will need to provide additional at-source retardation. It is estimated that an additional 60 m<sup>3</sup> of storage per hectare of development will be required to mitigate the flows for all events up to and including the 1% AEP storm.


#### 7.1.2 At-Source Treatment within Collison Estate

At-source stormwater management for the re-development of Collison Estate includes the provision of stormwater quality treatment at, or close to, the source of stormwater runoff.

For the at-source management option, the site is assuming that rain water tanks will be mandated for the construction of new dwellings, with the minimum size to be 2 kL to achieve the 6-star rating. The dwellings will have a minimum of 50% of the roof area connected to the tanks. The tanks will be plumbed for toilet flushing and laundry use.

The additional assumptions have been applied for the at-source stormwater quality modelling:

- demand adopted for toilet flushing is 20 L / person / day (Melbourne Water acceptable demand)
- demand adopted for laundry use is 21 L / person / day (Melbourne Water acceptable demand)
- Assumed 4 persons per dwelling on average based on the typical dwelling size
- All road reserves within the site will adopt passive irrigation of street trees, ensuring no directly connected imperviousness from road reserve catchments.

Modelling of the at-source treatment including rain water tanks with a 30% failure rate and passive irrigation in all road reserves has resulted in the treatment performance specified in **Table 7.1**.

Pollutant	Source (kg/yr)	Load Reduction (kg/yr)	Overall % Reduction
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	56,100	40,700	27.4%
Total Phosphorous (TP)	116	88.2	24.1%
Total Nitrogen (TN)	829	661	20.2%
Gross Pollutants (GP)	11,800	8,300	29.5%

Table 7.1 At-Source Treatment Performance for Rain Water Tanks and Road Reserve Passive Irrigation

The performance has indicated that the rain water tanks and the passive irrigation measures do not achieve the best practice pollutant reduction targets for stormwater. Therefore, the site will need to incorporate additional treatment measures, which may be co-located with the additional retardation. Analysis indicates that the site will need to provide an additional 10 m<sup>2</sup> of rain garden treatment per hectare of allotments to meet best practice pollutant reduction targets.



### 8 Option 3 – Distributed Management

This option attempts to equitably distribute the land required for drainage purposes for retardation to mitigate the flows discharging from the site to existing flow magnitudes, and treatment of the stormwater runoff generated from the site. It utilises linear drainage reserves distributed throughout the site to equally encumber each land-owner, but with sufficient size to create green spines throughout the estate and enhance liveability within the re-development.

Key to this option is a digression from the conventional development with pipe drainage for the minor drainage, instead providing direct house connections to the kerb and channel, and sheet flowing the runoff from each allotment into the green spines. This option to retain stormwater runoff at the surface will assist in the reduction of the heat island effect through the cooling properties of the runoff, and minim a water sensitive city. The maximum flow anticipated to be conveyed along an access street within the development is 0.5 m<sup>3</sup>/s. this magnitude of overland flow is safe and contained within the road reserve.

The proposed incorporation of the linear reserves / green spines into Collison Estate is illustrated in **Figure 8.1**.





Figure 8.1 Proposed Linear Reserves / Green Spines Through Collison Estate



#### 8.1.1 Distributed Retardation within Collison Estate

Distributed stormwater management for the re-development of Collison Estate includes the provision of retardation within the linear reserves / green spines to mitigate the flows to pre-development magnitudes for all events up to and including the 1% AEP design storm.

It is anticipated that all blocks within the existing estate will be able to discharge to a green spine. It is estimated that 101 m<sup>3</sup> of storage will be required per hectare of re-development for retardation within the green spine. Based on the typical section sketched in **Figure 8.2**, this equates to a length of approximately 18 m to 19.2 m of encumbered green spine per hectare.



Figure 8.2 Proposed Cross Sections for Linear Reserves / Green Spines (by KLM Spatial)

#### 8.1.2 Distributed Treatment within Collison Estate

Distributed stormwater management for the re-development of Collison Estate includes the provision of treatment within the linear reserves / green spines for runoff generated from the urbanisation of the site.

Modelling indicates that the site will need to provide 20 m<sup>2</sup> of rain garden per hectare of redevelopment to achieve best practice pollutant reduction targets. These rain gardens can be included within the linear reserves to create multi-functional drainage assets and provide an aesthetic break to the reserve.



# 9 Outfall Arrangement and Staging

Collison Estate has three outfalls which are existing or soon to be existing. The outfalls have been designed for the conveyance of the flows from the current land-use of Collison Estate. The re-development of Collison Estate may will use these outfalls and provide retardation to mitigate the runoff to the capacity of these outfalls for pipe drainage; and the capacity of the road reserves for overland flow.

It is imperative that the re-development of Collision Estate commences at the drainage outfalls so that interim drainage measures are not required. Any significant drainage infrastructure required, such as retardation, should be constructed prior to the re-development of the catchment associated with the drainage assets.

Parcels of land located upstream of an outlet from the existing Estate must construct all required pipe infrastructure to the outlet with easements and overland flow paths prior to commencement of any other works.

Existing drainage easements are located throughout the Estate and provide developers the opportunity to construct the permanent outfall should they precede the downstream development within the Estate.

Development of each individual site within the Estate must ensure the re-development has a permanent outfall, provides adequate retardation and stormwater quality treatment.



# 10 Conclusion

Collison Estate is currently a low-density development consisting of 94 allotments that drains into Clyde Creek. The Estate is proposing a re-development to a combination of standard and medium density allotments.

Analysis of the Clyde Creek catchment has indicated that the catchment has the capacity to convey the peak flows from the re-development of Collison Estate without the provision of any on-site retardation, however the existing pipe infrastructure between the Estate and Clyde Creek is insufficient to convey the 20% AEP flows generated from the re-development of the Estate.

The Collison Road DSS catchment and Clyde Creek DSS catchments, together with the proposed South East Wetland Retarding Basin asset (SE WLRB) provide treatment to the re-development of Collison Estate.

The authorities have indicated that it is preferable for Collison Estate to provide on-site retardation and stormwater quality treatment. Collison Estate can provide this through catchment scale options, at-source options or distributed options.

Catchment scale options result in the creation of three drainage reserves located immediately upstream of each outfall from the site.

At-source management includes the mandating of rain water tanks for treatment and retardation, as well as passive irrigation of all road reserves and additional treatment and retardation.

Tanks need to be a minimum of 2 kL per dwelling for treatment, and 2 kL of additional storage per 200 m<sup>2</sup> of roof area<sup>2</sup>. An additional 60 m<sup>3</sup> of storage per hectare of redevelopment and 10 m<sup>2</sup> of rain garden per hectare of redevelopment is required to achieve the management targets for the at-source option.

Distributed management will direct runoff overland to linear reserves which incorporate storage and treatment. The linear reserves will act as green spines throughout the Estate, linking the community. They will need to provide 101 m<sup>3</sup> of storage and 20 m<sup>2</sup> of rain garden per hectare of re-development to achieve the management targets.

Ideally, the re-development of Collison Estate should commence from the drainage outlets and progress upstream. Any out-of-sequence development should ensure that the pipe infrastructure and suitable overland flow paths exist, with drainage easements over the assets, prior to the commencement of any re-development works.

Irrespective of the stormwater management option adopted for Collison Estate, the Victorian Planning Provisions CI53.18 and CI56.07-4 require the management of flows and the pollutant wash-off from the site to best practice stormwater management. Council may utilise these planning provisions to ensure any re-development within Collison Estate retards runoff to pre-development magnitudes, provides safe conveyance of stormwater runoff, and treats stormwater runoff to best practice pollutant reduction targets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Based on 50% of roof area connected to the tank, and 2 kL of storage per 100 m<sup>2</sup> of roof connected



### 11 References

Ball J, Babister M, Nathan R, Weeks W, Weinmann E, Retallick M, Testoni I, (Editors), 2016, Australian Rainfall and Runoff: A Guide to Flood Estimation, Commonwealth of Australia

CSIRO, 2006, Urban Stormwater: Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines

Engineers Australia, 1987, Australian Rainfall and Runoff

Growth Areas Authority, April 2011, Engineering Design and Construction Manual

Metropolitan Planning Authority, February 2014, Clyde Creek Precinct Structure Plan PSP54

Melbourne Water, 2018, Planning and Building website

Melbourne Water, 2018, Guidelines for the Use of MUSIC

Melbourne Water, 2005, WSUD Engineering Procedures: Stormwater

Neil M Craigie, 11 December 2013, Casey Growth Area, Thompsons Road PSP53 and Clyde Creek PSP54, Surface Water Management Aspects (Version 3 Final Draft)

Stormy Water Solutions, August 2009, Collison Road DSS Technical Review



### Appendix A – RORB Parameters

RORB File	Modified Clyde Creek July18.catg
kc	15.41
m	0.8
IL	10 mm
RoC	0.6 (100 year ARI)
Rainfall Location	CLYDE NORTH
Temporal Pattern	Filtered
Aerial Pattern	Uniform
Aerial Reduction Factor	Siriwardena and Weinmann
Loss Factor	Constant Losses

#### **IFD Parameters**

Location	CLYDE NORTH
2  <sub>1</sub>	17.64
2  <sub>12</sub>	3.80
<sup>2</sup>   <sub>72</sub>	1.10
50  <sub>1</sub>	33.93
50  <sub>12</sub>	7.34
50  <sub>72</sub>	2.12
Skew	0.38
F2 Value	4.27
F50 Value	14.97
Zone	1



### **Appendix B – Intensity Frequency Duration Data**

#### **Cranbourne Intensity Frequency Duration Table**

Latitude: -38.1092 [Nearest grid cell: 38.1125 (S)] Longitude: 145.3131 [Nearest grid cell: 145.3125 (E)]

Average Exceedance Probability									
Duration	63.20%	50%#	20%*	10%	5%	2%	1%		
1 min	89.8	102	143	173	203	245	279		
2 min	78.2	88.1	120	143	166	191	211		
3 min	69.9	78.9	108	129	150	174	194		
4 min	63.5	71.9	99.2	119	138	163	182		
5 min	58.3	66.2	66.2 92 110		129	153	173		
10 min	42.8	48.9	68.9	83.3	98.1	119	137		
15 min	34.7	39.6 56		67.9	80.1	97.8	112		
20 min	29.6	33.8	47.7	57.7	68.1	83	95.2		
25 min	26	29.7	41.8	50.5	59.5	72.3	82.7		
30 min	23.4	26.6	37.3	45.1	53	64.2	73.2		
45 min	18.3	20.8	28.8	34.6	40.5	48.5	54.9		
1 hour	15.3	17.3	23.8	28.4	33.1	39.4	44.4		
1.5 hour	11.9	13.4	18.1	21.4	24.8	29.2	32.7		
2 hour	9.91	11.1	14.9	17.5	20.2	23.6	26.3		
3 hour	7.64	8.51	11.3	13.2	15.1	17.6	19.6		
4.5 hour	5.87	6.52	8.57	9.98	11.4	13.3	14.8		
6 hour	4.85	5.38	7.06	8.2	9.33	10.9	12.2		
9 hour	3.69	4.1	5.37	6.24	7.11	8.39	9.4		
12 hour	3.03	3.36	4.42	5.15	5.89	6.99	7.86		
18 hour	2.27	2.52	3.35	3.93	4.52	5.42	6.13		
24 hour	1.84	2.05	2.74	3.24	3.75	4.51	5.13		
30 hour	1.55	1.74	2.34	2.78	3.24	3.91	4.45		
36 hour	1.35	1.51	2.05	2.45	2.86	3.46	3.94		



Duration	Average Exceedance Probability										
Duration	63.20%	50%#	20%*	10%	5%	2%	1%				
48 hour	1.08	1.21	1.66	1.99	2.34	2.83	3.23				
72 hour	0.79	0.884	1.21	1.46	1.73	2.08	2.37				
96 hour	0.633	0.707	0.961	1.16	1.37	1.64	1.86				
120 hour	0.536	0.595	0.8	0.956	1.12	1.34	1.52				
144 hour	0.469	0.519	0.688	0.813	0.948	1.13	1.27				
168 hour	0.422	0.464	0.604	0.705	0.814	0.971	1.09				



### Appendix C – Storage Calculations Catchment Scale Management

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (l/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	21.400	8143.9	3845	24	10	4886.3	3921.9	964.4
95.2	21.400	5659.1	3845	24	20	6790.9	5075.4	1715.5
73.2	21.400	4351.3	3845	24	30	7832.4	6228.9	1603.5
59.8	21.400	3554.8	3845	24	40	8531.5	7382.4	1149.1
50.8	21.400	3019.8	3845	24	50	9059.3	8535.9	523.4
44.4	21.400	2639.3	3845	24	60	9501.6	9689.4	-187.8
39.5	21.400	2348.1	3845	24	70	9861.8	10842.9	-981.1
35.7	21.400	2122.2	3845	24	80	10186.4	11996.4	-1810.0
32.7	21.400	1943.8	3845	24	90	10496.7	13149.9	-2653.2
30.2	21.400	1795.2	3845	24	100	10771.3	14303.4	-3532.1
26.3	21.400	1563.4	3845	24	120	11256.4	16610.4	-5354.0
22.4	21.400	1331.6	3845	24	150	11984.0	20070.9	-8086.9
19.6	21.400	1165.1	3845	24	180	12583.2	23531.4	-10948.2
16.0	21.400	951.1	3845	24	240	13696.0	30452.4	-16756.4
13.7	21.400	814.4	3845	24	300	14659.0	37373.4	-22714.4
12.2	21.400	725.2	3845	24	360	15664.8	44294.4	-28629.6

Northern Catchment

# **INCiTUS**

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (l/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	26.742	10176.7	4141	18	10	6106.0	3478.4	2627.6
95.2	26.742	7071.7	4141	18	20	8486.0	4720.7	3765.3
73.2	26.742	5437.5	4141	18	30	9787.4	5963.0	3824.4
59.8	26.742	4442.1	4141	18	40	10661.0	7205.3	3455.6
50.8	26.742	3773.5	4141	18	50	11320.6	8447.6	2873.0
44.4	26.742	3298.1	4141	18	60	11873.3	9689.9	2183.3
39.5	26.742	2934.1	4141	18	70	12323.4	10932.2	1391.2
35.7	26.742	2651.9	4141	18	80	12729.0	12174.5	554.4
32.7	26.742	2429.0	4141	18	90	13116.7	13416.8	-300.1
30.2	26.742	2243.3	4141	18	100	13459.9	14659.1	-1199.2
26.3	26.742	1953.6	4141	18	120	14066.1	17143.7	-3077.7
22.4	26.742	1663.9	4141	18	150	14975.3	20870.6	-5895.4
19.6	26.742	1455.9	4141	18	180	15724.0	24597.5	-8873.5
16.0	26.742	1188.5	4141	18	240	17114.6	32051.3	-14936.7
13.7	26.742	1017.7	4141	18	300	18318.0	39505.1	-21187.2
12.2	26.742	906.2	4141	18	360	19574.8	46958.9	-27384.1

#### Middle Catchment

# **INCíTUS**

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (I/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	28.647	10901.7	4612	17	10	6541.0	3735.7	2805.3
95.2	28.647	7575.5	4612	17	20	9090.6	5119.3	3971.3
73.2	28.647	5824.9	4612	17	30	10484.7	6502.9	3981.8
59.8	28.647	4758.6	4612	17	40	11420.5	7886.5	3534.0
50.8	28.647	4042.4	4612	17	50	12127.2	9270.1	2857.0
44.4	28.647	3533.1	4612	17	60	12719.2	10653.7	2065.5
39.5	28.647	3143.2	4612	17	70	13201.4	12037.3	1164.1
35.7	28.647	2840.8	4612	17 80		13635.9	13420.9	215.0
32.7	28.647	2602.1	4612	17	90	14051.3	14804.5	-753.2
30.2	28.647	2403.2	4612	17	100	14418.9	16188.1	-1769.2
26.3	28.647	2092.8	4612	17	120	15068.2	18955.3	-3887.1
22.4	28.647	1782.5	4612	17	150	16042.2	23106.1	-7063.9
19.6	28.647	1559.7	4612	17	180	16844.3	27256.9	-10412.6
16.0	28.647	1273.2	4612	17	240	18334.0	35558.5	-17224.5
13.7	28.647	1090.2	4612	17	300	19623.1	43860.1	-24237.0
12.2	28.647	970.8	4612	17	360	20969.5	52161.7	-31192.2

#### Southern Catchment

# **INCiTUS**

### Appendix D – Storage Calculations At-Source Management

#### Rain Water Tank Storage Per 200 m<sup>2</sup> of Connected Roof

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (I/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	0.020	7.6	2.7	5	10	4.6	1.2	3.4
95.2	0.020	5.3	2.7	5	20	6.3	2.0	4.3
73.2	0.020	4.1	2.7	5	30	7.3	2.8	4.5
59.8	0.020	3.3	2.7	5	40	8.0	3.6	4.3
50.8	0.020	2.8	2.7	5	50	8.5	4.5	4.0
44.4	0.020	2.5	2.7	5	60	8.9	5.3	3.6
39.5	0.020	2.2	2.7	5	70	9.2	6.1	3.1
35.7	0.020	2.0	2.7	5	80	9.5	6.9	2.6
32.7	0.020	1.8	2.7	5	90	9.8	7.7	2.1
30.2	0.020	1.7	2.7	5	100	10.1	8.5	1.6
26.3	0.020	1.5	2.7	5	120	10.5	10.1	0.4
22.4	0.020	1.2	2.7	5	150	11.2	12.6	-1.4
19.6	0.020	1.1	2.7	5	180	11.8	15.0	-3.2
16.0	0.020	0.9	2.7	5	240	12.8	19.8	-7.0
13.7	0.020	0.8	2.7	5	300	13.7	24.7	-11.0
12.2	0.020	0.7	2.7	5	360	14.6	29.6	-14.9

### **INCiTUS**

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (I/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	0.672	255.7	170	10	10	153.4	102.0	51.4
95.2	0.672	177.7	170	10	20	213.2	153.0	60.2
73.2	0.672	136.6	170	10	30	246.0	204.0	42.0
59.8	0.672	111.6	170	10	40	267.9	255.0	12.9
50.8	0.672	94.8	170	10	50	284.5	306.0	-21.5
44.4	0.672	82.9	170	10	60	298.4	357.0	-58.6
39.5	0.672	73.7	170	10	70	309.7	408.0	-98.3
35.7	0.672	66.6	170	10	80	319.9	459.0	-139.1
32.7	0.672	61.0	170	10	90	329.6	510.0	-180.4
30.2	0.672	56.4	170	10	100	338.2	561.0	-222.8
26.3	0.672	49.1	170	10	120	353.5	663.0	-309.5
22.4	0.672	41.8	170	10	150	376.3	816.0	-439.7
19.6	0.672	36.6	170	10	180	395.1	969.0	-573.9
16.0	0.672	29.9	170	10	240	430.1	1275.0	-844.9
13.7	0.672	25.6	170	10	300	460.3	1581.0	-1120.7
12.2	0.672	22.8	170	10	360	491.9	1887.0	-1395.1

#### Additional Storage Required per Hectare of Re-development

# **INCíTUS**

### **Appendix E – Storage Calculations Distributed Management**

Per Hectare of Re-development

l (mm/hr)	Ae (ha)	Qa (l/s)	Qp1 (I/s)	Ts (mins)	Td (mins)	Vin (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vout (m <sup>3</sup> )	Vstored (m <sup>3</sup> )
137.0	0.808	307.5	185	8	10	184.5	99.9	84.6
95.2	0.808	213.7	185	8	20	256.4	155.4	101.0
73.2	0.808	164.3	185	8	30	295.7	210.9	84.8
59.8	0.808	134.2	185	8	40	322.1	266.4	55.7
50.8	0.808	114.0	185	8	50	342.1	321.9	20.2
44.4	0.808	99.7	185	8	60	358.8	377.4	-18.6
39.5	0.808	88.7	185	8	70	372.4	432.9	-60.5
35.7	0.808	80.1	185	8	80	384.6	488.4	-103.8
32.7	0.808	73.4	185	8	90	396.3	543.9	-147.6
30.2	0.808	67.8	185	8	100	406.7	599.4	-192.7
26.3	0.808	59.0	185	8	120	425.0	710.4	-285.4
22.4	0.808	50.3	185	8	150	452.5	876.9	-424.4
19.6	0.808	44.0	185	8	180	475.1	1043.4	-568.3
16.0	0.808	35.9	185	8	240	517.1	1376.4	-859.3
13.7	0.808	30.7	185	8	300	553.5	1709.4	-1155.9
12.2	0.808	27.4	185	8	360	591.5	2042.4	-1450.9

### **INCiTUS**

Incitus Pty Ltd ABN 55 285 448 851 PO Box 7142 Richmond VIC 3121

T 0414 404 730 E nina.barich@incitus.com.au W www.incitus.com.au

### **Appendix B**

**Catchment Plan** 





### Appendix C

**Layout Plan and Typical Sections** 



DISCLAIMER - KLM Spatial therefore disclaims any liability whatsoever and howsoever caused for loss or damage arising from a third party's misuse of the plan/data (whether inadvertent or not) caused by the failure to inform any such third party of the limitations which apply to the information contained in this plan/within the accompanying data.





### **Appendix D**

**Concept Design** 



construction. KLM Spatial is to be notified immediately of any error or discrepancy and the matter resolved prior to the commencement or continuation of this plan or any part of it without this note being included in full will render the information shown on such reproduction invalid and not suitable for use.











KLM SPATIAL

LAND DEVELOPMENT INTELLIGENCE

								·		
		MAX	STORAGE LEVEL RL3	36.90						
		VIP R.L. 35.700								
DESIGN GRADELINE	-3	3.33 ≫	%							
VERTICAL GEOMETRY										
HORIZONTAL GEOMETRY	СР									
ΠΔΤΗΜ 29.0	Т									
DESIGN										
LINE LEVEL	36.9	35.7	25 75 25 75	<u>35.78</u>	35 <u>.</u> 82	35 80	35.94	35.95	36.02	
TOP OF		3	c	» 5	រភ	2	2 4	5	5	
BANK LEVEL		37.1		37.2	37.2		37.1	37.1	37.2	
EXISTING	5	2	ç	<b>5</b>	04	č			88	
	37.	37.		37	37.	37	37	37	36	
		9	ç	7.28	0		4 36	0	00	
	0	с С	ر ا		4	<u>ا</u>		œ		





construction. KLM Spatial is to be notified immediately of any error or discrepancy and the matter resolved prior to the commencement or continuation of this plan or any part of it without this note being included in full will render the information shown on such reproduction invalid and not suitable for use. DISCLAIMER - KLM Spatial therefore disclaims any liability whatsoever and howsoever caused for loss or damage arising from a third party's misuse of the plan/data (whether inadvertent or not) caused by the failure to inform any such third party of the limitations which apply to the information contained in this plan/within the accompanying data.







	l										>	
		M	AX S	TÓRÁGÉ LÉVEL RL	38.65							
		X										
		0										
		37.75										
		° R.L.										
		Ν										
DESIGN GRADELINE	-2	9.17	%							0.20%		
VERTICAL GEOMETRY												
HORIZONTAL GEOMETRY												
	ЧСР											
	8.0	7.75	76	7.78		.82			.86	.88	6 2	
	33	37	37	37		37			37	37	31	
		02	<u>03</u>	.05		60			13	15	17	
BANK LEVEL		39	39	39		39			39	39	30	
EXISTING	ω	ω	ω	œ		ω			78	69	69	
SURFACE LEVEL	38. 38.	38.	38.	38.		38 <u>.</u> 38			38 <u>.</u> 38	38 <u>.</u> 38	30	
CHAINAGE										o.		
AT CENTRELINE	0	3 <u>.</u> 6	6.38	20		40			09	68.4	80	
							ONGIT			SECTI	ON - CH	
						<u> </u>	HORIZ 0	10	20	40	60	
							VERT 0	1	2	4	6	



	1		<u></u>					`~	~	
		MAX	x st	ORAGE LEVEL RL38	3.90					
		Y		<u>//////</u>	<u>///////</u>					
		0								
		. 37.8								
		VIP R.I								
DESIGN GRADELINE	-3	3.33	%							
HORIZONTAL GEOMETRY										
	НСР									
DATUM 31.0										
DESIGN			2	23		7	5	4	5	
LINE LEVEL	39	37.8	37.8	37.8		37.8	37.9	37.9	37.9	
TOP OF			01	33		20	5	14	15	
BANK LEVEL		39	39.(	39.(		<u>39.(</u>	68	30	30	
EXISTING			11			2	$\sim$		16	
SURFACE LEVEL	39	39	<u> 39.</u>	39		39.	30	39	39.	
		ŝ	32				_	<b>T</b>	_	
ATCENTRELINE	0	3.(	9	20		40	60	75	80	



construction. KLM Spatial is to be notified immediately of any error or discrepancy and the matter resolved prior to the commencement or continuation of this plan or any part of it without this note being included in full will render the information shown on such reproduction invalid and not suitable for use. DISCLAIMER - KLM Spatial therefore disclaims any liability whatsoever and howsoever caused for loss or damage arising from a third party's misuse of the plan/data (whether inadvertent or not) caused by the failure to inform any such third party of the limitations which apply to the information contained in this plan/within the accompanying data.



VERTICAL GEOMETRY	
HORIZONTAL GEOMETRY	
	НСР
DATUM 30.0	
DESIGN	
LINE LEVEL	37.6
TOP OF	
BANK LEVEL	
EXISTING	
SURFACE LEVEL	37.6
	_

Verify all dimensions prior to construction - Do not scale

This plan (or the data transmitted herewith) has been prepared to facilitate the construction and should not be used for any other purpose. KLM Spatial accepts no responsibility whatsoever for the use of unapproved plans in any construction and should not be used for any other purpose. Set-Out dimensions of all design lines, grid lines, recovery marks and bench marks should be verified and confirmed against the latest information at construction. KLM Spatial is to be notified immediately of any error or discrepancy and the matter resolved prior to the commencement or continuation of this plan or any part of it without this note being included in full will render the information shown on such reproduction invalid and not suitable for use. DISCLAIMER - KLM Spatial therefore disclaims any liability whatsoever and howsoever caused for loss or damage arising from a third party's misuse of the plan/data (whether inadvertent or not) caused by the failure to inform any such third party of the limitations which apply to the information contained in this plan/within the accompanying data.



manager@klms.com.au

LAND DEVELOPMENT INTELLIGENCE





construction. KLM Spatial is to be notified immediately of any error or discrepancy and the matter resolved prior to the commencement or continuation of this plan or any part of it without this note being included in full will render the information shown on such reproduction invalid and not suitable for use. DISCLAIMER - KLM Spatial therefore disclaims any liability whatsoever and howsoever caused for loss or damage arising from a third party's misuse of the plan/data (whether inadvertent or not) caused by the failure to inform any such third party of the limitations which apply to the information contained in this plan/within the accompanying data.

# Appendix E

**Neighbouring Estate Plans** 

					,		FU	l.
				ł				
								-
							DEX - M	-
	F537.61		Ex OPEN DR	AIN		5250 510		
		37.6		FS	27.00			/ \
LEGEND		FS37.77	16.0m	 85. 12.3m		(54) 300¢		
KERB TYPES S-502-D1 = DISHED INVERT	127 372m <sup>2</sup> 127 372m <sup>2</sup> 126 5 354m <sup>2</sup> 5 354m <sup>2</sup> 5 5 126 126 126 126 126 126 126 126			CH 319.			5250	
S-506-BK&C = BARRIER KERB & CHANNEL			フ 24 - 長 2m <sup>2</sup> だい	- 12	TPCH		1 her	
200-400mm FILL REFER TO NOTES 17 & 18		CH 58.	142 00	578m	12,755	FS37.6	144) 450ø	
> 400mm FILL REFER TO NOTES 17 & 18		69.1 <u>6</u> 16 om	CT 0.0	32.06	T37.60 FS37.38	58 22 452		ŧ
ALL OTHER AREAS WHERE FINISHED SURFACE LEVELS ARE SHOWING FILL	63 +	PVC		65		AT AT		, ,
ARE TO BE GRADED TO LEVELS SHOWN	AIRLANE COU	RT- <u>62</u> ,		N4 N3 ●	N2	(40) N1 S (49)		5
96.98				5ø (50)	3150	38	300g	- Ba
5		14.0m ± 89.223	37.68 37.68	37.67 537.47 37.67	T37	F <sup>\$37,60</sup> 12,287	57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 5	',
5 12	84:500 121.91 151.91	6.00	3.977 H 42.0	5.50	TPUN	ر الم 133 - م	,31	$\langle$
	「129 <b>130</b> 〇 354m <sup>2</sup> 炭 447m <sup>2</sup> 長	<b>131</b> 448m <sup>2</sup>			527 ~o /	<sup>582m²</sup> TPCH 255	.553	
	33 33 32	32.0m	433m²	₩ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	70	32.0m	FS37.95	ł
<b>F537.87</b> 37.83 16.0r	12.5m 12.5m 14.0m 22 22 14	80		n D &/S E		S CH 2	46.811	
	(59) <b>1</b> 4.0m <b>5</b>	225ø 125m +	13.4m	1225ø	5	50m² 36.5m <b>TPCH</b>	234.570	
141	1.00 E S 99 1.00 2.00 3.0m D & S E 1.00 2.00 3.0m D & S E	2.00	8. 14.0m 58	00) 132.82 132.82 132.82		32.4m	<b>F\$38.08</b> 37.98	
46/m²	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	لا <b>138</b> 400m <sup>2</sup>	Û 1	8 1500 PVC 16.0m		CH <b>135</b> 541m <sup>2</sup>	229.166	
100 100 128:00	H 93.2	9.646 32.0 806	<b>137</b>	00 F538. 37.5	99	35.0m	F\$20 a	
(30)	200 Ch	PCH 6 24 CH 62	H 48.8(	(61) JP	<u>;</u>  0:  0:	<sub> сн 21</sub>	1.924 <sup>38.1</sup>	7
		- 33.50 - 33.50 - 33.50 - 33.50 - 33.50 		38.14 338.10 838.10	56	136 <sup>34m²</sup> TPCH 20.	3 315 88	
		27			<u>32.8</u>	n	F538.01	
19.77 38.75 38.75	3000	19 · + · - · ·	+P_QNY4		2 <b>T</b>	++	17)	
H 5.00	F538.33 38.13 3000 3000 50 3000	3.21 ± 13.0m &	3 R. 14.0m =			23		-
5 6 7 142 7 7 7	4.40 (31) 20 E * 11.8		3.00	<b>F538.1</b> 138.2 178.2	4.0m	₩ <b>FS.</b>	38.01	
		H 57.4	T	43.446	5.00	9 TPCI	1 539 H	Ē
(36) 			<b>164</b> 448m²	ま 子 16 448				
<i>FS38.30</i> 30.1m CH 40 0	16.0m <b>S</b> 738.45 16.0m 2	225	DRSE SS			508m² (Q		
	38.38 B38.37 35 (2) 35 (2) 38.45 38.42 38.45 CH 40.	000	14.0m	** 32 	<del>5538.64</del> 38.49	) TP(	29.0m	
378m <sup>2</sup>	SERVICE OFFSET TABLE	500			-			
	Location	Water	ND-Water	Gas	NBN	Elec	Sewer	
	FIORELLI BOULEVARD	3.10 W 4.30 W 2.80 N&W	2.60 W 3.70 W 2.30 N&W/	2.10 W 3.10 W 1.85 N&W/	2.10 E 4.90 W 3 40 N&W/	2.60 E 5.50 W 4.00LV N&W	1.00 W	7
	FAIRLANE COURT	3.10 S	2.60 S	2.10 S	2.10 N	4.60HV N&W 2.60 N	1.00 S	_
	PONY COURT SHELBY STREET	3.10 N 3.10 W	2.60 N 2.60 W	2.10 N 2.10 W	2.10 S	2.60 S 2.60 F	-	
	DODGE TERRACE	3.10 N	2.60 N	2.10 N	0.40 S	0.90 S	-	_

© COF									
No una	ge williams & Co. Fry Ltd has granted a licence to the principal to use this document the the second s								
E	BATTER LEVELS ADDED TO BLOCKS	06.08.12	JM	LH					
D	CROSSOVERS & WATER CONNECTIONS AMENDED	10.07.12	JM	LH					
С	TGSIS ALTERED, CONNECTIONS ALTERED	04.03.11	JM	LH	н	AS CONSTRUCTED	09.12.16	LH	LH
В	GAS & ELECTRICITY OFFSET ALTERED - FERRARI	18.02.11	JM	LH	G	DRIVEWAYS TO LOTS 126, 129 & 140 AMENDED	13.02.15	LH	LH
А	ISSUED FOR CONSTRUCTION	23.11.10	JM	LH	F	AMENDED INTERSECTION PONY CT/FIORELLI BVD	14.08.14	RH	LH
Rev	Description	Date	Ву	Арр	Rev	Description	Date	Ву	Арр








