



"Where will our knowledge take you?"

Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Report Roma Urban Land Development Area Bowen Street, Roma


October 2011

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS
referred to in the ULDA
APPROVAL dated 14/12/12



Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Report

Roma Urban Land Development Area
Bowen Street, Roma



Prepared For: Urban Land Development Authority

Prepared By: BMT WBM Pty Ltd (Member of the BMT group of companies)

Offices


Brisbane
Denver
Mackay
Melbourne
Newcastle
Perth
Sydney
Vancouver

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

BMT WBM Pty Ltd BMT WBM Pty Ltd Level 11, 490 Upper Edward Street Brisbane 4000 Queensland Australia PO Box 203 Spring Hill 4004 Tel: +61 7 3831 6744 Fax: + 61 7 3832 3627 ABN 54 010 830 421 www.wbmpl.com.au	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 35%;">Document :</td> <td>R.B17916.005.01.RomaDetailedSMP.doc</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Manager :</td> <td>Paul Dubowski</td> </tr> </table> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 35%;">Client :</td> <td>Urban Land Development Authority</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Client Contact:</td> <td>Franz Van Den Brink and Genaea Mitchell</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Client Reference</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Document :	R.B17916.005.01.RomaDetailedSMP.doc	Project Manager :	Paul Dubowski	Client :	Urban Land Development Authority	Client Contact:	Franz Van Den Brink and Genaea Mitchell	Client Reference	
Document :	R.B17916.005.01.RomaDetailedSMP.doc										
Project Manager :	Paul Dubowski										
Client :	Urban Land Development Authority										
Client Contact:	Franz Van Den Brink and Genaea Mitchell										
Client Reference											

Title :	Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Report - Roma Urban Land Development Area - Bowen Street, Roma
Author :	Paul Dubowski, Nigel Hardie and Anne Kolega
Synopsis :	This report builds on the <i>Bowen Street, Roma - Concept Stormwater Management Report</i> (BMT WBM, 2011) providing a detailed assessment of stormwater quantity and quality for the Roma Urban Development Area.

REVISION/CHECKING HISTORY

REVISION NUMBER	DATE OF ISSUE	CHECKED BY		ISSUED BY	
0	October 2011	Nigel Hardie		Paul Dubowski	
1	October 2011	Nigel Hardie		Paul Dubowski	

DISTRIBUTION

DESTINATION	REVISION			
	0	1	2	3
ULDA	PDF	PDF		
BMT WBM File	PDF	PDF		
BMT WBM Library	PDF	PDF		

SUMMARY

As part of the Urban Land Development Authority's (ULDA) affordable housing strategy a mixed-use urban development is proposed for Bowen Street, Roma located in the Maranoa Regional Council local government area. The site has a total area of 24ha and will consist of over 300 dwellings and three large parkland areas.

The aim of this report is to demonstrate the type of stormwater management systems required to meet the relevant stormwater quantity and quality objectives.

This report includes the following two elements:

- Water Quantity Assessment (Section 2)
- Water Quality Management Plan (Section 3)

Based on the Maranoa Regional Council's Planning Scheme Maps, the site is located well outside the 100 Year ARI Flood Event. Therefore, no flood impact assessment has been undertaken for this development.

The **Water Quantity Assessment** presented in this report provides an assessment of the proposed development on the site's hydrology. The hydrological modelling undertaken as part of the concept SMP showed that without mitigation:

- peak flow-rates would increase in areas downstream of the eastern portion of the site and therefore treatment is required for this sub-catchment
- peak flow-rates would not increase in areas downstream of the western portion of the site and therefore no treatment is required for this sub-catchment.

The recommended treatment for the eastern portion of the site detailed in the *Bowen Street, Roma - Concept Stormwater Management Report* (BMT WBM, 2011) "the concept SMP", includes a detention basin with a **storage volume of 4,800m³** (e.g. surface area of 4,000m² and 1.2m storage depth).

During the concept design stage, rainwater tanks, stormwater harvesting and bioretention systems had also initially been identified as potential stormwater management options. Stormwater harvesting was discounted from the preferred strategy and the impact from this decision on detention volume was assessed. Given the conservative approach to hydrologic modelling adopted during the concept design phase, the detention basin storage volume would not be affected by the removal of stormwater harvesting.

The **Water Quality Management Plan** included in this report provides a detailed stormwater quality assessment of the proposed development considering recommendation of the *Bowen Street, Roma - Concept Stormwater Management Report* (BMT WBM, 2011).

The stormwater quality objectives adopted at the concept design stage were derived from the *State Planning Policy 4/10 Guideline for Healthy Waters* (DERM, 2010), (the SPP). Although currently under review, these objectives remain the most current objectives in Queensland legislation and therefore have also been adopted for the site during the detailed design phase.

There were 3 driving factors for reviewing the models developed during the concept design stage including:

- The removal of stormwater harvesting from the stormwater treatment strategy
- There were changes in the sub-catchments areas modelled during the concept design stage as result of more detailed earthworks information being available at the detailed design stage
- A new version of the modelling software has become available allowing more accurate pollutant removal predictions.

The treatment train adopted in the detailed design models consists of domestic rainwater tanks sized to meet Queensland Development Code MP4.2 water savings targets and bioretention systems.

In order to meet the stormwater quality objectives, bioretention systems (in conjunction with rainwater tanks) would need to be sized at no less than 0.8% of the catchment area. Bioretention systems sized at less than 1% of a contributing catchment typically experience a range of operational problems and therefore **the recommended size of bioretention systems is 1% of the contributing catchment**. It is expected that hydrological management objectives would also be met by constructing these systems. The equivalent bioretention filter surface area required for treatment would include be:

- **1,844m² for the western catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 6 parkland**
- **922m² for the eastern catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 8 parkland.**

Although the ultimate size of the systems may be up to twice the size of the filter media (due to batters and associated design requirements), the systems will be passively integrated into the parklands. This will assist in minimising the visual effect of the systems and maximise recreation opportunities in the parks.

The ultimate design of both the detention basin and bioretention systems including the size, shape, location and configuration is subject to further design at the operational works phase.

CONTENTS

Summary	i
Contents	iii
List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	iv
1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Background & Project Description	1-1
1.2 Site Description	1-1
1.2.1 Site Location	1-1
1.2.2 Existing Land Usage	1-1
1.2.3 Site Topography and Drainage	1-1
1.3 Scope of the Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Plan	1-5
2 WATER QUANTITY ASSESSMENT	2-1
2.1 Preamble	2-1
2.2 Operational Phase Stormwater Quantity Management Objectives	2-1
2.3 Hydrological Modelling	2-1
2.4 Stormwater Quantity Conclusion	2-2
3 WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN	3-1
3.1 Preamble	3-1
3.2 Operational Phase Stormwater Quality Management Objectives	3-1
3.2.1 Stormwater Quality	3-1
3.2.2 Hydrologic Management Objectives	3-2
3.3 Modelling Approach	3-2
3.3.1 Preamble	3-2
3.3.2 Modelling Scenarios	3-2
3.3.3 Rainwater Tanks	3-5
3.3.4 Bioretention Treatment Systems	3-5
3.3.5 Stormwater Quality Modelling Results	3-10
3.4 Construction Phase Stormwater Management	3-11
3.4.1 Erosion and Sediment Control	3-11

3.5	Staged Construction of Bioretention Systems	3-11
3.6	Asset Hand-over	3-12
3.7	Maintenance Plans	3-13
3.8	Stormwater Quality Conclusion	3-13
4	REFERENCES	4-1
APPENDIX A: LOT CONFIGURATION PLAN		A-1
APPENDIX B: WATER QUALITY MODELLING PARAMETERS		B-1
APPENDIX C: BIORETENTION SATURATED ZONE INVESTIGATION		C-1
APPENDIX D: ASSET TRANSFER CHECKLIST		D-1
APPENDIX E: INDICATIVE MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR BIORETENTION SYSTEMS		E-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Proposed Development Layout	1-2
Figure 1-2	Location of Site	1-3
Figure 1-3	Digital Elevation Model of Existing Site	1-4
Figure 3-2	Sub-catchment Layout for Proposed Development	3-4
Figure 3-3	Proposed Bioretention Basin Locations	3-7
Figure 3-4	Preliminary Bioretention Design - Stage 8	3-8
Figure 3-5	Preliminary Bioretention Design - Stage 6	3-9
Figure 3-6	Example of a Bioretention Basin with Temporary Protection (During Lot-Scale Works)	3-12

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1	Concept Pollutant Load Reduction Targets	3-1
Table 3-3	Predicted Change in Flow and Annual Pollutants	3-10

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background & Project Description

As part of the Urban Land Development Authority's (ULDA) affordable housing strategy a mixed-use urban development is proposed for Bowen Street, Roma located in the Maranoa Regional Council local government area.

The development includes over 300 dwellings and three large parkland areas which will serve a variety of uses including integrated stormwater solutions. A commercial/community use precinct is also proposed along the eastern boundary which will support the hospital and other needs of local residents. The proposed layout is illustrated in Figure 1-1 while a lot plan is available in Appendix A.

1.2 Site Description

1.2.1 Site Location

The site is located approximately 1.5 kilometres west of the Roma Town Centre, directly south of the Roma Hospital. The 24 hectare site is bounded by Bowen Street to the south, McDowall Street to the north, Cottell Street to the east and rural residential land to the west. It is also dissected by Currey Street. The site is located within the Balonne River Catchment, which is within the Murray Darling Basin.

The location of the site is shown in Figure 1-2.

1.2.2 Existing Land Usage

The site is predominantly rural and undeveloped, with residential lots within the eastern portion of the site.

1.2.3 Site Topography and Drainage

The existing topography of the site is predominantly flat with ground levels ranging from 313m AHD to 322m AHD. The highest elevation is approximately 322m AHD along the Currey Street ridgeline which dissects the site into two main sub-catchments. The eastern sub-catchment is divided into a smaller sub-catchment which drains away from the site in a south west direction and a larger sub-catchment which drains north to an open channel. The western sub-catchment drains to the north east into the existing stormwater network.

The existing topography is illustrated in Figure 1-3.

The proposed site topography will not vary significantly from the existing case with limited earthworks proposed.



Title:
Proposed Development Layout

Figure:
1-1

Rev:
A

BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this map is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, guarantee or make representations regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained in this map.



0 150 300
Approx. Scale

 **BMT WBM**
www.bmtwbm.com.au

Filepath : I:\B17916_I_JLB Stormwater Management Review for ULDA BAD\DRGWQU_013_110202_Layout.wor



LEGEND



Proposed Development Site

Title:

Location of Site

Figure:

1-2

Rev:

A


BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this map is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, guarantee or make representations regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained in this map.



0 1 2km
Approx. Scale



Filepath : I:\B17916_I_JLB Stormwater Management Review for ULDA BAD\DRG\WQU_016_110203_Roma_Locality.wor



1.3 Scope of the Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Plan

This Detailed Integrated Stormwater Management Plan provides a holistic approach to stormwater management for the proposed urban development during and after construction. The main elements of plan are:

- **Water Quantity Assessment (Section 2):** This section provides an assessment of the proposed development on site hydrology and provides recommendations as to how these impacts can be appropriately mitigated.
- **Water Quality Management Plan (Section 3):** This section provides a water quality assessment of the proposed development and explains how the proposed stormwater management strategy for the site will comply with the given water quality objectives.

Based on the Maranoa Regional Council's Planning Scheme Maps R6, the site is located well outside the 100 Year ARI Flood Event. Therefore, no flood impact assessment has been undertaken for this development.

2 WATER QUANTITY ASSESSMENT

2.1 Preamble

This section outlines the assessment of the proposed development on the site's hydrology and provides recommendations as to how these impacts can be addressed by further on-site works, such that the development complies with the requirements of the Maranoa Regional Council (MRC) Planning Scheme Policy.

Hydrologic modelling was initially undertaken during the concept design phase to assess the changes in peak flows and quantity of stormwater from the site in the existing and developed scenarios. Where further retention of flow is required to mitigate peak flows, the model has been utilised in the developed scenario to determine the extent of mitigation (i.e. sizing of a detention basin on site) needed to meet MRC requirements.

2.2 Operational Phase Stormwater Quantity Management Objectives

The MRC Planning Scheme reflects the following guidelines:

- State Planning Policy 1/03 – Mitigating the Adverse Impacts of Flood, Bushfire and Landslide
- Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (Volume 1 text, Volume 2 Design Charts)
- Australian Rainfall and Runoff (Volume 1, A guide to Flood Estimation).

The overall objective of the Planning Scheme in regards to flooding is that *“Residential development to be located in the Residential Zone clear of the flood inundated area of the 1 in 100 year event”*.

2.3 Hydrological Modelling

A hydrological assessment was undertaken to determine the flow behaviour across the site. The methodology and results were reported in the *Bowen Street, Roma - Concept Stormwater Management Report* (BMT WBM, 2011), hereafter referred to as “the concept SMP”. Hydrologic modelling of the site had been performed for three scenarios:

- *Existing*: current state of the site
- *Developed (with no mitigation)*: as existing condition with the development but no mitigation
- *Developed (with mitigation)*: as developed (with no mitigation) scenario, but with the inclusion of a detention basin in the eastern part of the site.

The hydrological modelling showed that without mitigation, peak flow-rates would increase in areas downstream of the eastern portion of the site but would not worsen in the western part of the site. A detention basin was subsequently required in the eastern portion of the site. No mitigation is required for the western catchment.

In order to address the stormwater management objectives **a detention basin with storage volume of 4,800m³ will be required** e.g. a basin with a surface area of 4,000m² and storage depth

limited to a maximum of 1.2m. This required detention basin will be integrated with recreational uses and stormwater quality treatment in the Stage 8 parkland area and is therefore subject to further design investigation at the operational works stage to maximise landscape integration.

The stormwater harvesting system identified in the concept SMP is no longer being adopted and therefore the impact from removing this system on the detention was checked as part of this detailed design report.

This review found that the modelling for design flood events allowed for conservative assumptions, i.e. the stormwater harvesting and rainwater tanks being full at the beginning of the flood event. Thus the design of the detention basin represents the necessary capacity needed to attenuate flooding without any of the water savings measures noted above. No change to the design of the detention basin is therefore recommended as a result of the exemption from water savings requirements.

2.4 Stormwater Quantity Conclusion

The hydrological modelling undertaken as part of the concept SMP showed that without mitigation:

- peak flow-rates would increase in areas downstream of the eastern portion of the site and therefore treatment is required for this sub-catchment
- peak flow-rates would not increase in areas downstream of the western portion of the site and therefore no treatment is required for this sub-catchment

The recommended treatment for the eastern portion of the site includes a detention basin with a storage volume of 4,800m³ (e.g. surface area of 4,000m² and 1.2m storage depth). This basin will be integrated with recreational uses and stormwater quality treatment systems in the Stage 8 parkland area.

There will be no changed required detention volume as a result of not adopting stormwater harvesting due to the conservative hydrological modelling adopted at the concept design phase.

3 WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 Preamble

This section provides a detailed assessment of the stormwater quality and receiving water hydrology management. This section explains how the proposed stormwater management strategy for the site will comply with the given stormwater management objectives.

3.2 Operational Phase Stormwater Quality Management Objectives

3.2.1 Stormwater Quality

The *State Planning Policy 4/10 Guideline for Healthy Waters* (Department of Environmental and Resource Management (DERM), 2010), hereafter referred to as “the SPP for Healthy Waters”, provides stormwater quality performance criteria for the operational phase of the development. The objectives listed in this guideline for “Western Districts” which had been adopted in the concept SMP are provided in Table 3-1.

The pollution reduction targets represent the mean annual stormwater pollutant load, comparing a developed (untreated) site to a developed (mitigated) site.

Table 3-1 Concept Pollutant Load Reduction Targets

Pollutant	Criteria
Total Suspended Sediment (TSS)	85 % reduction
Total Phosphorus (TP)	70 % reduction
Total Nitrogen (TN)	45 % reduction
Gross Pollutants (GP)	90 % reduction

These objectives were developed by DERM using MUSIC (Model for Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation) Version 3 in accordance with the methodology outlined the document: “*Urban Stormwater: Queensland Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines 2009: Technical Note: Derivation of Design Objectives*” (DERM, 2009). This methodology was in turn based on the document “*Water Sensitive Urban Design, Developing Design Objectives for Urban Development in South East Queensland* (Water by Design, 2007).

Since these objectives were developed, more current versions of the software were released. The most current version available is MUSIC Version 5 and the treatment performance of bioretention systems varies between these models. As a result, DERM have commenced reviewing the objectives for the State however this process is not expected to be completed until mid-2012. The objectives adopted in the concept SMP for Roma were therefore also adopted at the detailed design stage.

3.2.2 Hydrologic Management Objectives

The SPP for Healthy Waters also identifies hydrologic management objectives for frequent flow and waterways stability management. The hydrologic management objectives adopted for this site include:

- Limiting the post-development peak one-year average recurrence interval (ARI) event discharge within the receiving waters to the pre-development peak.
- Capturing and managing the first 15 mm of runoff from impervious surfaces where the total impervious surface is greater than 40%.

These objectives have also been adopted for the development as noted in the concept SMP.

3.3 Modelling Approach

3.3.1 Preamble

The performance of stormwater treatment strategies in managing stormwater pollutants (during the operational phase) has been assessed using the MUSIC as part of the concept design. Subsequent to this report a number of changes had occurred driving a need to undertake new modelling as part of detailed design. The main changes which occurred included:

- The removal of stormwater harvesting from the stormwater treatment strategy impacts on water quality results
- During the concept design stage the site was separated into 3 sub-catchments however during the detailed design phase it was confirmed that as a result of earthworks there would only be 2 sub-catchments (eastern and western). The revised sub-catchment layout for the proposed development is illustrated in Figure 3-1.
- An updated version of the MUSIC software had become available providing more reliable modelling predictions.

The modelling described in this report takes account of these changes and demonstrates how stormwater quality objectives will be achieved with a revised approach to treatment. The most current version of MUSIC (Version 5.0) has been used to model the site during the detailed design process.

3.3.2 Modelling Scenarios

There were 3 scenarios modelled including the following:

- *Base Case - Undeveloped Site.* The base case is an assessment of the undeveloped site in its current state represented by 'rural residential' parameters.
- *Developed Case - Unmitigated.* The developed case without mitigation is essentially an assessment of what would occur if the site were developed without any integration of stormwater treatment systems.
- *Developed Case - Mitigated.* This case is an assessment of the fully developed site with domestic rainwater tanks sized to meet Queensland Development Code MP4.2 water


savings targets and bioretention installed in each sub-catchment, sized to meet stormwater quality objectives.

For consistency, the unmitigated and mitigated scenarios have been modelled using identical source node parameters. The meteorological parameters, source node parameters and treatment node parameters adopted in these models are presented in Appendix B. Rainwater tanks are further discussed in Section 3.3.3 while bioretention systems are further discussed in Section 3.3.4.

Commercial/Community Use Areas

The commercial/community use areas have been excluded from the water quality assessment within this report. These areas will ultimately be developed separately, with ULDA acting as the assessment manager for applications made over this land. The ULDA will assess these applications against the "*Residential 30: Guideline to Deliver Diversity in New Neighbourhood Development*" (ULDA, 2010), which includes provisions for stormwater management. Developers of these allotments will therefore need to demonstrate to the ULDA compliance with the same best practices objectives outlined in Section 3.2, ensuring stormwater is treated to a suitable standard.

An appropriate planning mechanism is therefore in place to ensure the stormwater from the commercial sub-catchments will be treated to appropriate standards at a subsequent stage of the development process.




Title:
Sub-catchment Layout for Proposed Development

Figure:
3-1

Rev:
A

BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this map is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, guarantee or make representations regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained in this map.



3.3.3 Rainwater Tanks

Every allotment within the development will be required to install a rainwater tank (to collect roof runoff to supplement non-potable water demands) in accordance with the Queensland Government (2010) "*Queensland Development Code (QDC) MP4.2: Water Savings Targets*".

For the purposes of the MUSIC modelling, the rainwater tanks have been represented in the MUSIC model as a single 'rainwater tank' in each of the sub-catchments. The provision and size of rainwater tanks have been modelled in accordance with the QDC requirements as summarised in Appendix B, which also provides the assumed reuse rates.

3.3.4 Bioretention Treatment Systems

There were 2 bioretention treatment nodes in the "developed case" MUSIC model i.e. one for each sub-catchment shown in Figure 3-1.

The configuration, size and number of the individual bioretention systems does not make any difference to the overall stormwater quality performance as long as:

- the overall percentage of filter media compared to the contributing catchment area remains the same
- the equivalent area which drains to the bioretention systems remains consistent with the model
- all other parameters remain the same.


This means that there is flexibility in how the systems will be configured at the operational works stage (the number of systems and their location) and there is flexibility in their ultimate design (their shape and size). This is important to ensure that both the bioretention systems and detention can be passively integrated into the parklands.

Figure 3-2 provides the preliminary location of the bioretention/detention systems while Figure 3-3 and Figure 3-4 provide preliminary detailed designs of the bioretention systems. The ultimate location and design will be further refined during operational works in collaboration with the ULDA, landscape architects and civil engineers.

It is noted the bioretention system modelled include "submerged zones" which provide an important store of water for extended plant survival during dry periods. This water store will help support both the establishment and long-term survival of plants in the systems. The media in the submerged zones comprises of medium-to-coarse sand or gravel and a carbon source (e.g. woodchips) and typically remains saturated. The carbon source is essential to promote the denitrification process by feeding denitrifying bacteria thereby enhancing nitrogen removal (due to additional denitrification) and providing a slightly greater reduction in nitrogen compared to conventional bioretention systems.

The depth of these systems is important as deeper systems provide a greater store of water (supporting plants for longer) and increased denitrification but are also more expensive. An assessment of the most appropriate depth for these systems is presented in Appendix C. Given that the primary aim of saturated zones is to support plants, the depth of the modelled systems is based

primarily on the assessment presented in Appendix C and to a lesser extent the need to meet the water quality objectives.






Title:
Proposed Bioretention Basin Locations

Figure:
3-3


Rev:
A

BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this map is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, guarantee or make representations regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained in this map.






Section B-B - Weir Detail





Section A-A - Coarse Sediment Forebay Detail




Section C-C - Outlet Detail



Title: ULDA Roma Preliminary Bioretention Basin Design - Stage 8	Figure: 3-4	Rev: A
BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this drawing is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, represent or make any representation regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained in this drawing. Filepath: \\wbm-bne-nas\1\drafting\B18142\Loader Slipway - 18142-02.dwg BMT WBM www.bmtwbm.com.au		



Section A-A - Weir Detail



Title: ULDA Roma Preliminary Bioretention Basin Design - Stage 6	Figure: 3-5	Rev: A
BMT WBM endeavours to ensure that the information provided in this drawing is correct at the time of publication. BMT WBM does not warrant, guarantee or make representations regarding the currency and accuracy of information contained on this drawing.		
Filepath: \\wbm-bme-nas1\drafting\B18142\Loader Slipway - 18142.02.dwg		
BMT WBM www.bmtwbm.com.au		

3.3.5 Stormwater Quality Modelling Results

Stormwater Quality

Total annual flow and pollutant loads from the site for each of the three modelled scenarios are presented in Table 3-2. These values represent the flow and loads that are predicted to discharge from the site.

Table 3-2 Predicted Change in Flow and Annual Pollutants

	Flows & Pollutant Loads				
	Flow (ML/yr)	TSS (kg/yr)	TP (kg/yr)	TN (kg/yr)	GP (kg/yr)
The Base Case - Undeveloped Site	24	7 370	7.66	63.1	650
Developed Case - Unmitigated	67	14 200	26.8	144	2 190
Developed Case - Mitigated	61	1 200	11.4	64	0
	% Reductions (Compared to 'Developed Case - Unmitigated')				
	Flow	TSS	TP	TN	GP
Developed Case – Mitigated with rainwater tanks and 0.8% bioretention	25	86	79	58	100
Developed Case – Mitigated with rainwater tanks and 1% bioretention	26	90	82	61	100
Stormwater Quality Objectives	N/A	85	70	45	100

From these results it can be seen that by developing the site for urban purposes, the change in land use would result in significantly greater pollutant loads being discharged from the site to the local waterways. The table also demonstrates that adopting the bioretention systems (sized at 0.8% of the catchment), the pollutant loads will be sufficiently reduced to meet the revised load-based stormwater quality pollutant reduction targets. This includes predicted pollutant reductions of 86% for TSS, 79% for TP, 58% for TN and 100% for GP.

Bioretention systems sized at less than 1% of a catchment area can experience a range of operational risks which may reduce performance, lifespan and increase maintenance costs. These risks include:

- plant mortality due to extended waterlogging
- formation of a biofilm on the filter surface as a result of water logging
- excessive sediment accumulation and subsequent clogging of the filter media
- plant mortality due to excessive smothering with sediment.

As a result it is recommended that the bioretention systems be sized at 1% of the contributing catchment. This will result in slightly higher pollutant reductions including 90% for TSS, 82% for TP, 61% for TN. The equivalent bioretention filter surface area required for treatment would include be:

- 1,844m² for the western catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 6 parkland
- 922m² for the eastern catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 8 parkland.

As noted above the, configuration, size and number of the individual bioretention systems does not make any difference to the overall stormwater quality performance as long as the systems meet the criteria outlined in the dot points provided in Section 3.3.3.

Hydrologic Management

The local planning scheme does not detail any relevant compliance methodologies for hydrologic objectives and Council does not enforce the objectives listed in the State Planning for Healthy Waters (DERM, 2010). The proposed treatment train includes bioretention which exceeds the stormwater quality objectives and a number of local Council accept that meeting stormwater quality objectives will also provide hydrologic management objectives to the extent that hydrologic objectives are also achieved. Given that the recommended filter area exceeds the objectives, the proposed bioretention systems will be more likely to achieve the hydrological management objectives compared to a "typical" bioretention system.

3.4 Construction Phase Stormwater Management

3.4.1 Erosion and Sediment Control

The pollutants of concern during the construction phase are not readily modelled due to the site-specific nature of typical construction pollutant sources. Pollutant export would be largely dependent on site management practices and would vary throughout the construction phase depending on the particular activities being undertaken. A Best Management Practice (BMP) approach should be adopted in selecting management options for the construction phase.

A detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Program (E&SCP) will be prepared during the operational works stage. The concept report provides information to identify the controls and procedures that would be incorporated into the detailed E&SCP. During the construction phase of the development, the E&SCP will be implemented to minimise water quality impacts.

3.5 Staged Construction of Bioretention Systems

The proposed bioretention systems should be constructed and established in accordance with the the staged construction and establishment methodology "Option 1: Surface protection with temporary vegetation" outlined in Water by Design's (2010a) "*Construction & Establishment Guidelines: Swales, Bioretention Systems and Swales*".

According to this methodology, the functional elements (e.g. underdrain pipes, gravel drainage media, transition layer and filter media) of the bioretention systems can be constructed/ installed during road and lot-scale construction activities. However, they will need to be protected (e.g. from

excessive sediment loads) by over-laying a temporary geo-fabric over all the media, followed by a 25mm layer of topsoil and turf.

This protection can be applied to all of the filter media or a section (with stormwater flows prevented from entering the remainder of the bioretention system by a plywood barrier or similar barrier). Figure 3-5 provides an example of a bioretention basin with temporary protection (during lot-scale works) as described above.



Figure 3-5 Example of a Bioretention Basin with Temporary Protection (During Lot-Scale Works)

As part of the operational works phase a stormwater quality operational works package will be prepared including:

1. Detailed design operational works drawings for the bioretention systems
2. Civil and landscape construction and establishment sign-off forms for bioretention systems
3. Bioretention construction tolerance limits and filter media specifications (to be noted on plans). Filter media specification will be in accordance with *Guidelines for Soil Filter Media in Bioretention Systems* (Facility for Advancing Water Biofiltration 2008).
4. Civil and landscape contract clauses as they relate to the construction and establishment of bioretention systems.

Coordination between landscape design, stormwater quality and flooding design will be undertaken to ensure designs are compatible and complementary.

Following 90% completion of construction and building works the temporary protection layers will be removed and the bioretention basins landscaped in accordance with the detailed landscape plans.

3.6 Asset Hand-over

It is expected that the proposed stormwater management systems (including responsibility for all ongoing maintenance requirements) will be transferred to Maranoa Regional Council after the “on-maintenance” period. The on-maintenance period should be 18 months unless it can be demonstrated that the systems have established earlier.

Asset transfer checklists will need to be completed and approved by Council prior to asset handover to Council for maintenance after the conclusion of the off-maintenance period. The checklist for bioretention systems is contained in Appendix D.

3.7 Maintenance Plans

Indicative maintenance requirements for bioretention systems have been provided in Appendix E. It should be noted that the Water by Design program of the SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership is developing more advanced maintenance guidelines. When these become available they should be used in place of the maintenance advice provided herein. Alternatively where locally available bioretention maintenance guidelines become available these should be used.

3.8 Stormwater Quality Conclusion

The stormwater quality monitoring undertaken as part of the concept SMP showed that without mitigation, stormwater quality would be worse than existing conditions post development and fail to meet stormwater quality objectives.

Bioretention systems and rainwater tanks were therefore adopted as the preferred stormwater quality treatment train for minimising impact in the receiving environment and meeting the stormwater quality objectives identified by the SPP Healthy Waters.

Modelling results demonstrated that bioretention systems sized at 0.8% of the catchment would be adequate to meet the load-based stormwater quality pollutant reduction targets. A range of operational risks were identified for bioretention systems sized at less than 1% of a contributing catchment which may reduce performance, lifespan and increase maintenance costs.

Given these operational risks **it is recommended that the bioretention systems be sized at 1% of the contributing catchment.** This will result in slightly higher pollutant reductions including 90% for TSS, 82% for TP, 61% for TN. The equivalent bioretention filter surface area required for treatment would include be:

- **1,844m² for the western catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 6 parkland**
- **922m² for the eastern catchment. This will be accommodated in the Stage 8 parkland.**

A staged construction and establishment process will be undertaken to protect the filter media from construction and building phase sediment.

4 REFERENCES

Facility for Advancing Water Biofiltration (2008). *Guidelines for Soil Filter Media in Bioretention Systems (Version 2.01)*. Monash University, Melbourne, March.

Hatt B.E, Lewis J, Fletcher T, Deletic A, (2007) *Insights from The Design, Construction And Operation of an Experimental Stormwater Biofiltration System*. Paper presented at the Rainwater & Urban Design Conference, Sydney, Australia, August 21-23, 2007.

Queensland Department of Environment and Resource Management (2010) *State Planning Policy for Healthy Waters*. Queensland Government, Brisbane.

Urban Land Development Authority (2010) *Residential 30: Guideline to Deliver Diversity in New Neighbourhood Development. Policy Version 1.0*. ULDA, Brisbane.

Wong T. H. F. (Ed.) (2006) *Australian Runoff Quality: A Guide to Water Sensitive Urban Design*. Sydney, Australia: Institution of Engineers, Australia.

Water by Design (2006) *WSUD Technical Design Guidelines*. SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership. Brisbane, Queensland.

Water by Design (2007) *Water Sensitive Urban Design, Developing Design Objectives for Urban Development in South East Queensland*. SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership, Brisbane.

Water by Design (2009) *Advanced Bioretention Design Training Course Notes*. SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership. Brisbane, Queensland.


Water by Design (2010a). *Construction and Establishment Guidelines: Swales, Bioretention Systems and Wetlands*. SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership. Brisbane, Queensland.

Water by Design (2010b). *MUSIC Modelling Guidelines*. SEQ Healthy Waterways Partnership. Brisbane, Queensland. ISBN 978-0-9806278-4-8

Zinger Y., A. Deletic A. and Fletcher T.D. (2007a) *The Effect of Various Intermittent Dry-Wet Cycles on Nitrogen Removal Capacity in Bioretention Basin Systems*. Rainwater and Urban Design 2007 Conference, Sydney 2007.

Zinger Y., Fletcher T.D., A. Deletic A., blacken G.T., and Viklander (2007b) *Optimisation of the Nitrogen Retention Capacity of stormwater Biofiltration Systems*. Novatech Conference 2007, Lyon France.

APPENDIX A: LOT CONFIGURATION PLAN



Lot Type	Nominal Dimensions			Stage 1		Stage 2		Stage 3		Stage 4		Stage 5		Stage 6		Stage 7		Stage 8		Total Site	
	Width	Depth	Area	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%	Lots	%
Traditional (long)	20	32	640	2	6.25%	0	0%	2	4.7%	0	0%	5	12.8%	1	2.7%	1	2%	0	0%	11	3.5%
Courtyard (long)	15	32	480	2	6.25%	3	11.1%	6	14%	3	8.1%	7	17.9%	7	18.9%	12	24%	4	8.9%	44	14.2%
Villa (wide)	12.5	32	400	5	15.6%	3	11.1%	7	16.3%	5	13.5%	9	23.1%	13	35.2%	8	16%	7	15.6%	57	18.4%
Villa (narrow)	10	32	320	4	12.5%	6	22.2%	14	32.5%	2	5.4%	8	20.5%	8	21.6%	13	26%	10	22.2%	65	21%
Courtyard (short)	15	25	375	7	21.9%	1	3.7%	3	7%	8	21.6%	3	7.7%	0	0%	4	8%	4	8.9%	30	9.7%
Studio (wide)	11.5	25	287.5	6	15.6%	5	18.5%	1	2.3%	7	18.9%	1	2.6%	0	0%	2	4%	9	20%	31	10%
Studio (narrow)	10	25	250	4	15.6%	5	18.5%	5	11.6%	10	27.1%	2	5.1%	0	0%	4	8%	9	20%	39	12.6%
Multi-family Dwelling*	varies	varies	450	2	6.25%	4	14.9%	5	11.6%	2	5.4%	4	10.3%	8	21.6%	6	12%	2	4.4%	33	10.6%
Total				32	100.0%	27	100.0%	43	100.0%	37	100.0%	39	100.0%	37	100.0%	50	100.0%	45	100.0%	310	100.0%

*Average number of dwellings per MFD lot = 3

APPENDIX B: WATER QUALITY MODELLING PARAMETERS

Meteorological Data

MUSIC modelling was undertaken using meteorological data from 'Roma' station (BOM 43091) for a period of ten years (from 1 January 1996 to 31 December 2005) at six-minute time steps. This modelling period was selected for the following reasons:

- There is minimal 'missing data' or 'accumulated data'
- The mean annual rainfall for this period (537mm) is relatively close to that for Roma (556mm).

Average potential evapo-transpiration data for the site has been obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology for Roma.

Source Nodes

To allow for accurate pollutant generation and hydrologic assessment of the site, each sub-catchment was assigned source nodes representing the catchment area and appropriate pollutant generating characteristics. The base and stormflow pollutant concentration parameters and rainfall and runoff parameters were adopted in accordance with Water by Design's (2010b) "*MUSIC Modelling Guidelines for South East Queensland*". Justification for use of these objectives is provided in the Concept SMP.

The 'rural residential' land use parameters were used for the existing scenario while, "urban residential" "split-catchment" parameters were used for the developed scenarios. The "split-catchment" modelling approach involves further discretising source nodes according to roof, road reserve and other impervious (ground level) areas.

The existing site was assumed to have an effective imperviousness of 5% while split catchment effective impervious percentages of 100%, 60% and 30% were assumed for roof, road reserve, and ground level respectively. The eastern parkland will feature a skate bowl and shelters so 5% imperviousness was adopted for this open space area while all other open spaces were assumed to have 0% impervious area.

The land use proportions applied in the MUSIC model are summarised in the following table.

Applied Land Usage Proportions for Proposed Developed Areas

	Sub-catchment 1	Sub-catchment 2
Allotment area (ha)	9.36	2.84
Roof area (ha)	4.68	1.42
Ground level area (ha)	4.68	1.42
Road reserve area (ha)	7.23	1.91
Park space area (ha)	1.85	0.81
Total Sub-catchment area (ha)	18.44	5.56

Rainwater Tank Nodes

For the purposes of the MUSIC modelling, the rainwater tanks have been represented in the MUSIC model as a single 'rainwater tank' in each of the sub-catchments.

The dwelling categories below table are in accordance with the concept layout plan provided in Appendix A. It has been assumed that each tank will be approximately 1.8m in diameter and have a permanent detention depth of 0.2m.

The outdoor irrigation is based on 75% of the impervious area (30% of non-roof ground level).

Assumed Rainwater Tank Properties for MUSIC Modelling

Dwelling Type	Adopted Size of Rainwater Tanks (kL)	Adopted Reuse Rates (kL/dwelling/day)
Traditional Long	5	0.4625
Courtyard Long	5	0.4625
Courtyard Short	5	0.4625
Villa Wide	3	0.4255
Villa Narrow	3	0.4255
Studio Wide	3	0.4255
Studio Narrow	3	0.4255
Multi Family Dwelling	N/A	N/A

Bioretention Nodes


The table below provides a summary of the bioretention systems assumed in MUSIC. The ultimate design will be further refined during operational works in collaboration with the ULDA, landscape architects and civil engineers.

Assumed Properties for Bioretention Systems

		Subcatchment 1	Subcatchment 2
	Surface area (m ²)	1,844	922
	Filter area (m ²)	1,844	922
	Low flow bypass (m ³ /sec)	0.00	
	High flow bypass (m ³ /sec)	100.00	
	Extended Detention Depth (m)	0.20	
	Filter depth (m)	0.50	
	Filter median particle diameter	0.45	
	Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (mm/hr)	180	
	Depth below underdrain pipe (m)	0.30	
	TN content of filter media (mg/kg)	800	
	Orthophosphate content of filter media (mg/kg)	20.0	
	Submerged zone depth	0.30	

APPENDIX C: BIORETENTION SATURATED ZONE INVESTIGATION

Saturated zones are typically designed for bioretention systems to support plants particularly in dry climates. The diagram below shows a typical cross section of a saturated zone bioretention system.



Typical Cross Section of Saturated Bioretention System

The saturated zones provide a store of water which plants can draw upon during inter-event periods and have the added bonus of increased nitrogen removal, particularly where designed with a carbon source (e.g. wood chips). This carbon source aids in the denitrification process by feeding denitrifying bacteria.

The high hydraulic conductivity and low nutrient level required for efficient stormwater treatment through bioretention filter media creates a challenging environment for plants to survive. These conditions are further exacerbated in climates such as those encountered in Roma where long dry periods are typically experienced over the winter months.

Nitrogen removal in conventional bioretention systems (without saturated zones), rapidly deteriorates when the media begins to dry out and nitrogen leaching can occur in these type of systems after just 3 weeks without rainfall (Zinger et al, 2007a). Systems with saturated zones, however, not only minimise nutrient leaching during dry weather but can actually continue to remove nitrogen during subsequent dry periods at rates equivalent to the previous rain event (Zinger et al, 2007a).

These results led Zinger et al (2007a and 2007b) to recommend 300mm deep saturated zone as the preferred minimum saturated zone depth. The minimum depth of 300mm is expected to provide protection against drying for up to 5 weeks however this is highly dependent on climate and site conditions.


The long dry season experienced in Roma is likely to be characterised by occasional dry periods well beyond five weeks. The minimum saturated zone depth recommended by Zinger et al (2007a and 2007b) may therefore be inappropriate for Roma. An assessment of rainfall patterns was therefore undertaken to determine the most appropriate depth of saturated zone for the proposed development.

Sizing Bioretention Saturated Zones

Historical rainfall data recorded at the Yuleba Daily station was interrogated to determine appropriate saturated zone depths. This station provides a much longer period of reliable rainfall and therefore more appropriate for this type of assessment. Rather than using the data described in Appendix B it was necessary to assess a much longer rainfall period to account for less frequent events such as droughts and rare flooding events.

Over 39 years of available data (1967-2006) was assessed for suitability. The historical records were found to have limited missing and accumulated data. The whole rainfall period could subsequently be used and results interpreted with a high degree of reliability. To assess how saturated zones would be expected to perform locally, the rainfall data was exported from MUSIC and plotted in Excel measuring the frequency which rainfall exceeds a rainfall threshold of 1 mm¹ (see the graph below).

The longest drought period² experienced in Roma according to the available rainfall was between 08/05/1994 and 01/09/1995 (451 days) however such droughts are rare in the region with there being weekly rainfall greater than 1mm for 50% of the time on average.



¹ A rainfall threshold of 1mm was selected as the estimated minimum rainfall required to generate runoff from impervious surfaces.

² Defined here as the greatest number of consecutive days where the rainfall threshold of 1mm is not met.

Water by Design (2009) recommends that saturated zone depth should be increased by 120mm for every week of dry weather additional to the five weeks of continuous dry weather mitigated by the recommended minimum 300mm deep saturated zone. The dashed, green line on the graph shows that for 90% of the time on average, a 300mm deep saturated zone will protect a bioretention system in Roma from drying out to the point of leeching (35 days).

The shape of this performance curve enables the informed selection of the 'optimal' treatment size beyond which any further increase in saturated zone depth (and thus cost) yields only limited incremental increase in protection from drought. This so called "point of diminishing performance (or return)" can be considered to represent the reasonable limit of performance of the saturated zone which can then be adopted as the most appropriate depth of the saturated zone.

For example, the dotted, red line on the graph has been plotted to show that if the saturated zone depth was increased by an additional 120mm to provide an extra week of protection this would on average result in the protection of the system for only an additional 1-2% of the time. The cost associated with the construction of an additional 120mm would therefore be beyond the point of diminishing return and an unsustainable option for ULDA and Council from both a life cycle cost and performance perspective.

It is therefore recommended that the saturated zones are not increased in depth beyond the minimum depth of 300mm recommended by Zinger et al (2007a and 2007b).

During droughts² which exceed 5 weeks it may be necessary to top up bioretention systems to protect the systems from leeching nitrogen. It should be noted however that carefully selected plant species will be used in the bioretention system capable of survival well beyond the point where the saturated zone dries up and therefore significantly less frequent watering would be required maintain plant viability. Watering and planting is further discussed below.

Watering Bioretention Systems

The need to top up saturated zones will be reliant not only on rainfall but also on a range of interrelated factors including evapotranspiration, plant species and surface runoff as result of base flows (e.g. from lawn/garden watering, leaking pipes etc.). The number of variables makes it therefore unrealistic to reliably predict a top up frequency however there two methods for determining an appropriate watering regime:

1. **Topping up the systems to limit nitrogen leeching and improve denitrification** - topping up to limit nitrogen leaching and improve denitrification should be undertaken after every five weeks where there has been no runoff (including domestic source base flows). As discussed above however, a 300mm deep saturated zone will on average protect a bioretention system in Roma from drying out to the point of leeching for 90% of the time on average.
2. **Topping up the systems to maintain plant health** – topping up to maintain plant health should be undertaken when plants display any sign of stress related to a lack of water. However with water in the saturated zones present for 90% of an average year and species selection based in part on drought tolerance, the systems will remain healthy well beyond five

weeks where there has been no runoff. This means that the likelihood of a dry spell which begins to effect plant health would be very rare.

As with any other public asset in the Maranoa Regional Council the bioretention systems will need to be monitored by the asset manager and managed responsively with more or less watering required depending on prevailing conditions. Watering can be undertaken either via surface irrigation or direct filling via the overflow pits/drainage pipes.

APPENDIX D: ASSET TRANSFER CHECKLIST

BIORETENTION BASIN DESIGN ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST			
Asset I.D.		DA No.	
Basin Location:			
Hydraulics:	Minor Flood (m ³ /s):	Major Flood (m ³ /s):	
Area:	Catchment Area (ha):	Bioretention Area (ha):	
TREATMENT		Y	N
Treatment performance verified from curves?			
BIORETENTION MEDIA AND UNDER-DRAINAGE		Y	N
Design documents bioretention area and extended detention depth as defined by treatment performance requirements.			
Overall flow conveyance system sufficient for design flood event(s)?			
Where required, bypass sufficient for conveyance of design flood event?			
Where required scour protection provided at inflow point to bioretention?			
Bioretention media specification includes details of filter media, drainage layer and transition layer (if required)?			
Design saturated hydraulic conductivity included in specification?			
Transition layer provided where drainage layer consists of gravel (rather than coarse sand)?			
Perforated pipe capacity > infiltration capacity of filter media?			
Selected filter media hydraulic conductivity > 10 x hydraulic conductivity of surrounding soil?			
Liner provided if selected filter media hydraulic conductivity < 10 x hydraulic conductivity of surrounding soil?			
Maximum spacing of collection pipes < 1.5m?			
Collection pipes extended to surface to allow inspection and flushing?			
BASIN		Y	N
Bioretention area and extended detention depth documented to satisfy treatment requirements?			
Overflow pit crest set at top of extended detention?			
Maximum ponding depth will not impact on public safety?			
Maintenance access provided to surface of bioretention system (for larger systems)?			
Protection from coarse sediments provided (where required) with a sediment forebay?			
Protection from gross pollutants provided (where required)?			
LANDSCAPE		Y	N
Plant species selected can tolerate extended dry periods, periodic inundation and design velocities?			
Bioretention design and plant species selected integrate with surrounding landscape or built environment design?			
COMMENTS			

Source: Water by Design (2006)

APPENDIX E: INDICATIVE MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR BIORETENTION SYSTEMS

SCHEDULE OF SITE VISITS													
Purpose of Visit	Frequency	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Routine inspection	6/year	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
Annual inspection	1/year					✓							
Routine Maintenance	4/year	✓			✓			✓			✓		

The above schedule is a guideline only. Inspection and maintenance activities during the plant establishment period (first two years) are likely to be more frequent when frequent weed removal and replanting may be required. Inspections should also be performed after large rainfall events to check for damage or significant pollutant accumulation. Maintenance should only occur after a reasonably rain free period when the soil in the bioretention system is dry. Inspections are also recommended following large storm events to check for scour and other damage. Resetting (i.e. complete reconstruction) of the bioretention basin will be required if the system fails to drain adequately after tilling of the surface. The bioretention basin inspection checklist is based on Water by Design (2006).

INSPECTION	
1	Routine Inspection
1.1	Routine inspection should be carried out on a regular bi-monthly basis. The purpose of the inspection is to check for weed invasion, litter accumulation and any damage/vandalism.
1.2	The bioretention system (including floor and batters) should be inspected for weed growth.
1.3	The bioretention system (including inflow points, overflow pits, under-drains and vegetation) should be checked for litter accumulation.
1.4	Identify areas of obvious sediment deposition, damage from vehicles and/ or clogging within the bioretention basin (evident by ponding and/ or 'boggy' filter media surface). If there is shallow ponding or evidence of clogging, firstly ensure that cause is not a build up of sediment. Investigate effect of "turning over" or "tilling" filter media soil, and inspect outflow pipes for clogging.
1.5	Identify areas of erosion, including scouring from storm flows and rill erosion of the batters from lateral inflows.
1.6	Any structures such as maintenance accesses, weirs, piping and access restrictions (eg. lock-rails, fencing) should be inspected for damage and or vandalism.
2.	Annual Inspection
2.1	Once per year, the condition of the bioretention basin should be closely inspected. Any damage or problems should be noted on the inspection form for action by the relevant maintenance agency.