

Flood Assessment

Yeronga Priority Development Area – Parkside Yeronga

Stantec c-/ Economic Development Queensland

14 February 2022





Document Status

Version	Doc type	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date issued
V01	Final	AMD	AMD	14/02/2022

Project Details

Project Name	Yeronga Priority Development Area – Parkside Yeronga
Client	Stantec c-/ Economic Development Queensland
Client Project Manager	John Marshall (EDQ), Anthony Raadschelders (Stantec)
Water Technology Project Manager	James Weidmann
Water Technology Project Director	Alister Daly
Authors	James Weidmann / Alister Daly
Document Number	22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01

COPYRIGHT

Water Technology Pty Ltd has produced this document in accordance with instructions from Stantec c-/ Economic Development Queensland for their use only. The concepts and information contained in this document are the copyright of Water Technology Pty Ltd. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without written permission of Water Technology Pty Ltd constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Water Technology Pty Ltd does not warrant this document is definitive nor free from error and does not accept liability for any loss caused, or arising from, reliance upon the information provided herein.

Level 5, 43 Peel Street
South Brisbane QLD 4101
Telephone (07) 3105 1460
Fax (07) 3846 5144
ACN 093 377 283
ABN 60 093 377 283





CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	4
1.1	Introduction	4
1.2	Proposed Development	5
1.3	Scope of Report and Overview of Approach	6
2	SITE DESCRIPTION	7
2.1	Topography and Drainage	7
2.2	Available Data	8
3	HYDROLOGIC MODELLING	9
3.1	Overview	9
3.2	Base Case Model	9
3.2.1	Sub-Catchment Breakdown	9
3.2.2	Rainfall and Losses	9
3.2.3	Base Case Model Validation	10
3.3	Post-Development Case Model	11
3.4	Hydrological Model Results	12
4	HYDRAULIC MODELLING	14
4.1	Overview	14
4.2	Base Case Model	14
4.3	Post-Development Case Model	18
4.4	Results and Discussion	21
4.4.1	Minimum Design Levels	25
4.4.2	Severe Storm Assessment	26
5	CONCLUSION	28

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Proposed Development Layout Plan and Civil Drawings
Appendix B	Pre Demolition Survey
Appendix C	WBNM Model Catchment Details
Appendix D	Selected Base Case Box Plots
Appendix E	Base Case and Post Development Flood Mapping
Appendix F	Flood Level Change Mapping

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Site Location (Aerial Image Pre-Demolition)	4
------------	---	---



Figure 1-2	Proposed Development Layout Plan (Source: Wolter Consulting Group, 2021)	5
Figure 2-1	Pre Demolition Site Topography – Based on 1m LiDAR 2014	7
Figure 3-1	Sub-Catchment Layout – Base Case	10
Figure 3-2	Sub-Catchment Layout – Post-Development Case	12
Figure 4-1	Pit Adjacent to Railway	15
Figure 4-2	TUFLOW Model Layout and Topography – Base Case	16
Figure 4-3	TUFLOW Roughness Layout – Base Case	17
Figure 4-4	TUFLOW Model Layout and Topography – Post-Development Case	19
Figure 4-5	TUFLOW Roughness Layout – Post-Development Case	20
Figure 4-6	Australian Emergency Management Institute Hazard Categories	22
Figure 4-7	Railway Culvert Critical Hydrographs – 1% AEP	23
Figure 4-8	Railway Culvert Critical Hydrographs – 10% AEP	23
Figure 4-9	Railway Culvert Critical Hydrographs – 50% AEP	24
Figure 4-10	Water Level Time Series Upstream of Railway– 10% AEP	24
Figure 4-11	Villa Street Frontage Bund – Base Case Topography	25
Figure 4-12	Maximum Flood Depth and Level – 1% AEP Severe Storm Case	27

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

Water Technology Pty Ltd (WT) has been commissioned by Stantec on behalf of Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) to undertake a detailed flood impact assessment for a proposed development located at 70 Park Road, Yeronga (the Site). The development, known as Parkside Yeronga, involves a subdivision of land historically occupied by the Yeronga TAFE facility. The Site locality and pre-demolition site condition is shown in Figure 1-1. The site is approximately 3.1 ha in total area and is located within the Brisbane City Council (BCC) Local Government Area (LGA). The Site is affected by backwater flooding from the Brisbane River and overland flow from external catchments to the south and east of the site. The hydraulic modelling undertaken for this study assesses the overland flow flooding impacts of the proposed development.

This report addresses relevant flooding and stormwater issues raised in the Further Issues information request from the State Department, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (SDILGP), dated 28th October 2021 (ref: DEV2021/1221). The information request additionally contains items raised by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) primarily relating to the railway located downstream of the site. This report has been prepared to address all outstanding flooding items contained in the information request.



FIGURE 1-1 SITE LOCATION (AERIAL IMAGE PRE-DEMOLITION)



1.2 Proposed Development

Figure 1-2 below shows the proposed development layout plan provided by Wolter Consulting Group. We note that this layout has since been revised, however, this does not fundamentally affect the outcomes of this hydraulic assessment. The development layout and associated civil drawings provided by Stantec are included in Appendix A. We understand that the development being sought as part of the development application includes the following:

- Reconfiguration of the lot (1 into 14 lots, easement and road);
- Road and drainage improvement works in Villa Street; and
- Construction of ultimate drainage works on Villa Street and diversion trunk pipe and overland flow swale on the Site's eastern boundary.

Hydraulic assessment undertaken and documented in this report is consistent with the ultimate and interim design case with drainage swale on Lot 10.

We understand that demolition of the Yeronga TAFE buildings and facilities on the site occurred in early 2019. Our assessment is based on assessing impacts of the proposed development compared to pre-demolition conditions. This is discussed in further detail herein.




FIGURE 1-2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT LAYOUT PLAN (SOURCE: WOLTER CONSULTING GROUP, 2021)



1.3 Scope of Report and Overview of Approach

This report has been prepared for the purpose of addressing flooding impact matters raised by TMR and EDQ in respect to the development and proposed works on Villa Street, and to support the development application for the site. This report does not specifically address BCC's overland flow code as these provisions do not apply in respect to a State Government development and there is no requirement to obtain a DA via BCC, however, the assessments undertaken have had regard for the BCC code provisions where relevant.

The scope of this report specifically includes consideration of flooding impacts of the development and drainage works. Issues relating to regional flooding from the Brisbane River and other stormwater quality management issues have been addressed separately by Stantec.

Detailed hydrologic and hydraulic modelling has been undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed development can be fundamentally supported. The following sections of this report outline in further detail the methodologies, details and results of the technical assessments completed.



2 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Topography and Drainage

The Site was historically occupied by the Yeronga TAFE until all buildings were demolished in early 2019. The flood assessment has been based on the pre-demolition conditions which are represented in the publicly available 2014 LiDAR. Figure 2-1 illustrates the Site topography based on available 2014 LiDAR topographic survey and includes the BCC stormwater networks layers.

The Site grades from the southern boundary towards the northern boundary at an average slope of approximately 6%. Elevations at the Site range from approximately 20 mAH in the south of the Site to 6 mAH in the north.




FIGURE 2-1 PRE DEMOLITION SITE TOPOGRAPHY – BASED ON 1M LIDAR 2014



2.2 Available Data

The following data has been sourced and used to inform the current assessment:

- LiDAR and associated contour data captured in 2014 for BCC LGA. Note that this dataset is suitable for the assessment given that the base case scenario considered the site prior to demolition occurring in early 2019;
- Council stormwater pipe and pit network data, obtained via BCC online data portal;
- Proposed development layout supplied by Wolter Consulting Group (refer to Appendix A);
- DRAINS model provided by Stantec;
- Pre-demolition survey undertaken by RPS (provided in Appendix B);
- Post-demolition survey undertaken by Wolter Consulting Group;
- Civil design surface and stormwater design plans provided by Stantec;
- Site photos provided by Stantec;
- Rainfall data from the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM); and
- Aerial imagery obtained from Google Earth and MetroMap.



3 HYDROLOGIC MODELLING

3.1 Overview

To assess stormwater characteristics at the Site, hydrologic models have been established for the catchment using the Watershed Network Bounded Model (WBNM) software. Resulting flows were incorporated into the hydraulic model discussed in the following section. This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with ARR19 methodology using the Storm Injector software.

In the absence of stream gauges, the hydrologic models were validated to the Rational Method, in accordance with Section 4.3 of the IPWEA Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM) Fourth Edition (2017). Additional comparisons were made with the DRAINS model supplied by Stantec. The following sections of this report provide further details with respect to the stormwater modelling methodology.

3.2 Base Case Model

3.2.1 Sub-Catchment Breakdown

Sub-catchments have been delineated based on the LiDAR topography and available pipe network data. The WBNM model catchment layout is shown in Figure 3-1 below. Note that a diversion has been included in the model to represent minor flows captured in the stormwater system on Villa St (flowing north) with excess flows routed west down to the sag on Villa St. Sub-catchment details for the WBNM model are included in Appendix C.

The model layout includes the site, upstream catchments to the west, east and south, and extends downstream of the site a sufficient distance to fully include downstream areas that are included in the hydraulic model.

3.2.2 Rainfall and Losses

Rainfall intensity data has been obtained online from the Australian Bureau of Meteorology's 2016 Design Intensity Frequency and Duration (IFD) Rainfall System via the Storm Injector software. Median preburst depths have been applied and initial and continuing losses have been applied from the pre-bursts. Rainfall losses adopted have included a 5mm initial loss and 1mm/hr continuing loss which is consistent with the DRAINS model and have also been subject to validation using the Rational Method. Digital models including Storm Injector files will be provided separately to this report.

Hydrology for the 1%, 2%, 5%, 10% and 50% AEP events was analysed for this assessment and represents an appropriate range of flow conditions for assessment the impacts of the proposed development.



FIGURE 3-1 SUB-CATCHMENT LAYOUT – BASE CASE

3.2.3 Base Case Model Validation

The WBNM model was validated against the Rational Method for the base case catchment conditions and in the absence of available stream gauges. The time of concentration was calculated using an assumed average flow velocity and including an additional 5-min for standard inlet time. Table 3-1 summarises the Rational Method parameters used. Figure 3-1 shows the Rational Method validation location, with Table 3-2 summarising the Rational Method results. The hydrology model flows show good correlation with the Rational Method and are slightly higher than the Rational Method. The flow comparisons show that the WBNM model can be suitably adopted for all hydrological modelling prepared as part of this assessment.

Additional spot checks and comparisons were made with the DRAINS model provided by Stantec. The spot checks of peak flow at various locations (discharges to Villa St and in pipes discharging to the downstream area of the site) were comparable to the WBNM model results.

An impervious percentage of 90% has been assumed for the pre-demolition TAFE site.



TABLE 3-1 VALIDATION LOCATION RATIONAL METHOD PARAMETERS – BASE CASE

Parameter	Input	Reference
Catchment area (ha)	20.5	Sub-catchment area
Discharge coefficient C_{10}	0.82	QUDM 2016 Table 4.5.4
Time of concentration (min)	23	Calculated using flow path length, assumed average velocity and adding 5min standard inlet time

TABLE 3-2 WBNM RATIONAL METHOD VALIDATION RESULTS – BASE CASE

AEP Event	WBNM Peak Flow (m ³ /s)	Rational Method Peak Flow (m ³ /s)	Difference (%)
1%	10.0	9.6	+5
2%	8.9	8.3	+8
5%	7.4	6.5	+15
10%	6.3	5.4	+18
50%	3.2	2.7	+16

3.3 Post-Development Case Model

The base case model was used as the basis for the post-development model, with minor catchment modifications to represent the post-development internal catchments and overland flow drain. Figure 3-2 below shows the modified catchment boundaries for the Site. The update ensured that the hydrology for the Site and overland flow drain were represented as accurately as possible and that inflows for the hydraulic model were appropriately defined.

Note that the impervious percentage of 90% for the pre-demolition TAFE site has been assumed for the post-development case. This is consistent with the proposed layout of development. Given the proposed land use and impervious percentage of the proposed development is not intensified or increased, the hydrology of the site will not be fundamentally affected, and provision of on-site detention is not required.

Note that catchment “Yer21” major storm will be discharged to the drain on the eastern boundary. For the purpose of the assessment, we have included the total flow from “Yer21” in the drain which traverses along the eastern site boundary.




FIGURE 3-2 SUB-CATCHMENT LAYOUT – POST-DEVELOPMENT CASE

3.4 Hydrological Model Results

Base case box plots for all events analysed at the rail corridor (Catchment Yer13) are included in Appendix D. We note that the changes made in the post-development WBNM model were minor and do not fundamentally change the resulting critical durations or total flows downstream.

The critical duration at the railway corridor is generally the 15-minute, 25-minute and 30-minute storms across the AEPs analysed based to the hydrologic model. The base case and post development model outputs were used to inform the hydraulic model flows as discussed in the following section. Determination of the critical durations was undertaken using the hydraulic model due to the complexity of the catchment and effect of



natural flood storage and changes in conveyance characteristics. Testing in the hydraulic model using the 1% and 10% AEP hydrology showed that the 25-minute storm was found to be critical at the railway corridor.

Base case and post-development run-off from the site will not be fundamentally worsened given that the impervious area and catchment characteristics are similar in both cases.



4 HYDRAULIC MODELLING

4.1 Overview

To assess the hydraulic flooding conditions in the catchment and to quantify the change in hydraulic behaviour as a result of the proposed development, a TUFLOW hydraulic model has been developed. TUFLOW is an effective 1d/2d hydraulic simulation software which is capable of assessing various water environments, including flooding within urban drainage catchments. The TUFLOW model developed for this flood study was based on the TUFLOW software version 2020-10-AC-iSP-w64 which incorporates the Highly Parallelised Compute (HPC) solution scheme.

Hydraulic models have been developed to assess the following scenarios:

- Base Case – representing the Site pre-demolition conditions;
- Post-Development Case – based on the base case model, with the inclusion of the civil design surface and associated drainage features; and
- Severe Storm Sensitivity Case – this case assesses a 1% AEP storm with complete blockage (100%) applied to the proposed new trunk 1200 RCP aligned with the eastern site boundary. This case was simulated to ensure that the overland flow drain is adequately sized and to inform civil design levels at the site as well as design planning levels. Results are discussed in Section 4.4.1.

The following sections of this report provide further detailed information on the hydraulic model developed for this study.

4.2 Base Case Model

The topography for the TUFLOW model was based on 1m resolution LiDAR datasets captured in 2014 and has been modelled using the same 1m resolution. The extent of this model has been set to ensure the overland flow paths at the site are suitably represented at the site as well as in both upstream and downstream areas from the site. The downstream boundary has been positioned perpendicular to the drain downstream of Fairfield Road and is located a sufficient distance downstream of the site to assess local flooding impacts of the proposed development.

The TUFLOW model layout is shown in Figure 4-2 below. The model roughness layout for the base case is shown in Figure 4-3. A summary of the model for the base case assessment is as follows:

- The model topography is based on a 1m grid resolution;
- Detailed ground survey has been included based on the pre-demolition survey provide by RPS;
- Building footprints in the base case have been represented using Z-shapes;
- Some internal drainage has been included to ensure that overland flow through the site does not pond unrealistically and is conveyed downstream. The internal drainage pits and pipe arrangement has been informed by the pre-demolition survey, LiDAR and aerial imagery;
- Downstream boundary (2D and 1D boundary) set using a HQ type normal slope of 0.1% based on the ground topography slope at this location. The location of the boundary was chosen to be sufficiently downstream of the site and railway corridor which forms a major hydraulic control, to ensure that the boundary conditions did not affect the outcomes of the assessment;
- Stormwater network has been informed by BCC-supplied stormwater pipe and pit network, pre-demolition site survey and additional data and photos provided by Stantec;



- Some upstream drainage from the catchment to the east and downstream of the railway has been simplified due to incomplete records;
- Depth-discharge curves have been derived for all pits where data was available. All curves have assumed 50% grate blockage. Where structures have been assumed, these have been represented as R type pits;
- The pit on the upstream side of the railway has been represented as a pit structure with 30% inlet blockage based on photos provided by Stantec. A selected image of the pit is shown in Figure 4-1 below; and
- Inflows from the WBNM model have been applied using 2d_sa polygons and 2d_sa pit inflows.

The floodplain roughness for the TUFLOW model has been represented using Manning's 'n'. A summary of the roughness value for each land use type is summarised below in Table 4-1, with the spatial extent illustrated in Figure 4-3. Note that areas that do not get wet (such as buildings raised out of the topography) are not relevant to the roughness mapping.

Testing was undertaken using the base case model to determine the critical durations of the 1% and 10% AEP events. In both cases, the critical event downstream of the site at the railway corridor was the 25-minute storm. For the purpose of assessing impacts, the 25-minute storm was adopted for all AEPs analysed, noting that this duration storm produces appropriate flows in all AEPs.

TABLE 4-1 MANNINGS 'N' ROUGHNESS

Material Type	Manning's 'n' Roughness
Roads and Pavement	0.020
Open Space	0.045
Low Vegetation	0.050
Medium Vegetation	0.070
Urban Residential	0.200
Buildings	2.000
Swale (sensitivity)	0.100



FIGURE 4-1 PIT ADJACENT TO RAILWAY




FIGURE 4-2 TUFLOW MODEL LAYOUT AND TOPOGRAPHY – BASE CASE

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



FIGURE 4-3 TUFLOW ROUGHNESS LAYOUT – BASE CASE

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



4.3 Post-Development Case Model

The post-development case model is based on the base case model and includes the following additional features:

- The civil design surface provided by Stantec. The design surface includes the proposed overland flow drain along the eastern boundary of the site;
- All proposed drainage associated with the overland flow path. The proposed stormwater design provided by Stantec was used to inform the model set up;
- As per the base case model, depth-discharge curves have been derived for proposed new pit structures with a 50% blockage applied to grates;
- 20% standard design blockage has been applied to the trunk 1200mm RCP aligned with the overland flow drain;
- The overland flow drain has been represented in the 2D domain and for the impacts assessment has been applied with a Manning's roughness of 0.020 to represent the proposed concrete invert. A sensitivity case using a roughness of 0.100 in accordance with overland flow path BCC guidelines has been undertaken to inform design level control; and
- A drain along the Villa Street frontage of Lot 10 (shown in Figure 4-4) is proposed to convey any flow overtopping the Villa Street footpath to the overland flow drain to the east. In reality, this can take many forms, such as an overland flow drain, concrete lined channel and pit and pipe structure with grates. Details for this aspect have not yet been determined. For the hydraulic modelling, this drain has been represented with a z-line gully and is only intended to represent conveyance of flow to the overland flow drain. We note that the sag and Villa Street footpath do not overtop in the standard design event analysed with standard blockage applied to the street inlets. A severe storm analysis has been simulated to inform the detailed civil design of the drain along Lot 10.




FIGURE 4-4 TUFLOW MODEL LAYOUT AND TOPOGRAPHY – POST-DEVELOPMENT CASE

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



FIGURE 4-5 TUFLOW ROUGHNESS LAYOUT – POST-DEVELOPMENT CASE

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



4.4 Results and Discussion

Base case and post-development case flood maps for maximum depth, water level, velocity and hazard are included in Appendix E. The adopted hazard categories are based on the Australian Emergency Management Institutes categories (ZAEM1 output in TUFLOW) which are shown in Figure 4-6.


Flood level change maps (flood impact maps) are included in Appendix F.

A summary of the results is provided as follows:

- Water level increases are predicted adjacent to the railway corridor in the downstream areas of the site in the 2%, 5% and 10% AEP events. Maximum water levels in the 10% AEP are predicted to increase approximately 176 mm adjacent to the railway corridor and embankment. These increases are considered as being of no actionable nuisance and will not affect railway operations, maintenance or any critical infrastructure. The top of the railway embankment is approximately 4.5m higher compared to the local 1% AEP water level whereby the 176mm increase is of no practical consequence;
- Water levels upstream and adjacent to the railway corridor are not worsened in the 50% or 1% AEP events;
- Water level increases upstream of the railway are largely due to there being less storage available in this part of the site at various ground elevations, which is directly attributable to the proposed bioretention basin structure. For clarity, there is less storage below the 10% AEP level, however, above the bioretention basin level, additional storage is provided via the development compared to the base case in the 1% AEP event. This is consistent with the requirement to preserve Brisbane River floodplain storage;
- Water level increases are also partially due to stormwater being conveyed from Villa Street through the site to the railway corridor. Removing flood water from Villa Street results in markedly improved flooding conditions upstream of the site;
- Surface water level increases downstream of the railway of up to approximately 22mm are noted in the 1% AEP, 12mm in the 2% AEP, 15mm in the 5% AEP and 15mm in the 10% AEP. These impacts are localised, minor and will not result in material worsening compared to the existing flood conditions;
- The increases in water level downstream of the railway will not fundamentally worsen existing flooding conditions or cause additional surcharging of pits downstream. We note that any changes to flood levels will not affect floor level control as this is highly dominated by Brisbane River flooding downstream of the railway;
- Due to the increased trunk drainage capacity, flow increases are predicted in the 1200mm RCP downstream of the site and under the railway corridor. Hydrographs for the pipe in the 1%, 10% and 50% AEP events are shown in Figure 4-7, Figure 4-8 and Figure 4-9 respectively. The hydrographs demonstrate that increases in peak flows are predicted due to the increased pipe capacity upstream, with the frequent events being unlikely to be affected;
- Increases in peak flows also occur in pipes downstream of the site. The stormwater network downstream of the railway has a large capacity and these small increases in peak flow do not cause actionable surface water level increases downstream;
- The time of inundation is not materially increased in the post-development case compared to the base case. Figure 4-10 shows the water level times series for the critical 10% AEP event (presented because this event has the highest water level change). There is no fundamental increase in the time of inundation;
- Maximum velocities in the concrete lined drain are up to 1.6 m/s (n.b. based on a Mannings $n=0.020$);
- Ponding in Villa Street has been dramatically reduced by virtue of the upgraded stormwater pits and downstream trunk pipe. Trafficability and flood hazard in Villa Street have been notably improved by the proposed development;



- The Villa Street footpath does not overtop in the standard design events analysed and therefore there is an acceptable risk to pedestrians and represents a marked improvement compared to the base case; and
- Minimum design levels for the site can be readily achieved and are discussed in detail in the following section.



Hazard Classification	Description
H1	Relatively benign flow conditions. No vulnerability constraints.
H2	Unsafe for small vehicles.
H3	Unsafe for all vehicles, children and the elderly.
H4	Unsafe for all people and all vehicles.
H5	Unsafe for all people and all vehicles. Buildings require special engineering design and construction.
H6	Unconditionally dangerous. Not suitable for any type of development or evacuation access. All building types considered vulnerable to failure.

FIGURE 4-6 AUSTRALIAN EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE HAZARD CATEGORIES




FIGURE 4-7 RAILWAY CULVERT CRITICAL HYDROGRAPHS – 1% AEP




FIGURE 4-8 RAILWAY CULVERT CRITICAL HYDROGRAPHS – 10% AEP

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01




FIGURE 4-9 RAILWAY CULVERT CRITICAL HYDROGRAPHS – 50% AEP




FIGURE 4-10 WATER LEVEL TIME SERIES UPSTREAM OF RAILWAY– 10% AEP

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



4.4.1 Minimum Design Levels

The site is subject to overland flow path mapping according to the BCC City Plan (2014). Overland flow flood levels will be the dominant flood event which control minimum design planning levels at the site as they are comparably higher than the 1% AEP Brisbane River level (8.3mAHD), the latter only affecting the bottom portion of the site adjacent to the railway. Based on the typical BCC City Plan (2014) requirements, the 2% AEP event design water levels with an additional 500mm should be adopted for minimum design levels across the site, except for the flood protection along the Villa Street frontage of Lot 10.

The former TAFE site employed an earthen bund downstream of Villa Street as shown in Figure 4-11 below. The top level of the bund (based on the 2014 LiDAR) is 19.0mAHD. It is recommended that the same level be adopted for the design planning levels proposed along the street frontage. We note that this is higher compared to the 2% AEP level plus 500mm and provides additional protection having regard to blockage or the instance where vehicles drive through the flooded sag forming bow waves.

Design levels can vary with the water level grade along the drain on the eastern site boundary. We have provided the design case flood results to Stantec to inform minimum design levels at the site, which are based on the 2% AEP design event plus 500mm.

The severe storm assessment discussed in the following section confirms that the minimum design levels for the site are appropriate.




FIGURE 4-11 VILLA STREET FRONTAGE BUND – BASE CASE TOPOGRAPHY



4.4.2 Severe Storm Assessment

A severe storm assessment has been undertaken using the 1% AEP storm with consideration of extreme blockage of the proposed new trunk drainage. The purpose of this assessment is to ensure that the drain is appropriately sized and ensure the minimum design level for the wall on the Villa Street frontage of Lot 10 is not compromised.

A 100% blockage condition was applied to the most upstream section of the trunk 1200mm RCP (immediately downstream of the Villa Street pits) such that the only flow relief is provided by the drain adjacent to Lot 10 and the overland flow swale.

Figure 4-12 shows the maximum flood depth and level in the severe storm case. The maximum water level adjacent to Lot 10 is 18.49 mAHD. The proposed design level for the wall along the Lot 10 frontage is 19.00mAHD, therefore, freeboard is not compromised in the severe storm case. The median peak 1% AEP flow in the cut off drain adjacent to Lot 10 is 0.6m³/s.

As previously noted, the Villa Street footpath does not overtop in the standard design events analysed. In the severe storm assessment, results show that the maximum depth over the footpath is approximately 0.1m and maximum velocity is approximately 0.8m/s. This represents a low hazard and will not present a significant safety risk, especially considering the extreme and unlikely nature of the severe storm conditions.

We also note that in the event of a severe blockage of the pit upstream of the railway corridor, relief is provided to the west via Park Road at approximately 9.5mAHD. Proposed floor levels adjacent to the bioretention basin are 10mAHD, therefore it is extremely unlikely floor levels will be compromised due to blockage of the pit or culvert. However, we recommend that the pit cover be upgraded to incorporate a dome cover to reduce the risk of severe blockage. This flow path also provides relief in the event of a severe local event coinciding with Brisbane River flooding.




FIGURE 4-12 MAXIMUM FLOOD DEPTH AND LEVEL – 1% AEP SEVERE STORM CASE

22020120_Yeronga_PDA_R01-V01



5 CONCLUSION

Water Technology Pty Ltd (WT) has been commissioned by Stantec on behalf of Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) to undertake a detailed flood impact assessment for a proposed development located at 70 Park Road, Yeronga (the Site). The development, known as Parkside Yeronga, involves a subdivision of land historically occupied by the Yeronga TAFE facility. The hydraulic modelling undertaken assesses the overland flow flooding impacts of the proposed development. Design aspects relating to Brisbane River flooding and floodplain storage have been addressed separately by Stantec.

This report addresses relevant flooding and stormwater issues raised in the Further Issues information request from the State Department, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (SDILGP), dated 28th October 2021 (ref: DEV2021/1221). The information request additionally contains items raised by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) primarily relating to the railway located downstream of the site.

A summary of the hydraulic assessment outcomes from this study are summarised as follows:

- Detailed hydrological modelling has been undertaken to define hydrology for the catchment and inform inflows to the hydraulic model;
- Detailed hydraulic modelling using TUFLOW has been undertaken to assess the adopted base case (pre-demolition) and post-development site conditions;
- Non-actionable water level increases (flood impacts) are predicted in the downstream areas on the site in the 2%, 5% and 10% AEP events. These increases will not affect railway operations, maintenance or any critical infrastructure. The top of the railway embankment is approximately 4.5m higher than the local 1% AEP water level. Water levels on the site are not markedly affected in the 50% AEP and 1% AEP events;
- There is no actionable nuisance resulting from water level changes downstream and adjacent to the railway corridor. The time of inundation is not fundamentally affected;
- Water level increases upstream of the railway crossing are largely due to there being less storage available in this part of the site at various ground elevations which is attributable to the proposed bioretention basin structure. For clarity, there is generally less storage below the 10% AEP level, however, additional storage compared to the base case is provided for the 1% AEP event and above the bioretention basin level;
- Water level increases are partially due to stormwater being conveyed from Villa Street and through the site to the railway corridor. Removing flood water from Villa Street results in markedly improved flooding conditions upstream of the site. We understand that improved flooding conditions on Villa Street was a requirement of the development and specifically requested by BCC;
- Due to the increased trunk drainage capacity, flow increases are predicted in the 1200mm RCP downstream of the site and under the railway corridor. The increases in peak flow also occur in pipes downstream of the site. The stormwater network downstream of the railway has a large capacity and these small increases in peak flow do not cause significant surface water level increases downstream;
- Surface water level increases downstream of the railway are localised, minor and will not cause material worsening of existing flooding conditions. We note that any changes to flood levels will not affect floor level control as this is highly dominated by Brisbane River flooding downstream of the railway;
- Minimum design levels for the site can be readily achieved, with design levels provided to Stantec that are based on the 2% AEP design event plus 500mm, apart from the higher standard recommended for the Villa Street frontage of Lot 10;
- Ponding in Villa Street has been dramatically reduced by virtue of the upgraded stormwater pits and downstream trunk pipe. Trafficability and flood hazard in Villa Street have been notably improved by the proposed development; and



- The Villa Street footpath does not overtop in the standard design event analysed therefore there is an acceptable risk to pedestrians and represents a marked improvement compared to the base case.


It has been demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in adverse flooding conditions external to the site. On this basis, we believe that the development can readily be readily supported subject to reasonable and relevant conditions.




APPENDIX A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT LAYOUT PLAN AND CIVIL DRAWINGS



PRELIMINARY



PRELIMINARY



Final intended use of new Lots & Easements:
Lot 4 - is for public open space (including drainage corridor)
Lot 5 - is for bio filter use
Lots 21, 22, 3, 6, 7, 8 & 10 - are for future development
Easement 1 - is for Public Thoroughfare - benefiting all development Lots and Services, benefiting Lot 7
Easement 3 - is for Light & Air - benefiting all development Lots
Easement 4 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 7, benefiting Lot 6
Easement 6A - is for Right of Way Access - burdening Lot 10, benefiting Lot 7
Easement 5 - is for Stormwater & Overland Flow
Easement 7 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 7, benefiting Lot 10
Easement 8 - is for Stormwater
Easement 9 - is for Sewer
Easement 10 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 6, benefiting Lot 7
Easement 12 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 10, benefiting Lot 7
Volumetric Easement 13 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 1, benefiting all development Lots
Volumetric Easement 14 - is for Right of Way for Access - burdening Lot 11, benefiting all development Lots

Legend

- Public Thoroughfare & Services Easements
- Right of Way for Access & Services Easements
- Right of Way for Access Easements
- Stormwater Easement
- Sewer Easement
- Light & Air Easement

- Notes**
- Any licence, express or implied, to use this document for any purpose whatsoever is restricted to the terms of the agreement or implied agreement between Wolter Consulting Group and the instructing party.
 - Design subject to local authority approval & detailed engineering requirements, areas and dimensions are approximate only and are subject to survey. Therefore this drawing is not to be used for engineering design.
 - Easements locations from others and are approximate only.
 - This note is an integral part of this plan. This plan may not be reproduced without this notation being included.


Table of Development

Gross area of subject land.....	2.8 ha
Area of open space (Lots 4, 5, 8 and Emt 3).....	5457m²
Area of Development (Lots 21, 22, 3, 6, 7 & 10).	1.871 ha
Area of New Road.....	3987m²
Length of New Road.....	263m
Number of proposed lots.....	9
Number of existing lots.....	1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND

PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION

70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE



DEVELOPMENT LAYOUT PLAN







1:1000 10 0 10 20 30 40 50 A1
1:2000 A3

DRAWING REGISTRY	
DRAWING NUMBER	DRAWING DESCRIPTION
CI-001-P01	COVER SHEET, DRAWING REGISTRY AND LOCALITY PLAN
CI-100-P01	BULK EARTHWORKS PLANCONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN
CI-101-C01	BULK EARTHWORKS SECTIONS SHEET 1
CI-101-C02	BULK EARTHWORKS SECTIONS SHEET 2
CI-500-P01	CONCEPTUAL STORMWATER EXTERNAL CATCHMENT PLAN
CI-500-P02	CONCEPTUAL STORMWATER QUALITY CATCHMENT PLAN
CI-520-P01	CONCEPTUAL STORMWATER DRAINAGE PLAN
CI-520-P02	CONCEPTUAL STORMWATERMANAGEMENT PLAN
CI-526-D01	STORMWATER DRAINAGE DETAILS
CI-650-P01	EXTERNAL WATER AUGMENTATIONCONCEPT PLAN
CI-700-P01	COMBINED SERVICES PLANCONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN

Revised: 2/10/2022 11:38:46 AM BY: KULLARAH, MANASA
\\BHS-APP001\PROJECTS\DATA\ENGINEERING AND DELIVERY\APP001\CLIENTS\YIP BUILDING\BRISBANE OFFICE\301048272 - PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION\DRAWINGS\CI-001-P01-01.DWG

Notes		Issue Status		Colour Disclaimer		Client/Project Logo		Client/Project		Title	
		PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		This drawing has been documented in colour. This drawing is required to be printed in colour. Failure to do so may result in loss of information. Black and white printing may be used if specific black and white documents have been obtained from Stantec.				ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND		COVER SHEET AND DRAWING REGISTRY	
		This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above. Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.		AUTHORISED:		Stantec Australia Pty. Ltd. Level 3, 52 Merivale St. South Brisbane, QLD 4101 Tel: +61 7 3811 4500		PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION		Project No. 301048272	
		A RAADSCHELDERS (RPEQ: 19881)		Copyright Reserved		70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE		File Name: CH001-P01.DWG		Revision c	
								DDJ TJ AR 2021.11.10 Dwn. Dgn. Chkd. YYYY.MM.DD		Scale 1:1000 @A1	
										Drawing No. CI-001-P01	

[illegible]

[illegible]

Notes

Issue Status

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Colour Disclaimer

Colour Disclaimer
This drawing has been documented in colour. This drawing is required to be printed in colour. Failure to do so may result in loss of information. Black and white printing may be used if specific black and white documents have been obtained from Stantec.

AUTHORISED:



Stantec Australia Pty. Ltd.
Level 3, 52 Merivale St,
South Brisbane, QLD 4101
Tel: +61 7 3811 4500

Copyright Reserved

The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.
The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND

PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION

70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE

File Name: CF500-P01.DWG	DDJ	TJ	AR	2021.11.10
	Dwn.	Dsgn.	Chkd.	YYYY.MM.DD


Title
CONCEPTUAL STORMWATER
EXTERNAL CATCHMENT PLAN

Project No.
301048272


Scale
1:1250 @A1


Revision	Drawing No.
C	

CI-500-P01



ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A1 COORD - MGA/YY-Zone DATUM - mAHD





Notes		Issue Status		Colour Disclaimer		Client/Project Logo		Client/Project		Title	
		PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		This drawing has been documented in colour. This drawing is required to be printed in colour. Failure to do so may result in loss of information. Black and white printing may be used if specific black and white documents have been obtained from Stantec.		ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND		PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION		CONCEPTUAL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	
		This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above. Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.		AUTHORISED:		70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE		Project No. 301048272		Scale 1:200 @ A1	
						File Name: CI-520-P01-P02.DWG		Revision c		Drawing No. CI-520-P02	
						DDJ TJ AR 2021.11.10 Dwn. Dign. Chkd. YYYY.MM.DD					


C	FURTHER ISSUES RESPONDS	MK	AR	2022.02.10
B	FURTHER ISSUES LETTER	TJ	AR	2021.11.10
A	ISSUED FOR APPROVAL	BM/VI	AR	2021.09.15
Issued/Revision		By	Appd	YYYY.MM.DD

ORIGINAL SHEET - 50 A1 COORD - MGA/Y1 Zone DATUM - mAHM


C

B


A



TYPICAL OVERLAND FLOW PATH
SECTION D-D
N.T.S.



TYPICAL OVERLAND FLOW PATH
SECTION C-C
N.T.S.



TYPICAL OVERLAND FLOW PATH
SECTION B-B
N.T.S.

Notes

Issue Status

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Colour Disclaimer

This drawing has been documented in colour. This drawing is required to be printed in colour. Failure to do so may result in loss of information. Black and white printing may be used if specific black and white documents have been obtained from Stantec.

AUTHORISED:



Stantec Australia Pty. Ltd.
Level 3, 52 Merivale St,
South Brisbane, QLD 4101
Tel: +61 7 3811 4500

Copyright Reserved

The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.
The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND

PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION

70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE


File Name: CF-526-D01.DWG	DDJ	TJ	AR	2021.11.10
	Dwn.	Dsgn.	Chkd.	YYYY.MM.DD

Title
STORMWATER DRAINAGE DETAILS

Project No.	Scale
301048272	

Revision	Drawing No.
C	

CI-526-D01




SERVICES NOTES

- DRAWINGS ARE CONCEPTUAL ONLY AND HAVE BEEN PREPARED AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE CONCEPTS DISCUSSED WITHIN THIS REPORT AND ARE INTENDED TO ASSIST RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL.
- ALL ITEMS ON THIS DRAWING ARE SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION FROM RELEVANT SUPPLY AUTHORITY.
- WHERE LEVELS OR SIZES OF ANY WORKS ARE SHOWN, THESE ARE INDICATIVE ONLY TO DEMONSTRATE THE CAPABILITY OF THE SERVING OPTION PROPOSED AND ARE SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN (OPERATIONAL WORKS DESIGN). THIS IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST VERSIONS OF THE AUTHORITY STANDARDS, AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS AND OTHER INDUSTRY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS AT TIME OF DESIGN.
- DRAWINGS ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE USED FOR TENDER, ESTIMATING OR CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL LOTS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH CONNECTION TO SEWER, WATER, ELECTRICITY, TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND A LAWFUL POINT OF STORMWATER DISCHARGE.

LEGEND

	EXISTING KERB & CHANNEL
	EXISTING FENCE & GATE
	PROPOSED WATER MAIN AND SIZE
	EXISTING COMMUNICATIONS
	EXISTING TELECOM PIT
	EXISTING FIBRE COMM/TPG
	EXISTING ELECTRICITY OVERHEAD
	EXISTING DRAINAGE
	EXISTING DRAINAGE
	EXISTING ELECTRICITY (CABLE VOLTAGE - LESS THAN 33KV)
	EXISTING ELECTRICITY (CABLE VOLTAGE - 33KV OR HIGHER)
	EXISTING POWER POLE
	EXISTING ELECTRICAL LIGHT & POLE
	EXISTING ELECTRICAL PIT / PILLAR
	EXISTING SEWER AND STRUCTURE
	EXISTING WATER POTABLE AND SIZE
	EXISTING VALVE / FH
	DESIGN CONSTRAINT NOTES


(*) DENOTES QUALITY LEVEL OF THE UNDERGROUND UTILITY IN REFERENCE TO AS5488-2019


Notes				Issue Status				Colour Disclaimer				Client/Project Logo				Client/Project				Title			
								This drawing has been documented in colour. This drawing is required to be printed in colour. Failure to do so may result in loss of information. Black and white printing may be used if specific black and white documents have been obtained from Stantec.								ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUEENSLAND				EXTERNAL WATER AUGMENTATION CONCEPT PLAN			
				PRELIMINARY								PARKSIDE YERONGA - SUBDIVISION											
				NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION								70 PARK ROAD, YERONGA, BRISBANE											
				This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.								File Name: CH-650-P01.DWG				Project No. 301048272							
				Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.								DDJ TJ AR 2021.11.10				Revision c							
				AUTHORISED:				The Copyright to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden. The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.				Dwn. Dsgn. Chkd. YYYY.MM.DD				Drawing No. CI-650-P01							
C FURTHER ISSUES RESPONSE MK AR 2022.02.10																							
B FURTHER ISSUES LETTER TJ AR 2021.11.10																							
A ISSUED FOR APPROVAL BH/VI AR 2021.09.15																							
Issued/Revision By Appd YYYY.MM.DD																							





APPENDIX B PRE DEMOLITION SURVEY







[illegible]





APPENDIX C

WBNM MODEL CATCHMENT DETAILS



Appendix C.1 – Base Case WBNM Catchment Parameters

Catchment	Downstream Catchment	Area (ha)	Lag Parameters (C/Imp lag)	Flowpath Parameters (Type/Value)	Impervious Percentage (%)
Yer01	Yer06	1.048	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	70
Yer06	Yer07	1.255	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	20
Yer05	Yer07	1.238	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	50
Yer03	Yer04	0.102	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer04	Yer07	0.123	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer07	VillaUS	1.803	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	5
VillaUS	VillaDS	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer09	Yer10	0.149	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer10	VillaDS	0.076	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer08	VillaDS	0.124	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
VillaDS	Yer28	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer28	Yer30	0.531	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer30	Yer29	0.368	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer26	Yer27	1.123	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	85
Yer25	Yer27	0.122	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer27	Yer29	0.356	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer29	Yer13	0.316	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer23	Yer24	0.784	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer24	Yer13	0.935	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer12	Yer13	0.769	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	15
Yer02	Yer11	2.423	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer11	Yer13	6.185	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	50
Yer13	RailUS	0.645	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
RailUS	Yer14	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer19	Yer20	0.528	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer16	Yer18	0.113	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer18	Yer20	0.236	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer20	Yer14	1.562	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer22	Yer17	0.119	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer17	Yer14	0.133	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer14	Yer15	6.955	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer15	SINK	2.961	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65

Appendix C.2 – Post-Development Case WBNM Catchment Parameters

Catchment	Downstream Catchment	Area (ha)	Lag Parameters (C/lmp lag)	Flowpath Parameters (Type/Value)	Impervious Percentage (%)
Yer22	Yer17	0.108	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer17	Yer14	0.138	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer16	Yer18	0.113	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer18	Yer20	0.236	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer19	Yer20	0.528	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer20	Yer14	1.562	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer08	VillaDS	0.123	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer09	Yer10	0.149	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer10	VillaDS	0.076	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer03	Yer04	0.102	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer04	Yer07	0.123	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	60
Yer05	Yer07	1.238	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	50
Yer01	Yer06	1.048	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	70
Yer06	Yer07	1.255	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	20
Yer07	VillaUS	1.803	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	5
VillaUS	VillaDS	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
VillaDS	Yer31	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer31	Yer32	0.072	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer32	Yer33	0.034	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer33	Yer13	0.051	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer02	Yer11	2.423	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer11	Yer13	6.185	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	50
Yer12	Yer13	0.769	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	15
Yer23	Yer24	0.634	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer24	Yer13	0.467	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer25	Yer27	0.122	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer26	Yer27	1.123	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	85
Yer27	Yer29	0.344	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer29	Yer13	0.15	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer28	Yer30	0.9	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer30	Yer13	0.619	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	90
Yer13	RailUS	0.672	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
RailUS	Yer14	0	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	0
Yer14	Yer15	6.955	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65
Yer15	SINK	2.961	1.6/0.1	R/0.5	65




APPENDIX D SELECTED BASE CASE BOX PLOTS




Peak Flow (m3/s) Duration Analysis (BC01_50% AEP - Yer13)

☐ All Values
 ☒ Mean Values
 ☒ Adopted Temporal Pattern




Peak Flow (m3/s) Duration Analysis (BC01_10% AEP - Yer13)

☐ All Values
 ☒ Mean Values
 ☒ Adopted Temporal Pattern




Peak Flow (m3/s) Duration Analysis (BC01_5% AEP - Yer13)

☐ All Values
 ☒ Mean Values
 ☒ Adopted Temporal Pattern




Peak Flow (m3/s) Duration Analysis (BC01_2% AEP - Yer13)

☐ ☒ All Values ☒ * Mean Values ☒ — Adopted Temporal Pattern




Peak Flow (m3/s) Duration Analysis (BC01_1% AEP - Yer13)

☐ All Values ☒ Mean Values ☒ Adopted Temporal Pattern




Compare Peak Flow (m3/s) for Events (BC01_50% AEP, BC01_10% AEP, BC01_5% AEP, BC01_2% AEP, BC01_1% AEP - VillaDS)

- ☒ BC01_1% AEP- (15 min)
 ☒ BC01_50% AEP- (30 min)
 ☒ BC01_10% AEP- (20 min)
 ☒ BC01_5% AEP- (20 min)
 ☒ BC01_2% AEP- (15 min)
 ☐ All Values
☒ * Mean Values
 ☒ Adopted Temporal Pattern



Compare Peak Flow (m3/s) for Events (BC01_50% AEP, BC01_10% AEP, BC01_5% AEP, BC01_2% AEP, BC01_1% AEP - Yer13)





APPENDIX E BASE CASE AND POST DEVELOPMENT FLOOD MAPPING





Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Scale: 1:1,600

0

20

40

60


80

100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022



WATER TECHNOLOGY
WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS



Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30


0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

5% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30

0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

2% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30


0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30

0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30

0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30

0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

5% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30


0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

2% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Depth (m)

<= 0.03

0.03 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.30


0.3 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

>2.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Depth and Level - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Scale: 1:1,600

0 20 40 60 80 100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga

Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					

WATER TECHNOLOGY
WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

5% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0




Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

2% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Base Case
Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0

Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Base Case
Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0

1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0


1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

5% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Velocity (m/s)

<= 0.25

0.25 - 0.5

0.5 - 1.0


1.0 - 1.5

1.5 - 2.0

2.0 - 2.5

2.5 - 3.0

> 3.0



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Velocity - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Base Case
Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6

Scale: 1:1,600

0

20

40

60

80

100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga

Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					

WATER TECHNOLOGY

WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS



Scale: 1:1,600

0 20 40 60 80 100 m


5% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga

Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					

WATER TECHNOLOGY
WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS



Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6

Scale: 1:1,600

0

20

40

60

80

100 m

2% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022

WATER TECHNOLOGY

WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS



Scale: 1:1,600

0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Base Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

10% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

5% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

2% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Hazard (AEMI categories)

H1

H2

H3

H4

H5

H6



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Maximum Flood Hazard - Post Development Case

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





APPENDIX F FLOOD LEVEL CHANGE MAPPING





Legend

Site Boundary

Impacts (m)

<= -0.2

-0.2 - -0.10

-0.10 - -0.05

-0.05 - -0.02

-0.02 - -0.01

-0.01 - 0.01

0.01 - 0.02

0.02 - 0.05

0.05 - 0.10

0.10 - 0.2

> 0.2

Was wet now dry

Was dry now wet

Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

50% AEP Flood Level Change

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3 Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56 Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021 Local Authority: Brisbane City Council	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022





Legend

Site Boundary

Impacts (m)

≤ -0.2

$-0.2 - -0.10$

$-0.10 - -0.05$

$-0.05 - -0.02$

$-0.02 - -0.01$

$-0.01 - 0.01$

$0.01 - 0.02$

$0.02 - 0.05$

$0.05 - 0.10$

$0.10 - 0.2$

> 0.2

Was wet now dry

Was dry now wet




Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

10% AEP Flood Level Change
Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Impacts (m)

≤ -0.2

$-0.2 - -0.10$

$-0.10 - -0.05$

$-0.05 - -0.02$

$-0.02 - -0.01$

$-0.01 - 0.01$

$0.01 - 0.02$

$0.02 - 0.05$

$0.05 - 0.10$

$0.10 - 0.2$

> 0.2

Was wet now dry

Was dry now wet

Scale: 1:1,600

0

20

40

60

80


100 m

5% AEP Flood Level Change

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Impacts (m)

≤ -0.2

$-0.2 - -0.10$

$-0.10 - -0.05$

$-0.05 - -0.02$

$-0.02 - -0.01$

$-0.01 - 0.01$

$0.01 - 0.02$

$0.02 - 0.05$

$0.05 - 0.10$

$0.10 - 0.2$

> 0.2

Was wet now dry

Was dry now wet

Scale: 1:1,600

2% AEP Flood Level Change

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Legend

Site Boundary

Impacts (m)

≤ -0.2

$-0.2 - -0.10$

$-0.10 - -0.05$

$-0.05 - -0.02$

$-0.02 - -0.01$

$-0.01 - 0.01$

$0.01 - 0.02$

$0.02 - 0.05$


$0.05 - 0.10$

$0.10 - 0.2$

> 0.2

Was wet now dry

Was dry now wet



Scale: 1:1,600 0 20 40 60 80 100 m

1% AEP Flood Level Change

Parkside Yeronga
Stantec co- EDQ

Details	Rev	Description	Drawn	Checked	Date
Original Size A3	1	Final	JMW	AMD	10/02/2022
Projection: GDA/MGA94 Zone 56					
Imagery Source: Google Earth 2021					
Local Authority: Brisbane City Council					





Melbourne

15 Business Park Drive
Notting Hill VIC 3168
Telephone (03) 8526 0800
Fax (03) 9558 9365

Brisbane

Level 5, 43 Peel Street
South Brisbane QLD 4101
Telephone (07) 3105 1460
Fax (07) 3846 5144

Adelaide

1/198 Greenhill Road
Eastwood SA 5063
Telephone (08) 8378 8000
Fax (08) 8357 8988

Perth

Ground Floor
430 Roberts Road
Subiaco WA 6008
Telephone 0438 347 968

Geelong

PO Box 436
Geelong VIC 3220
Telephone 0458 015 664

Gippsland

154 Macleod Street
Bairnsdale VIC 3875
Telephone (03) 5152 5833

Wangaratta

First Floor, 40 Rowan Street
Wangaratta VIC 3677
Telephone (03) 5721 2650

Wimmera

PO Box 584
Stawell VIC 3380
Telephone 0438 510 240

www.watertech.com.au

info@watertech.com.au

