

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS referred to in the PDA DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL Approval no: DEV2024/1488 Date: 30/09/2024



# 67 to 69 Shore St East Cleveland QLD 4163

# Water Supply and Sewerage Network Capacity Assessment

FINAL Report V1 - 21 June, 2024



H2One Pty Ltd

Water, Sewer and Stormwater Engineering Specialists



H2One Pty Ltd

ABN 20 130 354 764

- P 07 5463 9538
- E info@H2One.com.au
- W h2one.com.au

Reviewed by RPEQ	Reg. No.	Signed	Date
Joshua May	18064		21 June, 2024

Version	Date	Author	Reviewer
DRAFT - V1	21 June, 2024	D Colledge	J May
FINAL - V1	21 June, 2024	D Colledge	J May

Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to H2One Pty Ltd and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person without the prior written approval of H2One Pty Ltd.



#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1	INTR	ODU	CTION	.2
	1.1	Back	<pre><ground< pre=""></ground<></pre>	.2
	1.2	Obje	ectives	.2
	1.3	Sew	er Catchment System	.2
	1.4	Wat	er Supply Zone	.2
	1.5	Dem	nand Assessment	.3
2	MET	HOD	OLOGY	.4
	2.1	Desi	ired Standards of Service	.4
	2.2	Sew	erage Network Assessment	.5
	2.3	Wat	er Supply Network Assessment	.5
3	RESU	JLTS .		.7
	3.1	Sew	erage Network Assessment	.7
	3.1.1	L	Pumps	.7
	3.1.2	2	Wet Wells	.7
	3.1.3	3	Gravity Mains	.8
	3.1.4	1	Emergency Storage	.8
	3.2	Wat	er Supply Network Assessment	.8
	3.2.1	L	Standard Flow	.8
	3.2.2	2	Fire Flow	.9
4	CON	CLUS	ion1	.1
5	REFE	RENC	CE LIST1	.2
6	APPI	ENDIC	CES1	.3
	Append	dix 1.	Preliminary development layout plan1	.4
	Append	dix 2.	Development site and SPS 002 sewer catchment1	.5
	Append	dix 3.	Development site and Alexandra Hills water supply system1	.6
	Append	dix 4.	Pump capacity assessment results1	.7
	Append	dix 5.	Operational storage capacity assessment results1	.9
	Append	dix 6.	Gravity main capacity assessment results2	20
	Append	dix 7.	Emergency storage capacity assessment results2	2

#### **1** INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background

A mid-rise residential tower development is currently in the planning phase of the Development Application (DA) process, located at 67 to 69 Shore Street East, Cleveland QLD 4163; Lots 12 and 13 on C14563. The land-use type and density is planned for 30 x 3+ bedroom apartments. Refer to Appendix 1 for the preliminary development layout plan.

H2One Pty Ltd was engaged to undertake a water supply and sewerage network capacity assessment to determine if the site's additional loading will impact system performance and trigger the need for infrastructure upgrades. This assessment has been prepared in accordance with Redland City Council's (RCC) minimum Design Standards; *"South East Queensland Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code"* (2020). The results of the study are presented in this report.

#### 1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the project were as follows.

- 1. Assess the capacity of existing gravity mains, pressure mains, pumps, wet wells and emergency storage for the relevant sewer catchment; Sewer Pump Station (SPS) 002.
- 2. Assess standard flow and fire flow capacity of the relevant water supply network; Alexandra Hills Low Level Zone (LLZ).
- 3. Determine infrastructure upgrades necessary to achieve RCC's minimum Design Standards, where system performance failures have occurred due to the additional loadings of the new development.
- 4. Prepare a network capacity assessment report.

#### 1.3 Sewer Catchment System

The development site is located within the SPS 002 sub-catchment and larger catchment area of the Cleveland Sewage Treatment Plant (STP). The proposed service connection will be located on the DN150 gravity main along Shore Street East, adjacent to the northern property boundary.

The development's sewage outfall will be conveyed west to SPS 002, via a 350 m, DN150 gravity pipe system. SPS 002 has duty-assist pumps that transfer sewage west to the downstream catchment (SPS 004), ultimately discharging to the Cleveland STP via a number of catchments.

As per RCC's 2022 Netserv model, the catchment demand is estimated at 1,295 EP and 6,094 EP, at the 2021 and Ultimate planning horizons, respectively. Refer to Appendices 1 and 2 for an overview of site location and the relevant service strategy.

#### 1.4 Water Supply Zone

The development site is located within the Alexandra Hills LLZ, which is supplied by a series of water tanks located at the top of Alexandra Hills (RL 65 m). A network of DN600, DN500 and DN450 trunk mains distribute water east to the network surrounding the development site. The proposed service strategy is to service the development from a single connection to the existing DN100 water pipe along Shore Street East.

As per RCC's 2022 Netserv model, the Alexandra Hills LLZ currently services 98,600 EP and is projected to increase to 117,213 EP, at the Ultimate planning horizon. Refer to Appendices 1 and 3 for an overview of site location and relevant service strategy.

#### 1.5 Demand Assessment

A water supply and sewage demand assessment was undertaken on the proposed development, to determine the approximate loading attributed to the land-use type and density. This was calculated using RCC's Equivalent Persons (EP) unit rates and average "per capita" demands for potable water and sewage; 230 L/EP/day and 210 L/EP/day, respectively. Refer to Table 1 below for a summary of the relevant demand estimate.

Site Land-use and Density	Demand Rate	EP	Water Peak Hour Flow (L/s)	Sewage PWWF (L/s)
30 x 3 bedroom apt.	2.51 EP/Apt.	75.3	0.80	0.92

#### Table 1. Estimated water supply and sewage demands for the proposed development

Note 1: For water demands, peak flow rates were based on the "residential" AD/PH peaking factor (4.0).

Note 2: For sewage demands, the PWWF flow rates were based on 5 x ADWF.

For the post-development scenarios, RCC's existing Netserv planning demands were removed from the hydraulic models and replaced with the demands presented in Table 1 above. The planning demands were sourced from RCC's 2022 Netserv IDM and are presented in Table 2 below.

#### Table 2. RCC's IDM water and sewer demands (EP) removed from the hydraulic models @ post-development

Address	Water Node ID	Sewer Node ID	2021 to Ultimate (EP)
67-69 Shore St E, Cleveland	J13223	43066	5.4

#### 2 METHODOLOGY

#### 2.1 Desired Standards of Service

The design standards adopted for the hydraulic assessment were based on the "South East Queensland Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code" (2020), with exception to the maximum depth of gravity pipe flow at 1.0 m freeboard. This requirement is merely a standard industry practice adopted by water authorities in South-east Queensland, and is <u>not</u> a specific design standard from either the SEQ Code or Water Service Association of Australia (WSAA) Sewerage Code.

A summary of the relevant design provisions utilised for the project is as follows.

	Provision	Specification	
	ET to EP conversion factor	2.7	
	Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF)	210 L/EP/day	
	Peak Wet Weather Flow (PWWF)	5 x ADWF	
		C1 x ADWF (L/s) where;	
	Single pump capacity	C1 = 3.5 to 5.0	
		C1 = 15 x (EP) <sup>-0.1587</sup>	
		$0.9 \times Q / N$ where;	
ge		Q = Single pump capacity (L/s)	
/era	Pump station operational storage (m <sup>3</sup> )	N = Number of pump starts per hour, where	
Sew		N = 12 for duty pump motor < 100 kW	
		N = 5 for duty pump motor $> 200$ kW	
	Pump station emergency storage $(m^3)$	A bours ADWE	
	Tatal nump station consolity (L/c)		
	Total pump station capacity (L/S)	PWWF	
	system)	75% pipe diameter	
	Maximum depth of gravity flow (existing system)	1.0 m below manhole level	
	Maximum pressure main flow velocity	3.0 m/s	
	ET to EP conversion factor	2.7	
	Average Day (AD) Demand	230 L/EP/day	
	Maximum pipe velocity (m/s)	2.5 m/s	
٨	Standard flow minimum network pressure and background demand	22m at the property boundary at PH demand	
ddn	Decidential fire flow minimum notwork processor	12m at 2/3 PH demand	
er S	and background demand	Positive pressure at PH demand	
Wat		Reservoir at Minimum Operating Level (15%)	
	Commercial fire flow minimum network pressure and background demand	12m at PH demand	
		Residential - 15 L/s	
	Fire flows	Residential (> 3 storey) - 30 L/s	
		Commercial/industrial - 30 L/s	

Table 3. De	esign provisions	adopted for the	hydraulic assessment
-------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------

#### 2.2 Sewerage Network Assessment

The methodology adopted for the hydraulic analysis of the sewer network is as follows.

- RCC's latest LGIP MIKE+ sewer network model was adopted for the hydraulic analysis ("Clev722P\_(Netserv\_Model)\_v3\_2023"), which incorporates the 2022 Netserv planning demands and infrastructure upgrades. For the post development scenarios, the site's total estimated sewage loading was placed onto manhole "43067", and RCC's existing Netserv demands removed from the hydraulic model as per Section 1.5 of this report.
- 2. The pump capacity of SPS 002 was assessed by comparing the PWWF required to service the catchment, pre- and post-development, to the available combined pump capacity presented in RCC's hydraulic model.

If the combined pump capacity was above the catchment's PWWF, relevant design standards were achieved. If it was below the PWWF, pump and pressure main upgrades were investigated until compliance was attained.

3. The operational storage of the SPS 002 wet well was subsequently evaluated by comparing the required storage capacity, post-development, against wet well volumes between the duty pump start/stop levels.

If the wet well's operational storage volume was above the minimum requirement, compliance was achieved. If it was below the minimum requirement, upgrades were investigated until design standards were achieved.

4. The flow depth of gravity mains was assessed from the proposed connection point to SPS 002, pre- and post-development. To avoid surcharging from potential deficiencies downstream, the relevant pump station was deactivated and the gravity mains discharged directly to an outlet.

*If flow depths could not be maintained within RCC's specifications, pipe augmentations were investigated until Design Standards were achieved.* 

5. The emergency storage of the SPS 002 catchment was assessed by determining the available storage volume between the overflow level (RL 1.95 m - 0.3 m) and the duty pump start level (RL -3.07 m), including upstream gravity mains and manholes. The overflow level was sourced from the manhole with the lowest surface level ("43077"), as per RCC's hydraulic model.

The available emergency storage was compared against the 4 hour ADWF requirement. If the available storage was above the minimum requirement, compliance was achieved. If it was below the minimum requirement, compliance was not achieved and storage augmentations were investigated.

6. Modelling results were verified and findings reported.

#### 2.3 Water Supply Network Assessment

The methodology adopted for the water supply network analysis is as follows.

- RCC's latest MIKE+ LGIP hydraulic model was adopted for the water supply analysis ("RCC WD LGIP Model\_2021 FINAL v3"). For the post-development scenarios, the site's estimated demand and diurnal patterns were placed onto node "Junction\_115", and RCC's existing Netserv demands removed from the hydraulic model as per Section 1.5 of this report.
- 2. For all planning horizons, a 1 x Maximum Day (MD) demand standard flow hydraulic analysis was undertaken on the property connection point/s and local network, at both pre- and post-

development. Any deficiencies in the network were investigated and appropriate solutions determined.

Note: An assessment on the capacity of the water supply tanks (Alexandra Hills LLZ) was not undertaken, as the development's additional loading was considered negligible for the existing storage capacity.

- Residential (15 L/s) and commercial (30 L/s) fire flow allocation was applied to the surrounding network as per RCC's Netserv model. For the post-development scenarios, hydrants directly servicing the subject site were allocated 30 L/s fire flow @ 2/3 PH demand, as the proposed development will exceed 3 storeys in height.
- 4. For all planning horizons, a fire flow hydraulic analysis was undertaken on all hydrants servicing the local network, at pre- and post-development. Any deficiencies in the network were investigated and appropriate solutions determined.
- 5. Modelling results were verified and findings reported.

#### **3 RESULTS**

#### 3.1 Sewerage Network Assessment

#### 3.1.1 Pumps

A pump capacity assessment was undertaken on SPS 002 as per the methodology described in Section 2.2 of this report. Refer to Table 4 below for a summary of results.

Planning Horizon	Capacity Available (L/s)	Capacity Required (L/s)	Difference (L/s)
2021	35.9	16.6	+19.3
2026	35.9	28.0	+7.9
2031	74.1	42.0	+32.1
2051	74.1	71.7	+2.4
Ultimate	74.1	74.9	-0.8

Table 4.	Combined	pump f	low ca	pacity	results	(post-develo	opment)
Tuble H	complica	Painb i	ion cu	pacity	i courto	(post acvert	pincing,

Note 1: Above figures were sourced from RCC's hydraulic model.

Note 2: RCC has a combined pump upgrade projected for the 2031 planning horizon, hence the significant increase in flow capacity from 35.9 L/s to 74.1 L/s.

The above results demonstrate that there is sufficient combined pump capacity, at SPS 002, to service the proposed development, up to the 2051 planning horizon. The Ultimate planning horizon resulted in a minor 0.8 L/s pump capacity shortfall, which can be readily rectified via RCC's LGIP pump capacity upgrade projected for the 2031 planning horizon.

However, as the minor deficiency is a projection of a 40 year+ planning horizon, it is recommended the pump capacity shortfall is disregarded and relevant development conditions are not applied to the application process.

Refer to Appendix 4 for the detailed pump modelling results.

#### 3.1.2 Wet Wells

An assessment on the operational storage capacity of the SPS 002 wet well was undertaken with the inclusion of the development's estimated loading. Table 5 below shows a summary of results and Appendix 5 provides detailed calculations.

Planning Horizon	Storage Available (kL)	Storage Required (kL)	Difference (kL)
2021	0.47	1.19	-0.72
Ultimate	0.47	4.22	-3.75

#### Table 5. Operational storage capacity results (post-development)

The above table demonstrates there is insufficient operational storage capacity to incorporate the additional site loading, across all planning horizons. This result however, was determined to be a preexisting deficiency that was <u>not</u> triggered by the development site, as it only accounted for 0.06 kL of the storage requirement.

Further investigation determined that the duty pump start level can be increased to the invert level of the discharging gravity main (RL -2.66 m), to provide adequate capacity up to the 2031 planning horizon. From 2036 however, a wet well storage capacity upgrade (3.75 kL) will likely be required to comply with RCC's minimum Design Standards.

Since the operation storage deficiency is a pre-existing issue, and was negligibly impacted by the development's additional loading, it is recommended the resolution of the storage capacity is undertaken by RCC, via standard LGIP processes.

#### 3.1.3 Gravity Mains

As per the methodology described in Section 2.2, gravity main pipe flow depths were assessed against RCC's minimum requirement, from site connections to SPS 002. The analysis identified that there was sufficient capacity within the existing gravity main system to incorporate the site's loading across all planning horizons. No gravity main capacity upgrades are therefore required to service the development.

Refer to Appendix 6 for detailed modelling results and gravity main profiles.

#### 3.1.4 Emergency Storage

An emergency storage capacity assessment was undertaken on the SPS 002 catchment, with the inclusion of the additional ADWF attributed to the proposed development. Refer to Table 6 below for a summary of outcomes and Appendix 7 for detailed calculations.

Planning Horizon	Storage Available (kL)	Storage Required (kL)	Difference (kL)
2021	57.9	35.1	+22.8
2026	72.2	66.1	+6.1
2031	72.2	104.9	-32.7
Ultimate	72.2	190.9	-118.8

#### Table 6. Emergency storage capacity results (post-development)

Note 1: Above figures were based on 300 mm below the overflow level (RL 1.95 m - 0.3 m) as per RCC's hydraulic model.

Note 2: RCC has a gravity main upgrade projected for the 2026 planning horizon, hence the significant increase in available storage capacity from 57.9 kL to 72.2 kL.

Note 3: Above results can be considered an estimate only as it does not consider ADWF already present within the manholes and gravity mains.

The results in Table 6 show that the SPS 002 catchment has sufficient emergency storage up to the 2026 planning horizon, with all subsequent planning horizons presenting insufficient capacity. This outcome however, was determined to be a pre-existing deficiency that was <u>not</u> triggered by the development site, as it only accounted for 2.45 kL of the storage requirement.

Further investigation determined that a storage capacity upgrade (118.8 kL) will likely be required, at the 2031 planning horizon, in order to comply with RCC's minimum Design Standards. However, since the emergency storage deficiency is a pre-existing issue, and the development site only had a minor contribution, it is recommended the resolution of the storage capacity is undertaken by RCC, via standard LGIP processes.

#### 3.2 Water Supply Network Assessment

#### 3.2.1 Standard Flow

As per the methodology described in Section 2.3 of this report, a detailed standard flow network analysis was undertaken on all planning horizons with the inclusion of the estimated development demands. A summary of results is presented below in Table 7.

	2021		Ultir	Ultimate	
Provision	Pre-develop.	Post-develop.	Pre-develop.	Post-develop.	
Conn. point (Junction_115) min. pressure (m)	54.3	54.1	43.8	43.5	
Network min. pressure (m)	42.5	42.4	33.0	32.9	
Network min. pressure node ID	J9330 J9328		328		
Network no. pressure failures	0	0	0	0	
Max. pipe velocity (m/s)	1.1	1.1	1.9	1.9	
Network max. pipe velocity ID	9668				
Network no. velocity failures	0	0	0	0	

#### Table 7. Standard flow network modelling results (pre- and post-development)

Note 1: Peak hour was 9 am within the local network.

Note 2: Modelling with the supply reservoir at MOL was not considered, as the Capalaba Water Treatment Plant (WTP) pump station is required to operate over peak demand events.

The above results demonstrate that the network performed within RCC's Design Standards across all planning horizons. No infrastructure upgrades are therefore required to service the development for standard flow.

#### 3.2.2 Fire Flow

As per the methodology described in Section 2.3 of this report, a detailed fire flow network analysis was undertaken on all planning horizons with the inclusion of estimated development demands. A summary of results is presented below in Table 8.

		20	21	Ultimate		
	Provision	Pre- develop.	Post- develop.	Pre- develop.	Post- develop.	
	Site hydrant (Junction_115) min. pressure (m) @ 15 L/s pre-develop. and 30 L/s post-develop.	48.9	29.8	40.8	22.9	
2/3	Network hydrants min. pressure (m)	22.4	22.3	16.2	16.2	
PH FF	Network hydrant min. pressure node ID	J92	286	J10012		
	Network hydrants no. failures	0	0	0	0	
	Network hydrants min. pressure (m) @ 30 L/s	16.3	16.0	13.6	13.5	
PH FF	Network hydrant min. pressure node ID	J13190		J9464		
	Network hydrants no. failures	0	0	0	0	

#### Table 8. Fire flow network modelling results (pre- and post-development)

Note 1: Within the local network, 2/3 peak hour and peak hour was 4 pm and 9 am, respectively.

Note 2: Modelling with the supply reservoir at MOL was not considered, as the Capalaba Water Treatment Plant (WTP) pump station is required to operate over peak demand events.

## H29NE

The above results demonstrate that the network performed within RCC's Design Standards across all planning horizons. No infrastructure upgrades are therefore required to service the development for fire flow.



#### 4 CONCLUSION

A mid-rise residential tower development is currently in the planning phase of the Development Application (DA) process, located at 67 to 69 Shore Street East, Cleveland QLD 4163; Lots 12 and 13 on C14563. The land-use type and density is planned for 30 x 3+ bedroom apartments. Refer to Appendix 1 for the preliminary development layout plan.

H2One Pty Ltd was engaged to undertake a water supply and sewerage network capacity assessment to determine if the site's additional loading (75.3 EP) will impact system performance and trigger the need for infrastructure upgrades. The assessment was prepared in accordance with Redland City Council's (RCC) minimum Design Standards; *"South East Queensland Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code"* (2020).

The hydraulic analysis determined that, theoretically, there was sufficient capacity in the water supply and sewerage networks to incorporate the site's additional loading, across all planning horizons, without the need for infrastructure upgrades prior to development connection.

The downstream Sewer Pump Station (SPS) 002 presented minor pump, operational storage and emergency storage capacity deficiencies. However, these were determined to be either negligible, or pre-existing shortfalls that were <u>not</u> triggered by the development site. Refer to body of the report for more details.

In summary, it is recommended that RCC reviews the findings presented in this report and approves the relevant service connections for the development at 67 to 69 Shore Street East, Cleveland QLD.

Detailed modelling results, calculations and system plan can be observed in Appendices 1 through 7.



#### 5 REFERENCE LIST

RCC. (2020). SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code. Cleveland, QLD

#### **APPENDICES**

### Appendix 1. Preliminary development layout plan





			DESIGNED	I.ERNST	G B THIS DRAWING INCLUDES COLOURED INFORMATION COPIES OF THIS DRAWING MUST BE PRODUCED IN COLOUR		DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWING			PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	
			DRAWN	I.ERNST					PROJECT	67 & 69 SHORE STREET EAST CLEVELAND, QLD, 4163.	
					1 0	3	6	٥	12		
JB	NG	01.02.24	CHECKED	N.GREEN		- <b></b>	ĭ_				
IE	NG	19.01.24				1. 150					<b>A</b> 11 / 11
DRWN	APP'D	DATE	APPROVED		SCALE	1: 100		SCALE IN	m	DISCIPLINE	CIVIL

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\						
		\						
					\			
	1.15	P.30						
A	ана с 1							
	3.60							
325	3.00	A D D D		- 2.25				
		390						
3.50	3.25	92.22 FFL3.	650m					
				⊴   (				
						\ _		
				, _/ _/				
				/				
· _		- · · ·	·	·	NOT FOR	CONSTRU	JCT	ION
	STATUS SHEET TITLE		CON	PRI CEPT	ELIMINARY ISSU SERVICES	LAYOUT		
	PROJECT NUMBER	23191	DRAWING NUMBER	231	91-DWG-C\	/-CV-SK001	REV	В

## LEGEND

	SITE BOUNDARY
	EXISTING PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- — — - XX.XX - — — -	EXISTING CONTOURS (AT 0.25m INTERVALS)
	EXISTING KERB
	EXISTING EDGE OF BITUMEN
— E(OH) — — —	EXISTING OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL (OH)
— G — — —	EXISTING GAS
—— SWD — — — —	EXISTING STORMWATER DRAINAGE
SE	EXISTING SEWER
— NBN — — —	EXISTING NBN
— W — — —	EXISTING WATER
XX.XX	DESIGN CONTOURS (AT 0.10m INTERVALS)
	PROPOSED BUILDING OVER LINE
	PROPOSED CHANGE OF GRADE
	PROPOSED PAVEMENT SAW CUT
	TREE PROTECTION ZONE
	PROPOSED M1 MOUNTABLE KERB AND CHANNEL
<u>n n n n n n n n</u>	PROPOSED EDGE OF BITUMEN
— SWD — — —	PROPOSED STORMWATER DRAINAGE
——SE— — ——	PROPOSED SEWER
— W — — —	PROPOSED WATER
	PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
XX.XXXm 🗙	FINISHED SURFACE ELEVATION LABEL
XX.XXXm 🗙	EXISTING SURFACE ELEVATION LABEL
XX.XXXm 🗙	PROPOSED RETAINING WALL HEIGHT
X.X%	PROPOSED SURFACE SLOPE

## EARTHWORKS LEVELS

 EARTHWORKS VOLUMES AND LEVELS BASED ON DRIVEWAY THICKNESS OF 150mm AND BUILDING SLAB THICKNESS OF 150mm. REFER STRUCTURAL DESIGN DRAWINGS AT DETAILED DESIGN STAGE FOR FINAL PAD THICKNESS.
 ALL RETAINING WALL HEIGHTS ARE GIVEN FROM EXISTING SURFACE TO DESIGN (FINISHED) SURFACE.

EARTHWORKS VOLUMES						
(EXISTING SURFACE TO EARTHWORKS SURFACE)						
TOTAL CUT 1015m <sup>3</sup>						
TOTAL FILL	230m <sup>3</sup>					
TOTAL BALANCE (CUT TO EXPORT)	785m³					

## CUT & FILL LEGEND

MINIMUM ELEVATION	MAXIMUM ELEVATION	COLOUR		
-1.500m	-1.000m			
-1.000m	-0.500m			
-0.500m	0.000m			
0.000m	0.500m			
0.500m	1.000m			
1.000m	1.500m			







Appendix 2. Development site and SPS 002 sewer catchment



Appendix 3. Development site and Alexandra Hills water supply system







Time series 0.075 0.070 0.065 0.060 0.055 0.050 0.045 [meter^3/sec] 0.040 0.035 0.030 0.025 0.020 0.015 0.010 0.005 0.000 12:00 AM 1:00 AM 2:00 AM 3:00 AM 4:00 AM 5:00 AM 6:00 AM — Pump Discharge Pump:AUG\_Pump\_002-6450, 5 [meter^3/sec]

		2021	Ultimate
	C1	4.77	3.76
Single Pump Capacity Required	ADWF (L/s)	3.32	14.98
nequirea	Q (L/s)	15.83	56.26
	Pump Setup	Duty-assist	Duty-assist
	Duty Head (m)	NA	NA
Storege Conscitu Deguined	Pump Efficiency (%)	NA	NA
Storage Capacity Required	Duty Power (kW)	<100.00	<100.00
	No. pump starts (n)	12.00	12.00
	Volume (kL)	1.19	4.22
	Duty Start (RL m)	-3.07	-3.07
	Duty Stop (RL m)	-3.22	-3.22
Storage Capacity Available	Duty Height (m)	0.15	0.15
	WW Diam. (m)	2.00	2.00
	Volume (kL)	0.47	0.47
OUTCOME	Difference (kL)	-0.72	-3.75
OUTCOME	Pass / Fail	FAIL	FAIL

#### Appendix 5. Operational storage capacity assessment results

Note 1: Wet well and pump details were sourced from the RCC's hydraulic model.

Note 2: The above table shows results at post-development.

Note 3: The storage deficiencies can be resolved, up to the 2031 planning horizon, by increasing the duty pump start level to the invert level of the discharging gravity main (RL -2.66 m). Subsequent planning horizons may require a storage upgrade.



#### Appendix 6. Gravity main capacity assessment results









#### SPS 002 @ Ultimate, Post-development

#### Appendix 7. Emergency storage capacity assessment results

SPS 002 Overflow RL: RL 1.95 m @ node 43077 - 0.3 m = RL 1.65 m
MH Volume Below RL 1.65 m @ 1.05 m Diameter: 24.5 kL
Wet Well Volume Between Duty Start (RL -3.07 m) and Overflow @ 2.0 m Diameter: 14.8 kL
Gravity Main Volume Below RL 1.65 m: 18.5 kL (2021) and 32.9 kL (2026-Ultimate)
Total Available Volume (2021): 24.5 + 14.8 + 18.5 = 57.9 kL
Total Available Volume (Ultimate): 24.5 + 14.8 + 32.9 = 72.2 kL
Total Volume Required @ 4 hours ADWF (2021): 1,002.7 EP (post-develop.) x 210 L/EP/day = 35.1 kL
Total Volume Required @ 4 hours ADWF (2026): 1,889.3 EP (post-develop.) x 210 L/EP/day = 66.1 kL
Total Volume Required @ 4 hours ADWF (2031): 2,997.7 EP (post-develop.) x 210 L/EP/day = 104.9 kL
Total Volume Required @ 4 hours ADWF (ULT): 5,455.7 EP (post-develop.) x 210 L/EP/day = 190.9 kL

In summary, compliance is achieved for 2021 and 2026 only, i.e. 35.1 kL versus 57.9 kL, and 66.1 kL versus 72.2 kL, respectively. A storage upgrade (total of 190.9 kL) will likely be required to achieve 4 hours ADWF.

Note the available catchment storage does <u>not</u> consider existing ADWF already within the pipe/MH network. Results should therefore be considered an estimate only.