

Nathaniel Murray

From: Andrew Mooney [amooney@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Thursday, 20 September 2012 3:58 PM
To: Colless, Tim
Cc: Eveleigh, Ben; Favotto, Daniel; Fitzgerald, Suellen; Mark@costinroe.com.au; Nathaniel Murray
Subject: Re: SSD-5169 - WSPT response to Council submission
Attachments: WSPT Response - FCC Comments 20 Sept 12.pdf

Hi Tim

attached are our comments.

please call me if you would like to discuss anything further

regards

**Andrew Mooney | Senior Strategic Land Use Planner | Environmental Standards
Fairfield City Council**

A: PO Box 21 Fairfield NSW 1860
P: 9725 0214
F: 9757 4720



>>> "Tim Colless" <Tim.Colless@wspt.nsw.gov.au> 12/09/2012 2:57 PM >>>
Hi Andrew,

As discussed last week, please see attached our preliminary response to Council's submission. We will continue to work through the stormwater aspects directly with Erin.

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss further or arrange meeting.

Regards

Tim Colless
Project Manager

Western Sydney Parklands Trust
Department of Premier and Cabinet
www.westernsydneyparklands.com.au

Level 4, 10 Valentine Avenue, Parramatta, NSW, 2150
M: +61 403 234 066

This e-mail is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use or disclose this information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and advise me immediately.

E-mails may contain computer viruses, may be interfered with or may have other defects. They may not be

successfully replicated on other computer systems. This e-mail may be subject to copyright. If it is, the written consent of the copyright owner must be obtained before any part of it is reproduced, adapted or communicated.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs. For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>

This e-mail is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of Fairfield City Council.

**HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK –
Response from Western Sydney Parklands Trust dated 12-September 2012**



WSPT - Response	Fairfield City Council – further comments
1. Stand-alone commercial uses Trust accepts Council restriction on 'stand alone commercial uses	Acknowledged
2. Insufficient information (a) interim Construction Noise Guidelines (b) NSW EPA Contaminate Land requirements - Trust requests further clarification from Council.	Additional advice (email) sent to the Trust on 13 Sept 12 by Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer clarifying this issue. It is understood the Trust is liaising with its consultant to address the issues raised by Council
3. Proposed signalisation of Roundabout Trust accepts requirement for RMS approval and notification to business owners in Newton Road.	Acknowledged
4. Internal access road Trust accepts condition	Acknowledged
5. Landscape setbacks - Trust proposes a 10m landscape buffer along The Horsley Drive - Cannot achieve a 20m buffer along the Western Boundary as some of land in ownership of CMA - Land to north will form part of agriculture precinct and 20m buffer not required.	- Basis for a full 20m landscape buffer is contained Council's submission to the proposal. Setback and landscaping and setback issues for the site vary from those associated with the industrial area to the east along The Horsley drive as the proposal; - is located within an elevated section of the WS Parklands and will have a strong visual impact on the western gateway/entry precinct to this part of the City. - Incorporates elevated building pads which have the potential to exacerbate visual impacts of future industrial development on the site. - Requires significant screening measures to mitigate potential visual impacts of industrial buildings on the Parkland Precinct and to integrate the development into the Parklands.

**HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK –
Response from Western Sydney Parklands Trust dated 12-September 2012**



WSPT - Response	Fairfield City Council – further comments
	- As detailed in its submission, Council is prepared to discuss off-setting internal road frontages so that a more substantial setback can be achieved along The Horsley Drive. - Council acknowledges restrictions to achieving a full 20 buffer along the western boundary and that agriculture development on the northern boundary forms part of a future buffer. However suitable landscape measures should still be incorporated along these boundaries.
6. Facades of future buildings Building facades to be subject to future applications	This is still a critical issue in terms of the future visual impact of the proposal on the precinct referred to above. In this regard Council requests the issue of building facades still be flagged under any approval issued by the DP&I.
7. Landscape plans Landscape plans to be amended.	Noted, Council requests a meeting with the Trust before the amended landscape plans are prepared to discuss landscaping issues. E.g. planting recommendation for the OSD basin includes <i>Lomandra longifolia</i> and <i>Dianella caerulea</i> planted at 10/m2 evenly
8. Arborist report Trust to engage arborist to prepare further report and redesign of detention basin if necessary	Acknowledged.
9. Schedule of estimated costs	- As detailed under s.4.4.7 of EIS for proposal, under Part 4 of the EP&A Act the development attracts indirect s.94A contributions. - Further details regarding estimate of costs is therefore required for Council and the Department to assess these costs.

**HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK –
Response from Western Sydney Parklands Trust dated 12-September 2012**



WSPT - Response	Fairfield City Council – further comments
10. Draft Conditions of Consent	
A. Design of On-Site Detention System & On-site Detention Design Certificate • Consultation on Drains Model commenced with Council's Catchment Branch	• Issues relating to Drains Model, including data provided are still being resolved with Trust's consultant.
B. Dedication of Roadway • Trust proposes plans will be submitted to Land Titles Office to achieve OC rather than registered on Title	• As per email from Tim Colless 8.8.12 the site will remain in torrens title so new lots and access road will need to be registered on title. • Occupational certificate not relevant as no buildings are proposed. • Dedication of road needs to occur after construction and requires issuing of an engineering compliance certificate.
C. General Conditions • Monitoring of State Roadway condition too broad as development should not be responsible for cleanup of other vehicles using road • Dust Suppression condition ambiguous, amend to state "Automatic sprinkler systems shall be set up at appropriate locations on the site to mitigate against dust"	• More specifically, the proponent would still need to include necessary pollution control measures and monitor development to ensure there is no spill (e.g. soil, other materials) from the site onto the adjoining roads • Use of Automatic sprinkler systems to militate against dust is acceptable.
D. Subdivision Certificate Release Fee, • confirmation of fee requested.	• \$95 per lot required. Please contact Council's Subdivision Branch (9725 0319) if further clarification required.
E. No comments	-
F. Sydney Water Compliance Certificate • P.11 – Duplicate condition.	• Acknowledged, remove duplicate condition.
G. Conditions relating to landscape plans	

**HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK –
Response from Western Sydney Parklands Trust dated 12-September 2012**



WSPT - Response	Fairfield City Council – further comments
• Groundcover at 6/m2 excessive • Amended landscape plan to be submitted.	• Prior to updating the Landscape Plan, Council requests a meeting with the Trust to resolve this and other landscaping issues relevant to the proposal.

Nathaniel Murray

From: Andrew Voutsis [avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2012 11:29 AM
To: Mark Wilson
Cc: Erin Sellers; Nona Ruddell
Subject: Horsley Park - FCC Comments
Attachments: Catchment Management Branch comments on Horsley Drive Business Park Civil Engineering Report.docx

Mark,

Please find attached a summary of our comments on the report and the DRAINS model.

Any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Andrew Voutsis
B Eng (Hons)
Senior Professional Engineer
Natural Resources Branch
Engineering Services Division
Fairfield City Council
Ph: 02 9725 0869
Email: Avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au

This e-mail is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of Fairfield City Council.

COMMENTS ON HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK – COSTIN ROE
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERING REPORT BY CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT
BRANCH (18 SEPTEMBER 2012)

COMMENTS ON REPORT

Section	Page	Comment
5.1.2	10	...event of a piped system failure for flows above capacity of the piped system.
5.1.4	10	...catchment modelling software DRAINS and RAFTS.
5.1.4	11	Replace ILSAX with DRAINS
5.2.2	11	Replace Major System with Minor System
5.2.5	12	Why are the basins temporary? They should be permanent.
5.2.5	12	Which adjacent creek? Are you referring to the Wetherill Park drainage channel?
5.3.1	12	Catchment areas stated within this section of the report do not correlate to those presented on drawing Co11492.00-DA70. Need to confirm which catchment areas are correct and make necessary changes.
5.3.3	13	The NSW Office of Water document 'Controlled Activities: Guidelines for Outlet Structures' is not a design manual, only a design guideline. A more relevant design guideline should be reference. One example is the Catchments & Creeks <i>Rock sizing for single pipe outlets</i> August 2011
5.3.5	13	The outlet structures guidelines found within the blue book are for temporary structures, and are not appropriate for this situation.
5.3.5	13	Need to ensure the peak flow rate from the catchment are being used as the flow rate to size the rock protection
5.4	14	...drainage network to convey runoff from the two external catchments...
5.4	14	'...only minor flows are requires to be allowed at this location.' – No, just a reduced catchment size
5.4	14	Need to ensure that there is sufficient grade on the overland channel around northern extent of the development. Please provide calculations undertaken to ensure the channel is sufficient.
5.5	14	Please clarify what the 'Catchment 2 receiving drainage' consists of, and its location, and how do we know it is limited?
5.5	14	Total catchment of 87.9ha should be smaller as it should not include catchment C1 of 7.56 ha.
5.5	15	What stage storage relationship was used for the two basins?
5.5	15	What are the characteristics of the Cowpasture Road broad-crested weir
5.5	15	It is noted that stormwater flows will overtop Cowpasture Road for storm durations greater than or equal to the one hour event in the 100 year ARI. In which events does it overtop for other ARIs?
5.5	15	The following statement is a little unclear. 'We furthermore note that, due to the restrictive nature of the receiving drainage network that there will be little or no change to the outflow hydrograph in a storm event.' Can you please clarify if it is the downstream road crossing or box culvert that is restrictive, and clarify the exact location of the outflow hydrograph.
5.6	16	It is noted that for catchment C1 the estimated time of concentration is 7 minutes (drawing Co11492.00-DA70). This seems to contradict the flows listed in table 5.3 and 5.4 with the peak flow for the predeveloped site being higher for the 2 hour duration over the 30 minute duration. Can yo please clarify this.
5.6	16	Table 5.3 (and 5.4) lists the storage. How was the storage capacity optimised?

5.6	16	Details need to be provided with respect to the outlet configuration of both of the basins to ensure they are in compliance with Councils OSD policy requirements.
5.6	16	Do the calculations for OSD include the western undeveloped catchments, as per modelling of flooding at the intersection of Cowpasture Road and Victoria Street.

COMMENTS ON DRAINS MODEL

1 - Model Outlet/Downstream Boundary Condition

The received model has the following details for the RCBC at the model outlet:

Width = 3.0m

Height = 2.4m

Upstream Invert = 55.6m

Downstream Invert = 55.12m

Length = 62m

The outlet node of the model assumes a surface level of 55m and free discharge to the atmosphere.

However, we recently surveyed the culvert and obtained the following information:

Upstream Invert = 55.10m

Downstream Invert = 50.20m

Length = 422.74m

Therefore the actual length of the culvert is considerably longer than what is assumed in your model and extends to the eastern side of Potter Close where it discharges into a trapezoidal concrete-lined open channel. Could the model therefore be updated to include this length of culvert, with the model assuming normal flow depth in the channel?

2 - Additional Catchment Area

There is a small additional area of contributing catchment east of subcatchments C9 and C7 (between Trivett Street and Cowpasture Road) which is currently not accounted for in the model. This additional area is expected to drain in a southerly direction down Cowpasture Road and directly into the culverts under the road. Could the model be updated to include this additional catchment area?

3 - Overland Flow Path OF19320/OF19990

In the Predevelopment Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19320 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow routing: Kinematic Wave

Reach Length = 50m

Channel Slope = 6%

In the Post Development Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19990 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow Routing: Simple Translation (no attenuation)

Travel Time = 0.5 minutes

Channel Slope = 1%

Since these two flow paths appear to represent the same reach in the model (downstream of Node N4B), a consistent approach should be applied in representing these flow paths (unless there is a specific reason otherwise).

4 - Report Section 5.6, Table 5.4

As discussed on the phone, discharges reported in this table appear different to those produced by the model, eg for 1:100 year ARI event, 30 minute duration storm, the Pre-Development Peak Flow is 6.58 m³/s in the table, and the model results have this value as 6.73 cumecs.

5 - Time of Concentration

I forgot to mention this on the phone to you. On Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70, subcatchment C1 is given a time of concentration of 7 minutes. Why, therefore in Table 5.3 of the report, are much longer storm durations (30 minutes and 120 minutes) used in the modelling, and not durations closer to the critical? Similarly, for Table 5.4 of the report, the 120 minute duration storm was used, since it is the "critical local storm". On what basis was this selected? The times of concentration for the individual subcatchments on Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70 indicate that a considerably shorter time of concentration may be critical.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS REQUIRED

- The proponent is to undertake a risk assessment for the proposed on site detention/water quality basis.
- Formal access must be provided to each of the detention basin. It must be suitable for a car to reverse into and for people to access the basin for cleaning.

Nathaniel Murray

From: Andrew Voutsis [avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 18 September 2012 4:05 PM
To: Mark Wilson
Cc: Erin Sellers; Nona Ruddell
Subject: RE: DRAINS Model - Horsley Park

Hi Mark,

In response to your email this morning, I have the following suggestions:

Item 1

I am happy for your model to include only the first 62m length of culvert. This corresponds to a point almost directly under the centreline of Cowpasture Road where a 900mm diameter pipe joins into it from the south.

However, if only the first 62m length of culvert is used, the invert levels need to be updated to the below:

u/s invert level = 55.10m AHD

d/s invert level = 54.38m AHD

The downstream invert level of 50.20m AHD currently in the model corresponds closely to what is at the culvert outlet (i.e. several hundred metres further downstream) and using this level in the model will result in a considerably steeper grade in the culvert barrel than what is there in reality.

Furthermore, I believe that the hydraulic control at the culvert outlet will need to be set to higher than the culvert outlet. Preliminary modelling results from the Wetherill Park Overland Flood Study (in progress) indicate that for the 1:20 year and the 1:100 year ARI events, the hydraulic grade line at this location is approximately 58.80 - 59.00m AHD, i.e. slightly above the ground level.

Item 5

We are still reviewing and discussing this matter internally. I will be in touch when we have some further ideas.

I hope the above is clear. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Andrew Voutsis
B Eng (Hons)
Senior Professional Engineer
Natural Resources Branch
Engineering Services Division
Fairfield City Council
Ph: 02 9725 0869
Email: Avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au

>>> Mark Wilson <Mark@costinroe.com.au> 18/09/2012 10:56 AM >>>

Andrew,

Thanks for your email, could you please consider the below (in particular Item 1) before we make any adjustments to the modelling:

Item 1

We understand the culvert to be much longer than the modelled 62m. Can the modelled length of the culvert terminate at current location with the downstream hydraulic control set to the top of the culvert (as discussed

yesterday) rather than increasing the length to 422m? We would prefer to keep at the current length as if we increase the length then we would need to introduce additional downstream catchments which we do not have information on and will unnecessarily complicate the modelling.

Item 2

The additional catchment which enters directly into the culvert downstream can be included.

Item 3

The flow path will be adjusted.

Item 4

The minor differences in the model results to those in the report will be adjusted.

Item 5

As has been discussed with Erin Sellers, the critical storm duration for the ILSAX hydrological model does not necessarily correspond with the time of concentration of the local catchment/ subcatchment. This relates to the inner workings of the DRAINS modelling and as I understand it is a combination of temporal patterns used in the storms, the antecedent moisture conditions and time/area method used in the flow calculations. If you review the results for the different storm durations (once model has been run you can review different storm durations in tab on top LHS) you can see which storms give the peak flow and peak volume conditions. Also note that the "worst case storm" presented by DRAINS is a combination of the peak flows from all durations not a single duration storm.

Best Regards,

Mark Wilson
Senior Design Engineer



Costin Roe Consulting Pty Ltd
ABN 50 003 696 446
Newcastle Office:
Suite 108, 10-16 Kenrick Street, The Junction NSW 2291
PO Box 278, The Junction NSW 2291
tel: +61 2 4969 7070 fax: +61 2 4961 3269 mobile: 0421 847 808
Sydney office:
Level 1, 8 Windmill Street, Walsh Bay
PO Box N419, Sydney, NSW 1220 Australia
tel: +61 2 9251 7699 fax: +61 2 9241 3731
email: Mark@costinroe.com.au
web: www.costinroe.com.au

From: Andrew Voutsis [<mailto:avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au>]
Sent: Tuesday, 18 September 2012 10:12 AM
To: Mark Wilson
Cc: Erin Sellers; Nona Ruddell
Subject: DRAINS Model - Horsley Park

Mark,

Following up on our discussion on the phone on Monday afternoon, I have compiled a summary of the required ammendments to the DRAINS model:

1 - Model Outlet/Downstream Boundary Condition

The received model has the following details for the RCBC at the model outlet:

Width = 3.0m

Height = 2.4m

Upstream Invert = 55.6m

Downstream Invert = 55.12m

Length = 62m

The outlet node of the model assumes a surface level of 55m and free discharge to the atmosphere.

However, we recently surveyed the culvert and obtained the following information:

Upstream Invert = 55.10m

Downstream Invert = 50.20m

Length = 422.74m

Therefore the actual length of the culvert is considerably longer than what is assumed in your model and extends to the eastern side of Potter Close where it discharges into a trapezoidal concrete-lined open channel. Could the model therefore be updated to include this length of culvert, with the model assuming normal flow depth in the channel?

2 - Additional Catchment Area

There is a small additional area of contributing catchment east of subcatchments C9 and C7 (between Trivett Street and Cowpasture Road) which is currently not accounted for in the model. This additional area is expected to drain in a southerly direction down Cowpasture Road and directly into the culverts under the road. Could the model be updated to include this additional catchment area?

3 - Overland Flow Path OF19320/OF19990

In the Predevelopment Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19320 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow routing: Kinematic Wave

Reach Length = 50m

Channel Slope = 6%

In the Post Development Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19990 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow Routing: Simple Translation (no attenuation)

Travel Time = 0.5 minutes

Channel Slope = 1%

Since these two flow paths appear to represent the same reach in the model (downstream of Node N4B), a consistent approach should be applied in representing these flow paths (unless there is a specific reason otherwise).

4 - Report Section 5.6, Table 5.4

As discussed on the phone, discharges reported in this table appear different to those produced by the model, eg for 1:100 year ARI event, 30 minute duration storm, the Pre-Development Peak Flow is 6.58 m3/s in the table, and the model results have this value as 6.73 cumecs.

5 - Time of Concentration

I forgot to mention this on the phone to you. On Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70, subcatchment C1 is given a time of concentration of 7 minutes. Why, therefore in Table 5.3 of the report, are much longer storm durations (30 minutes and 120 minutes) used in the modelling, and not durations closer to the critical? Similarly, for Table 5.4 of the report, the 120 minute duration storm was used, since it is the "critical local storm". On what basis was this selected? The times of concentration for the individual subcatchments on Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70 indicate that a considerably shorter time of concentration may be critical.

Please let me know if you have any comments or questions regarding the above. Once these matters have been addressed and the model and the report have been updated, we can further discussion progression of this application.

Best regards,

Andrew Voutsis
B Eng (Hons)
Senior Professional Engineer
Natural Resources Branch
Engineering Services Division
Fairfield City Council
Ph: 02 9725 0869
Email: Avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au

This e-mail is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of Fairfield City Council.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs. For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>

This e-mail is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of Fairfield City Council.

Nathaniel Murray

From: Andrew Voutsis [avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2012 11:29 AM
To: Mark Wilson
Cc: Erin Sellers; Nona Ruddell
Subject: Horsley Park - FCC Comments
Attachments: Catchment Management Branch comments on Horsley Drive Business Park Civil Engineering Report.docx

Mark,

Please find attached a summary of our comments on the report and the DRAINS model.

Any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Andrew Voutsis
B Eng (Hons)
Senior Professional Engineer
Natural Resources Branch
Engineering Services Division
Fairfield City Council
Ph: 02 9725 0869
Email: Avoutsis@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au

This e-mail is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of Fairfield City Council.

COMMENTS ON HORSLEY DRIVE BUSINESS PARK – COSTIN ROE
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERING REPORT BY CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT
BRANCH (18 SEPTEMBER 2012)

COMMENTS ON REPORT

Section	Page	Comment
5.1.2	10	...event of a piped system failure for flows above capacity of the piped system.
5.1.4	10	...catchment modelling software DRAINS and RAFTS.
5.1.4	11	Replace ILSAX with DRAINS
5.2.2	11	Replace Major System with Minor System
5.2.5	12	Why are the basins temporary? They should be permanent.
5.2.5	12	Which adjacent creek? Are you referring to the Wetherill Park drainage channel?
5.3.1	12	Catchment areas stated within this section of the report do not correlate to those presented on drawing Co11492.00-DA70. Need to confirm which catchment areas are correct and make necessary changes.
5.3.3	13	The NSW Office of Water document 'Controlled Activities: Guidelines for Outlet Structures' is not a design manual, only a design guideline. A more relevant design guideline should be reference. One example is the Catchments & Creeks <i>Rock sizing for single pipe outlets</i> August 2011
5.3.5	13	The outlet structures guidelines found within the blue book are for temporary structures, and are not appropriate for this situation.
5.3.5	13	Need to ensure the peak flow rate from the catchment are being used as the flow rate to size the rock protection
5.4	14	...drainage network to convey runoff from the two external catchments...
5.4	14	'...only minor flows are requires to be allowed at this location.' – No, just a reduced catchment size
5.4	14	Need to ensure that there is sufficient grade on the overland channel around northern extent of the development. Please provide calculations undertaken to ensure the channel is sufficient.
5.5	14	Please clarify what the 'Catchment 2 receiving drainage' consists of, and its location, and how do we know it is limited?
5.5	14	Total catchment of 87.9ha should be smaller as it should not include catchment C1 of 7.56 ha.
5.5	15	What stage storage relationship was used for the two basins?
5.5	15	What are the characteristics of the Cowpasture Road broad-crested weir
5.5	15	It is noted that stormwater flows will overtop Cowpasture Road for storm durations greater than or equal to the one hour event in the 100 year ARI. In which events does it overtop for other ARIs?
5.5	15	The following statement is a little unclear. 'We furthermore note that, due to the restrictive nature of the receiving drainage network that there will be little or no change to the outflow hydrograph in a storm event.' Can you please clarify if it is the downstream road crossing or box culvert that is restrictive, and clarify the exact location of the outflow hydrograph.
5.6	16	It is noted that for catchment C1 the estimated time of concentration is 7 minutes (drawing Co11492.00-DA70). This seems to contradict the flows listed in table 5.3 and 5.4 with the peak flow for the predeveloped site being higher for the 2 hour duration over the 30 minute duration. Can yo please clarify this.
5.6	16	Table 5.3 (and 5.4) lists the storage. How was the storage capacity optimised?

5.6	16	Details need to be provided with respect to the outlet configuration of both of the basins to ensure they are in compliance with Councils OSD policy requirements.
5.6	16	Do the calculations for OSD include the western undeveloped catchments, as per modelling of flooding at the intersection of Cowpasture Road and Victoria Street.

COMMENTS ON DRAINS MODEL

1 - Model Outlet/Downstream Boundary Condition

The received model has the following details for the RCBC at the model outlet:

Width = 3.0m

Height = 2.4m

Upstream Invert = 55.6m

Downstream Invert = 55.12m

Length = 62m

The outlet node of the model assumes a surface level of 55m and free discharge to the atmosphere.

However, we recently surveyed the culvert and obtained the following information:

Upstream Invert = 55.10m

Downstream Invert = 50.20m

Length = 422.74m

Therefore the actual length of the culvert is considerably longer than what is assumed in your model and extends to the eastern side of Potter Close where it discharges into a trapezoidal concrete-lined open channel. Could the model therefore be updated to include this length of culvert, with the model assuming normal flow depth in the channel?

2 - Additional Catchment Area

There is a small additional area of contributing catchment east of subcatchments C9 and C7 (between Trivett Street and Cowpasture Road) which is currently not accounted for in the model. This additional area is expected to drain in a southerly direction down Cowpasture Road and directly into the culverts under the road. Could the model be updated to include this additional catchment area?

3 - Overland Flow Path OF19320/OF19990

In the Predevelopment Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19320 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow routing: Kinematic Wave

Reach Length = 50m

Channel Slope = 6%

In the Post Development Case, the Overland Flow Path OF 19990 is represented with the following parameters:

Flow Routing: Simple Translation (no attenuation)

Travel Time = 0.5 minutes

Channel Slope = 1%

Since these two flow paths appear to represent the same reach in the model (downstream of Node N4B), a consistent approach should be applied in representing these flow paths (unless there is a specific reason otherwise).

4 - Report Section 5.6, Table 5.4

As discussed on the phone, discharges reported in this table appear different to those produced by the model, eg for 1:100 year ARI event, 30 minute duration storm, the Pre-Development Peak Flow is 6.58 m³/s in the table, and the model results have this value as 6.73 cumecs.

5 - Time of Concentration

I forgot to mention this on the phone to you. On Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70, subcatchment C1 is given a time of concentration of 7 minutes. Why, therefore in Table 5.3 of the report, are much longer storm durations (30 minutes and 120 minutes) used in the modelling, and not durations closer to the critical? Similarly, for Table 5.4 of the report, the 120 minute duration storm was used, since it is the "critical local storm". On what basis was this selected? The times of concentration for the individual subcatchments on Drawing No Co11492.00-DA70 indicate that a considerably shorter time of concentration may be critical.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS REQUIRED

- The proponent is to undertake a risk assessment for the proposed on site detention/water quality basis.
- Formal access must be provided to each of the detention basin. It must be suitable for a car to reverse into and for people to access the basin for cleaning.