

Figure H.10 MUSIC model layout for the Tumbalong Park subcatchment

The results of the MUSIC modelling for all SICEEP PPP subcatchments, taken either individually or collectively, for the Desirable Treatment Scenario are summarised in Tables H.3 to H.8.

| | Pollutant | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|------|-------|--|--|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | ТN | | |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 724 | 4830 | 9.37 | 69.5 | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 651.6 | 4105.5 | 6.1 | 31.3 | | |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 580.00 | 2.90 | 34.00 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 724.0 | 4250.0 | 6.5 | 35.5 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 88% | 69% | 51% | | |

| Table H.3 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for the Bayside subcatchment |
|--|
| (Reporting Node in MUSIC model: SICEEP_Bay_2.904ha). |

Table H.4 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for the North Exhibition subcatchment (Reporting Node in MUSIC model: SICEEP_NthExh_2.780ha).

| | Pollutant | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|------|-------|--|--|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | TN | | |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 691 | 2880 | 7.14 | 66.4 | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 621.9 | 2448.0 | 4.6 | 29.9 | | |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 485.00 | 2.69 | 29.20 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 691.0 | 2395.0 | 4.5 | 37.2 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 83% | 62% | 56% | | |

Table H.5 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for the South Exhibition subcatchment (Reporting Node in MUSIC model: SICEEP_SthExh_1.486ha).

| | Pollutant | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|------|-------|--|--|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | TN | | |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 325 | 2700 | 4.66 | 32.7 | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 292.5 | 2295.0 | 3.0 | 14.7 | | |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 290.00 | 1.40 | 13.90 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 325.0 | 2410.0 | 3.3 | 18.8 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 89% | 70% | 57% | | |

Table H.6 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for The Theatre subcatchment (Reporting Node in MUSIC model: SICEEP_Thea_1.517ha).

| | Pollutant | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|------|-------|--|--|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | TN | | |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 458 | 2210 | 4.99 | 43 | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 412.2 | 1878.5 | 3.2 | 19.4 | | |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 333.00 | 1.60 | 16.00 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 458.0 | 1877.0 | 3.4 | 27.0 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 85% | 68% | 63% | | |

 Table H.7 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for the Tumbalong Park

 subcatchment (Reporting Node in MUSIC model: SICEEP_Tum_2.553ha).

| | | Pollu | utant | |
|--|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | TN |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 394 | 3330 | 5.73 | 44.9 |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 354.6 | 2830.5 | 3.7 | 20.2 |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 359.00 | 1.99 | 22.00 |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 394.0 | 2971.0 | 3.7 | 22.9 |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 89% | 65% | 51% |

Table H.8 Summary of estimated mean annual pollutant loads and reductions for the entire PPP development.

| | Pollutant | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|-------|--------|--|--|
| Criteria | Gross Pollutants | TSS | ТР | TN | | |
| Total Development Source Loads (kg/yr) | 2592 | 15950 | 31.89 | 256.5 | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (%) | 90% | 85% | 65% | 45% | | |
| Minimum Reduction Required (kg/yr) | 2332.8 | 13557.5 | 20.7 | 115.4 | | |
| Total Residual Load to Darling Harbour (kg/yr) | 0.00 | 2047.00 | 10.58 | 115.10 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (kg/yr) | 2592.0 | 13903.0 | 21.3 | 141.4 | | |
| Total Reduction Achieved (%) | 100% | 87% | 67% | 55% | | |

H.7 Bioretention System Properties

The properties of the bioretention systems used in either the Practical or Desired Treatment Scenarios are summarised in Tables H.9 to H.12.

Table H.9 General properties of Bioretention Road Median Strips along Darling Drive ('Desirable' Scenario)

| Property | Value |
|--|--------|
| Inlet Properties | |
| Low Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 0 |
| High Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 100 |
| Storage Properties | |
| Extended Detention Depth (m) | 0.30 |
| Surface Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Filter and Media Properties | |
| Filter Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Unlined Filter Media Perimeter (m) | 0.01 |
| Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (mm/hr) | 180 |
| Filter Depth (m) | 0.60 |
| TN Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 400 |
| Orthophosphate Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 20 |
| Infiltration Properties | |
| Exfiltration Rate (mm/hr) | 0 |
| Lining Properties | |
| Is base lined? | Yes |
| Vegetation Properties | |
| Vegetated with Effective Nutrient Removal Plants | Yes |
| Outlet Properties | |
| Overflow Weir Width (m) | Varies |
| Underdrain present? | Yes |
| Submerged Zone with Carbon Present | No |

Table H.10 General properties of Bioretention Tree Pits along The Boulevarde

| Property | Value |
|--|--------|
| Inlet Properties | |
| Low Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 0 |
| High Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 100 |
| Storage Properties | |
| Extended Detention Depth (m) | 0.30 |
| Surface Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Filter and Media Properties | |
| Filter Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Unlined Filter Media Perimeter (m) | 0.01 |
| Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (mm/hr) | 180 |
| Filter Depth (m) | 0.60 |
| TN Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 400 |
| Orthophosphate Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 20 |
| Infiltration Properties | |
| Exfiltration Rate (mm/hr) | 0 |
| Lining Properties | |
| Is base lined? | Yes |
| Vegetation Properties | |
| Vegetated with Effective Nutrient Removal Plants | Yes |
| Outlet Properties | |
| Overflow Weir Width (m) | Varies |
| Underdrain present? | Yes |
| Submerged Zone with Carbon Present | No |

Table H.11 General properties of Bioretention Strips in Landscaped Areas

| Property | Value |
|--|--------|
| Inlet Properties | |
| Low Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 0 |
| High Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 100 |
| Storage Properties | |
| Extended Detention Depth (m) | 0.30 |
| Surface Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Filter and Media Properties | |
| Filter Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Unlined Filter Media Perimeter (m) | 0.01 |
| Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (mm/hr) | 180 |
| Filter Depth (m) | 0.60 |
| TN Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 750 |
| Orthophosphate Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 55 |
| Infiltration Properties | |
| Exfiltration Rate (mm/hr) | 0 |
| Lining Properties | |
| Is base lined? | Yes |
| Vegetation Properties | |
| Vegetated with Effective Nutrient Removal Plants | Yes |
| Outlet Properties | |
| Overflow Weir Width (m) | Varies |
| Underdrain present? | Yes |
| Submerged Zone with Carbon Present | No |

Table H.12 General properties of Bioretention Strips in Terraced Landscaping

| Property | Value |
|--|--------|
| Inlet Properties | |
| Low Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 0 |
| High Flow Bypass (m ³ /s) | 100 |
| Storage Properties | |
| Extended Detention Depth (m) | 0.30 |
| Surface Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Filter and Media Properties | |
| Filter Area (m ²) | Varies |
| Unlined Filter Media Perimeter (m) | 0.01 |
| Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (mm/hr) | 180 |
| Filter Depth (m) | 0.60 |
| TN Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 750 |
| Orthophosphate Content of Filter Media (mg/kg) | 55 |
| Infiltration Properties | |
| Exfiltration Rate (mm/hr) | 0 |
| Lining Properties | |
| Is base lined? | Yes |
| Vegetation Properties | |
| Vegetated with Effective Nutrient Removal Plants | Yes |
| Outlet Properties | |
| Overflow Weir Width (m) | Varies |
| Underdrain present? | Yes |
| Submerged Zone with Carbon Present | No |

H.8 Sample Tank Reliability Calculation Spreadsheet

| ame rea (m2) a Efficiency (%) | | Bayside 11230 85 | | Number of days tank overf | | 26 5722 | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------|
| e Efficiency (%) e Absorption (mm) ed Rain (mm) | | 0.1 1 | | Volume of water overflowi | ng/oypassing tank (m3) | 5/22 | | | | |
| d Volume (m3) Vater Usage (m3) | | 11.23 25 | | Days in a Year with Water I Volume of mains water say | | 168 4193 | | | | |
| torage Volume (m3) itorage Available (%) | | 235 | | Days in a Year without Wa % Reliability | ter Left in Tank | 198 | | | | |
| % Volume for Mains Swi Volume for Mains Switch | 12.5 | 10% 23.5 | | | | | | | | |
| Porume for mains switch | | 23.0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Rainfall | Rain collected for | Stored rain at start of day | Stored rain at end of day | Adjusted Stored rain | Count for Dowr With | Count for Days With Rain in Tank at Start | Count for Days With Tank | Overflowi |
| Date | | mm/Day | the day (m3) | (m3) | (m3) | at end of day_No negatives (m3) | Rain in Tank (1,0) | of Day > Daily Demand (1,0) | Overflowing (1,0) | Volume (m3) |
| | 01/1957 01/1957 | 0.15625 | -10.69306563 -11.28965938 | 0 | -25 -25 | 0 | | | | |
| 3/ | 01/1957 | 8.89 | 72.674945 | 0 | 47.674945 | 47.674945 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 01/1957 01/1957 | 3.84 | 24.47017 | 47.674945 47.145115 | 47.145115 22.145115 | 47.145115 22.145115 | 1 | | 0 | |
| 6/ | 01/1957 | 1.78 | 4.80644 | 22.145115 | 1.951555 | 1.951555 | 0 | 22.145115 | 0 | |
| | 01/1957 | 0 | -12,18455 -12,18455 | 1.951555 D | -23.048445 -25 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 9/9 | 01/1957 | 1.02 | -2.44814 | 0 | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 01/1957 01/1957 | 0 | -12.18455 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | 01/1957 | 0 | -12.18455 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | 11/1966 | 105.16 | 991.62023 | 0 | 966.62023 | 966.62023 | | 0 25 | | 731.62 |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 31.07 2.03 | 284.394135 7.192815 | 235 235 | 494.394135 217.192815 | 494.394135 217.192815 | | 25 | | 259.394 |
| 11/ | 11/1966 | 4.32 | 29.05201 | 217.192815 | 221.244825 | 221.244825 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 0.32 4.26 | -9.12999 28.47928 | 221.244825 196.244825 | 196.244825 199.724105 | 196.244825 199.724105 | | 25 25 | 0 | |
| 14/ | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 199.724105 | 174.724105 | 174.724105 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 174.724105 149.724105 | 149.724105 124.724105 | 149.724105 124.724105 | 1 | | 0 | |
| 17/ | 11/1966 | 0.25 | -9.798175 | 124.724105 | 99.724105 | 99.724105 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 1.27 | -0.061765 -12.18455 | 99.724105 74.724105 | 74.724105 49.724105 | 74.724105 49.724105 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| 20/ | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 49.724105 | 24.724105 | 24.724105 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 24.724105 D | -0.275895 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 23/ | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 0 | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 1.27 | -12.18455 -0.061765 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| 27/ | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | D | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 11/1966 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| 30/ | 11/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 0 | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 2.75 8.92 | 14.065575 72.96131 | D | -10.934425 47.96131 | 0 47.96131 | | | | |
| 3/ | 12/1966 | 1.09 | -1.779955 | 47.96131 | 22.96131 | 22.96131 | 0 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 | 13.24 18.24 | 114.19787 161.92537 | 22,96131 112,15918 | 112.15918 249.08455 | 112.15918 249.08455 | | 22.96131 25 | 0 | 14.08 |
| 6/ | 12/1966 | 18.26 | 162.11628 | 235 | 372.11628 | 372.11628 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 137.11 |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 7.42 | 58.64306 -12.18455 | 235 235 | 268.64306 210 | 268.64306 210 | 1 | 25 25 | | 33.64 |
| 9/ | 12/1966 | 7.12 | 55.77941 | 210 | 240.77941 | 240.77941 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 5.77 |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 235 210 | 210 185 | 210 185 | 1 | 25 25 | | |
| | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 185 | 185 | 185 | | 25 | | |
| | 12/1965 | 0 | -12.18455 | 160 | 135 | 135 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 12.44 | 105.56147 -12.18455 | 135 216.56147 | 216.56147 191.56147 | 216.56147 191.56147 | | | | |
| 16/ | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 191.56147 | 166.56147 | 166.56147 | 1 | | | |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 166.56147 141.56147 | 141.56147 116.56147 | 141.56147 116.56147 | | | | |
| 19/ | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 116,56147 | 91.56147 | 91.56147 | 1 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -12.18455 | 91.56147 66.56147 | 66.56147 41.56147 | 66.56147 41.56147 | 1 | | | |
| 22/ | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 41.56147 | 16.56147 | 16.56147 | 0 | 25 | 0 | |
| | 12/1965 12/1966 | 1.53 0 | 2.420065 | 16.56147 0 | -6.018465 -25 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| 25/ | 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 | 0 | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 | 1.01 | -2.543595 -12.18455 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| 28/ | 12/1966 | 0.23 | -9.989085 | 0 | -25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 12/1966 12/1966 | 0 | -12.18455 -4.834515 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | 12/1966 | 3.27 | 19.029235 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 44240.78505 | 257 | 57223.68 |
| | | | | | | Total 1s Total 0s | 1677 1975 | | | |
| | | | | | | Total Days | 3652 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

H.9 Stormwater360 Proprietary Devices

H.9.1 STORMFILTER®

The second potential SQID proposed for SICEEP PPP development is the StormFilter, also a Stormwater 360 product. As a stormwater management device, the StormFilter (see Figure H.11) is a best management practice designed to remove a range of target pollutants including fine solids, soluble heavy metals, oils and total nutrients. Apart from meeting stringent regulatory requirements, the StormFilter systems are usually installed below ground allowing savings in land space and hence increase development yield. StormFilter's compact design reduces construction and installation costs by limiting excavation. Small to medium sized chambers can be delivered on-site fully assembled, whereas the larger types can be constructed from precast components or cast-in-place. Shown in Figure H.12 and Figure H.13 are examples of a fully assembled chamber and a chamber that is constructed out of precast components respectively.

StormFilter systems can be configured to suit flat sites and sites with shallow groundwater levels. Hydraulic drops for StormFilters range from 0.55 to 0.93 m. Likewise, with no metallic component, StormFilters are also suited at sites with salty groundwater conditions (personal communication with Stormwater360). We note that the SICEEP is close to the Darling Harbour and salty groundwater could potentially inundate the system during high tide events.



Figure H.11 A fully installed and operational StormFilter system (*Source: Stormwater360*)



Figure H.12 A fully assembled treatment chamber being hoisted in place (*Source: Stormwater360*)



Figure H.13 A treatment chamber constructed out of precast panels (Source: Stormwater360)

The StormFilter system usually includes the inlet and outlet pipes, a treatment chamber, an internal weir and bypass mechanism. The bypass mechanism protects the chamber from high flows and ensures the captured pollutants are not lost during high intensity storm events. The system can be configured to either create the required drop or work around the limited drop without impacting the performance of the system.

Stormwater360 recommends the use StormFilter in combination with Enviropod pit inserts to ensure treatment of the whole spectrum of stormwater pollutants. This combination or treatment train approach, called SFEP, uses the Enviropod pit inserts as the at-source or primary treatment measure and the StormFilter, usually located near the outlet of the catchment, as the secondary treatment measure. The SFEP screening and enhanced filtration process is indicated in Figure H.14.

As with pit inserts, the StormFilter devices may be substituted, during design development by landscape features or alternative devices such as centralised GPTs. Further modelling will be undertaken during the design development stage, to investigate alternative solutions.



Figure H.14 Screening and enhanced filtration of stormwater pollutants in an SFEP treatment train (*Source: Stormwater*360)

Stormwater360 has conducted field testing of the StormFilter device under Australian conditions with the assistance of experts from the Australian academe. The treatment efficiencies of the StormFilter system, when used in the SFEP treatment train in reducing gross pollutants, TSS, TP and TN are 100%, 74%, 49% and 32% respectively. As with the Enviropods, these treatment efficiencies were derived from the result of the Kuranda field testing that is discussed in Appendix H.

Like any infiltration system, pollutants retained by the StormFilter system must be periodically removed to restore the system to its fully efficiency and effectiveness. Maintenance requirements and frequency are dependent on the pollutant load requirements of the site. Additional maintenance activities may be required in the event of a chemical spill or due to excessive sediment loading from site erosion or extreme storms.

In consideration of Council and developers, StormFilters are specifically designed to reduce maintenance requirements compared to alternatives such as raingardens. Annual maintenance only involves cleaning of the chamber and the cartridges. Replacement of the filtration media cartridge is required after a designated period.

Stormwater360 offers a Maintenance Service for a designated period to achieve a cost-effective turnkey solution for maintaining the stormwater system and to ensure ongoing regulatory compliance.

StormFilter systems will be installed, either on-line or off-line, at appropriate locations within SICEEP generally within the shared zones and adjoining the Boulevard.

H.9.2 SFEP TREATMENT TRAIN FIELD TESTING (INFORMATION PROVIDED BY STORMWATER 360)

In 2005, a field evaluation of the SFEP technology was undertaken near the township of Kuranda. Stormwater360 supplied the product, sampling equipment and guidance on installation of the devices. The site was installed and wholly funded by QLD Department of Main Roads and was monitored over an extended period of time by James Cook University (JCU, 2008). This study was extended by Stormwater360 (Kuranda) for an additional 2 years to expand the data set. The results obtained by Stormwater360 were also independent as Cairns Water was engaged for sampling collection and analysis together with the program being overseen by a peer reviewer from Queensland University of Technology. The research referred to herein provides information to inform the performance claims of both the Enviropod and StormFilter technologies.

The site setup, equipment and monitoring protocols were independent and identical for both the JCU and Kuranda studies. The peer reviewer's assessment of the Kuranda study found that "...the data collection has been based on a very rigorous and technically demanding monitoring program. This adds further credibility to the field evaluation undertaken." (Goonetilleke, 2010). The data from the JCU and Kuranda studies have been correlated and published in the Australia Water Association's Water Journal in September 2011.

| Table 2. Summary of results. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyte | No. of events | Range of Influent EMCs (mg/L) | Median Influent EMC (mg/L) | Range of Effluent EMCs (mg/L) | Median Effluent EMC (mg/L) | Mean Removal Efficiency (Sum of Loads) | | | | | |
| SSC | 6 | 75 to 4384 | 1181 | 8 to 63 | 20 | 99% | | | | | |
| SSC < 500 micron | 6 | 48 to 180 | 105 | 8 to 62 | 20 | 78% | | | | | |
| TP | 6 | 0.08 to 0.19 | 0.123 | 0.02 to 0.15 | 0.055 | 47% | | | | | |
| TN | 6 | 0.6 to 1.5 | 1.045 | 0.2 to 0.9 | 0.615 | 44% | | | | | |
| TKN | 6 | 0.6 to 1.2 | 1.007 | 0.175 to 0.800 | 0.515 | 49% | | | | | |
| NH3-N | 6 | 0.05 to 0.15 | 0.050 | 0.05 to 0.07 | 0.050 | 31% | | | | | |
| TOC | 6 | 3 to 16 | 7 | 3 to 10 | 5 | 32% | | | | | |
| DOC | 6 | 3 to 12 | 7 | 3 to 11 | 6 | 21% | | | | | |

H.9.2 LIVEROOF® SYSTEM

LiveRoof is a modular a pre-vegetated engineered green roof system that is easily installed onto the roofing membrane in a similar manner to readymade lawn products. Pre-vegetation of LiveRoof® is undertaken at local nurseries using localised plant stock for approximately three months prior to installation. This means that only strong, mature plants are installed onto the roof top. The LiveRoof solution can be applied to the green roof of the ICC Exhibition south building. The system can also be utilised for the sloping roofs of the

entrance of the ICC Exhibition south building. Given the roof's steep pitches, LiveRoof will ensure a healthy strong living roof in the shortest possible time to reduce the possibility of wind and rain scour.

Recently Stormwater360 has developed the 'UrbanGreen' range of Low Impact Design solutions. One of these products being the LiveRoof® modular green roof system. LiveRoof® is a pre-vegetated engineered solution that is easily installed onto the roofing membrane in a similar manner to readymade lawn products.

LiveRoof® is pre-vegetated at local nurseries using localised plant stock for approximately three months prior to installation. This means that only strong, mature plants are installed onto the roof top. Given that the project has steep roof pitches, this approach will ensure a healthy strong living roof in the shortest possible time to reduce the possibility of wind and rain scour.

LiveRoof® is a modular pre-vegetated green roof system developed by horticulturalists in a collaborative effort with experts in the fields of logistics, architecture, manufacturing, construction, green roofing and ergonomics. Stormwater360 works with experienced local nurseries and horticultural specialists to offer the most appropriate planting for the project.





Each LiveRoof® module arrives at the job site with full-grown plants inside the container and is simply set in place on the rooftop. The Soil Elevators[™] are then removed for a seamless fit, meaning there is no need to start with a brown roof and farm it for years, waiting for it to become a green roof.

The main difference between LiveRoof® and a traditional 'built in place' approach to construct a green roof is that LiveRoof® is:

- pre-grown at a nursery and
- installed using minimal equipment,



This means less chance of penetrating the waterproofing membrane during installation and higher success rate of planting, with minimal maintenance costs.





The unique features and benefits of LiveRoof® are as follows:

- <u>Quick & easy installation</u>: Most of the installation work can be done on the ground. It's safer, faster, and costs less than working on the roof. Arranging/installing modules on the roof is all that's required.
- <u>Quality assurance process</u>: The LiteRoofTM soil mix and vegetated tray undergo stringent quality assurance procedures to ensure that they meet New Zealand and international guidelines and to ensure that only the strong and healthy plants are installed.
- <u>Fully grown upon installation</u>: LiveRoof® is delivered and installed pre-vegetated for immediate enjoyment of the appearance and benefits from day one.
- <u>Unique Hybrid Design</u>: No visible seams or grid appearance upon installation.
- No filter fabric or drainage board is required. The drainage board is integrated in the module and the carefully engineered growing medium minimises the amount of fines to preventing clogging. Unlike the built-in-place systems, there aren't heavy layers of additional water-retention fabrics, drainage layers, etc. which can be prone to clogging over time.
- No water reservoirs are present in the patented LiveRoof® modules as water build-up causes root rot.
- Engineered UrbanGreen LiteRoofTM Mix inorganic soil has minimal degradation, so plant crowns do not become exposed and damaged, and soil structure is retained over time to ensure good drainage.
- Minimal maintenance is required, and minimal watering is necessary under normal climate conditions.



APPENDIX B

SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN

Dwg No. AA004399 - HO-CI-0201



DARLING HARBOUR LIVE

| REFERENCE MAP | [| T | | CLIENT | | CIVIL / TRAFFIC / FACADES |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| I. DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWINGS. WORK TO WRITTEN DIMENSIONS | | | | | CONSTRUCTION | HYDER CONSULTING PTY LTD ABN 76 104 485 289 |
| ONLY. 2. ALL DIMENSIONS IN METRES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. | | | | Lend Lease | LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | LEVEL 5, 141 WALKER ST, NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060 |
| 3. ALL COORDINATES TO MGA. ALL LEVELS TO AHD. | | | | | , | AUSTRALIA |
| 4. ALL DIMENSIONS, COORDINATES AND LEVELS TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK. HYDER SHALL BE NOTIFIED IN | | | | CONSULTANTS | ARCHITECT | Tel: +61 (0)2 8907 9000 Fax: +61 (0)2 8907 9001 Huder V |
| WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES. 5. THIS DRAWING MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT | | | | LEND LEASE DESIG | N LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD | www.hyderconsulting.com © Copyright reserved |
| CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS. | | | | | WILLERS FOINT, NSW 2000 | |
| | | | | fimt | | PROJECT |
| | | | | IJIIL | Level 5, 70 King Street Sydney NSW 2000 | SICEEP |
| | | | | francis-jones morohen thorp | | DARLING HARBOUR |
| | 02 | ISSUE FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION | 09/08/2013 | HACCELL | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT | |
| 1 : 250 | 01 REV | ISSUE FOR INFORMATION DESCRIPTION | 26/07/2013 DATE | HASSELL | Level 2, Pier 8/9, 23 Hickson Road Millers Point NSW 2000 | ICC HOTEL |



DRAWING TITLE SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN

STATUS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

SCALE @ A1 1:250 KM PROJECT NUMBER AA004399 HO-CI-0201 02

APPENDIX C

CIVIL WORKS AND STORMWATER PLAN

Dwg No. AA004399 - HO-CI-0301



DARLING HARBOUR LIVE

| Г | | | | | | | | 1 |
|---|---------------|--|-----|-----------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | REFERENCE MAP | | | | | CLIENT | | CIVIL / TRAFFIC / FACADES |
| | | NOTES: 1. DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWINGS. WORK TO WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ONLY. 2. ALL DIMENSIONS IN METRES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. 3. ALL COORDINATES TO MGA ALL LEVES TO AHD. | | | | Lend Lease | PROJECT MANAGEMENT & CONSTRUCTION LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | HYDER CONSULTING PTY LTD ABN 76 104 485 289 LEVEL 5, 141 WALKER ST, NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060 AUSTRALIA |
| | | ALL DIMENSIONS, COORDINATES AND LEVELS TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK. HYDER SHALL BE NOTIFIED IN | | | | CONSULTANTS | ARCHITECT | Tel: +61 (0)2 8907 9000 Fax: +61 (0)2 8907 9001 |
| | | WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES. 5. THIS DRAWING MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT CONTRACTS. SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS. | | | | LEND LEASE DESIGN | LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | www.hyderconsulting.com © Copyright reserved |
| | | CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS. | | | | fjmt | ARCHITECT | PROJECT |
| | li, en | | | | | frates-ones morehout there | Level 5, 70 King Street Sydney NSW 2000 | SICEEP |
| | | 0 5 10 15 20 25m | 02 | ISSUE FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION | 09/08/2013 | | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT | DARLING HARBOUR |
| | | | 01 | ISSUE FOR INFORMATION | 26/07/2013 | HASSELL | Level 2, Pier 8/9, 23 Hickson Road | ICC HOTEL |
| | | 1 : 250 | REV | DESCRIPTION | DATE | | Millers Point NSW 2000 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

Date Plotted: 9 Aug 2013 - 05:00PM File Name: F:\AA004399\E-CAD\C-Civil\D-Final\C-Hote\\HO-CI-0301-Civil\WorksAndStormwaterPlan.dwg

| | LEGEND | |
|---|--------|--|
| 02.77 02.71 02.71 02.71 02.72 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.24 02.27 02.74 02.77 00.77 00000000 | | EXISTING PIPE/CULVERT TO BE RETAINED |
| | | EXISTING PIPE/CULVERT TO BE DEMOLISHED |
| | | EXISTING PIT TO BE RETAINED (OUTLINE SHOWN INDICATIVE ONLY) |
| | m | EXISTING PIT TO BE DEMOLISHED |
| | | (OUTLINE SHOWN INDICATIVE ONLY) PROPOSED PIPE/CULVERT |
| A the second sec | | KERB INLET PIT |
| | | SURFACE INLET PIT |
| | | JUNCTION PIT |
| | | h cm |
| | | |
| | | All |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 52 | | |
| | | 67 |
| | | |
| | 38 | 20 |
| | | |

| | DRAWING TITLE | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------|---------|-----|----------|--|
| Hyder | CIVIL WORKS AND STORMWATER PLAN | | | | | | |
| | STATUS | | | | | | |
| | DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION | | | | | | |
| | SCALE @ A1 | DRAWN | DESIGNED | REVIEWE | D | APPROVED | |
| JR | 1 : 250 | JJB | KM | - | | - | |
| | PROJECT NUMBER | DRAWING NUMBER | | | REV | | |
| | AA004399 | HO-CI-0301 | | 02 | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | |

Original Sheet Size A1 - 841 x 594mm



DARLING HARBOUR LIVE

| | | | | | | | | | 1 |
|---|---------------|---|--|-----|--|------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | REFERENCE MAP | | | | | | CLIENT | | CIVIL / TRAFFIC / FACADES |
| | | | NOTES: 1. DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWINGS. WORK TO WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ONLY. 2. ALL DIMENSIONS IN METRES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. 3. ALL COORDINATES TO MAG. ALL LEVELS TO AHD. | | Image: | | Lend Lease | PROJECT MANAGEMENT & CONSTRUCTION LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | HYDER CONSULTING PTY LTD ABN 76 104 485 289 LEVEL 5, 141 WALKER ST, NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060 AUSTRALIA |
| | | | ALL COORDINATES TO MGL ALL LEVELS TO AND. ALL DIMENSIONS, COORDINATES AND LEVELS TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK, HYDER SHALL BE NOTIFIED IN | | | | CONSULTANTS | | Tel: +61 (0)2 8907 9000 |
| | | - | WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES. 5. THIS DRAWING MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT | | | | LEND LEASE DESIGN | ARCHITECT LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD | Fax: +61 (0)2 8907 9001 www.hyderconsulting.com © Copyright reserved |
| | | | CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS. | | | | | MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | © Copyright reserved |
| | | | | | | | fjmt | ARCHITECT Level 5, 70 King Street | PROJECT |
| | ji m | | | | | | france-inner monthon thore | Sydney NSW 2000 | SICEEP |
| | | | 0 5 10 15 20 25m | | | | induscie-jonde monorion tadrp | | DARLING HARBOUR |
| 1 | | | 20 Z Z Z | 02 | ISSUE FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION | 8/9/2013 | | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT | |
| 1 | | | | 01 | ISSUE FOR INFORMATION | 26/07/2013 | HASSELL | Level 2, Pier 8/9, 23 Hickson Road | ICC HOTEL |
| 1 | | | 1 : 250 | REV | DESCRIPTION | DATE |] | Millers Point NSW 2000 | |

Date Plotted: 9 Aug 2013 - 03:45PM File Name: F:\AA004399\E-CAD\C-Civil\D-Final\C-Hotel\HO-CI-0301-Civil\WorksAndStormwaterPlan.dwg

| | H or P |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| And | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | M |
| | V |
| | |
| | 6 6 7 |
| | TO MAKE : |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | State Stat |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| BITUMEN RAMP | |
| | |
| 288 | |
| | 67 |
| | 00 |
| | 18 |
| | 20 |
| | |

| lyder | DRAWING TITLE CIVIL WORKS AND STORMWATER PLAN | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--------|----------|---------|-----|----------|--|--|
| • | STATUS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION | | | | | | | |
| | SCALE @ A1 | DRAWN | DESIGNED | REVIEWE | D | APPROVED | | |
| | 1 : 250 | JJB | KM | - | | - | | |
| | PROJECT NUMBER AA004399 | HO-CI- | | | REN | | | |

Original Sheet Size A1 - 841 x 594mm

APPENDIX D

PROPOSED FLOOR LEVEL GRADING AND FLOOD LEVEL (INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE) PLAN

Dwg No. AA004399 - SKCHO016



DARLING HARBOUR LIVE

| REFERENCE MAP | | | | | 1 | | | CLIENT | | CIVIL / TRAFFIC / FACADES |
|---------------|-------|----|--|-----------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | NOTES: 1. DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWINGS. WORK TO WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ONLY. 2. ALL DIMENSIONS IN METRES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. 3. ALL COODINATES TO MGA. ALL LEVELS TO AHD. | | | | | Lend Lease | PROJECT MANAGEMENT & CONSTRUCTION LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | HYDER CONSULTING PTY LTD ABN 76 104 485 289 LEVEL 5, 141 WALKER ST, NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060 AUSTRALIA |
| | | N) | ALL DIMENSIONS, COORDINATES AND LEVELS TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK HYDER SHALL BE NOTIFIED IN WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES. THIS DRAWING MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS. | | | | | LEND LEASE DESIG | ARCHITECT 1 LEVEL 4, THE BOND, 30 HICKSON RD MILLERS POINT, NSW 2000 | Tel: +61 (0)2 8907 9000 Fax: +61 (0)2 8907 9001 www.hyderconsulting.com © Copyright reserved |
| P | .D.A. | | | | | | | fint takes once monoton them | ARCHITECT Level 5, 70 King Street Sydney NSW 2000 | PROJECT |
| | | | 0 5 10 15 20 25m 1 : 250 | 01 REV | ISSUE FOR REVIEW | DESCRIPTION | XXX DATE | HASSELL | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT Level 2, Pier 8/9, 23 Hickson Road Millers Point NSW 2000 | DARLING HARBO |

Date Plotted: 9 Aug 2013 - 04:00PM File Name: F:\AA004399/E-CAD\C-Civil/B-Sketches\SKCHO016-AA004399-NSX-00-FloodPlanningLevelsHotel.dwg

Original Sheet Size A1 - 841 x 594mm

RBOUR



DRAWING TITLE FLOOD PLANNING LEVELS STATUS PRELIMINARY ONLY SCALE @ A1 1 : 250 KM - - - -

SKCHO016

PROJECT NUMBER

APPENDIX E

SYDNEY WATER 'AS BUILT' DRAINAGE PLANS