

TABLE D.1 GENERAL APPLICATION INFORMATION

(GDP Ref: 5941)

APPLICATION INFORMATION			
Site or Project Name	Vantage Stage 3	DA No.	
Lot and Plan No.	Lot 201 on PS295994		
Location	60 Stapylton Jacobs Well Road, Stapylton, QLD		

TABLE D.2 CLIMATE AND TIME STEP ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 3 & APPENDIX A)

CLIMATE & TIME-STEP (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C1)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the correct rainfall station been used?	Y		CoGC Misuc Link North
Has a 6-minute time-step been used for assessment against stormwater quality management objectives?	Y		
Has the correct modelling period been selected?	Y		
Has the correct potential evapotranspiration been selected?	Y		

TABLE D.3 CATCHMENT AND SOURCE NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 3.3)

CLIMATE & TIME-STEP (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C1)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Are the source node areas reported appropriate with respect to catchment areas shown on the plan?	Y		
Does the total area reported reflect the total catchment relative to the development application?	Y		
Does the land use reported reflect the proposed land use?	Y		
Is the total imperviousness percentage for each land type appropriate (for development applications this must be measured direct from plans)?	Y		

CATCHMENT SPLIT (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C3)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has a 'split catchment' approach been used?	Y		
Does the area of each land use/surface type reported reflect the areas shown on the plan?	Y		
Does the total area reported reflect the total catchment?	Y		
Do the land uses or surface types reported reflect the proposed development i.e. have correct source nodes been used?	Y		
Is the fraction imperviousness for each land uses or surface type appropriate? Nb: for development applications this must be measured direct from plan, otherwise refer Section 3.3.3.	Y		
For split catchment modelling where rainwater tanks are proposed as treatment nodes, is the percentage of connected roof area appropriate (Section 4.2)?	N/A		

TABLE D.4 RAINFALL AND RUNOFF ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 3.3 AND APPENDIX A)

RAINFALL RUN-OFF AND POLLUTANT EXPORT PARAMETER (CHECK REPORTING TABLE B4 AND TABLE)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Have the correct rainfall runoff parameters been used?	Y		
Are appropriate pollutant export parameters used?	Y		
Has stochastic generation been used for all pollutants?	Y		

TABLE D.5 ALL TREATMENT NODES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

ALL TREATMENT NODES	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Will treatment nodes modelled be free draining? Compare the total depth of the treatment measures modelled against development plan levels.	Y		
Have any receiving environments been modelled as treatment systems? These include natural waterways, natural wetlands, naturalised channel systems, environmental buffers, freshwater and brackish lake and pond systems (existing or constructed). Stormwater must be treated before it discharges to these systems.	N/A		

TABLE D.6 RAINWATER TANK NODES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.2)

RAINWATER TANKS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE B6)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the volume below overflow pipe (kL) been calculated appropriately?			
Has the depth above the overflow been calculated appropriately?			
If tanks are lumped, is depth below overflow the same as a single tank and overflow pipe scaled accordingly (Section 4.2.5)?			
Has the total tank surface area been calculated appropriately? For lumped tanks refer to Section 4.2.5.			
Has the overflow pipe diameter been calculated appropriately? For lumped tanks this must be equivalent to the diameter of the overflow pipe of a single tank multiplied by the square root of the number of tanks (Section 4.2.5).			
Has stormwater reuse been calculated appropriately? PET PET – Rain			
Have appropriate indoor connections been selected?			
Has the indoor demand been calculated appropriately?			
Has the outdoor demand been calculated appropriately?			
Has the daily demand been calculated appropriately?			
Has the monthly distribution of annual demand been calculated appropriately?			
Have K and C* been retained as default values? (Y/N)			

N/A

TABLE D.7 WETLAND NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.3)

RAINWATER TANKS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE B6)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the inlet pond volume sized appropriately to capture coarse sediment?			
Has the macrophyte zone surface area been calculated appropriately?			
Is the extended detention depth less than, or equal to, 0.5 m?			
Has the permanent pool volume been calculated appropriately?			
Is the exfiltration rate set to 0 mm/hr?			
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)			
Has the evaporative loss as % of PET been set to 125% or less?			
Has the equivalent pipe diameter been set so that the notional detention time is about 48 hours?			
Has the overflow weir width been calculated appropriately?			
Is the notional detention time (hrs) approximately 48 hours?			
Are the number of CSTRs appropriate for the shape of the system?			
Have K and C* been retained as default values for all parameters except nitrogen which has been adjusted to reflect Section 4.3.4? (Y/N)			

N/A

TABLE D.8 SWALE NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.4)

SWALES (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C8)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Is the length equivalent to the length shown on the development plans and does it account for conveyance capacity and safety limitations selected in accordance with the WSUD Technical Design Guidelines for SEQ?			
Is the bed slope less than or equal to 4%?			
Are the base width, top width and depth equivalent to the length shown on the development plans?			
Is the set vegetation height appropriate for the selected species (Section 4.4)?			
Is the exfiltration rate set to 0 mm/hr?			
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)			
If the swale accepts point source discharges at given locations, is it split into separate lengths?			
Have K and C* been retained as default values?			
BIORETENTION SWALE CHECKS			
Is the swale node located in the model downstream of bioretention swale surface component? (Y/N)			
Is the low-flow bypass of the swale node set to the infiltration rate of the filter? (Y/N)			

N/A

TABLE D.9 BIORETENTION AND BIORETENTION SWALE NODES ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.5)

BIORETENTION AND BIORETENTION SWALE FILTER COMPONENTS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C8 AND TABLE C9)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the filter surface area been calculated appropriately?	Y		
Is the extended detention depth consistent with the depth shown on the development plans and between 0-0.4 m?	Y		0.4m
Is the filter media area consistent with the area shown on the development plans?	Y		
Has an appropriate unlined filter media perimeter been set?	Y		200mm/Hr
Has an appropriate saturated hydraulic conductivity been set? This should be modelled once at 50 mm/hr, once at 200 mm/hr and both scenarios reported.	Y		
Is the filter media depth modelled equivalent to the depth of media shown on the plans? This depth should not include the intermediate layer, drainage layers, or submerged zone.	Y		
Is the TN content in the filter media set to either 400 mg/kg or another suitably justified value?	Y		
Is the orthophosphate content in the filter media set to 30 mg/kg or another suitably justified value?	Y		
Is the base lined?	Y		
Has the system been modelled to reflect the nutrient removal properties of the plants to be used on site?	Y		
Is the overflow weir width appropriate?	Y		10.0m
Is the exfiltration rate set to zero?	Y		
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)	N/A		
If exfiltration rate has been used, is the exfiltration rate justified?	N/A		
Has the system been modelled with underdrains present?	Y		
Is a submerged zone with carbon present?		N	
Is the depth of submerged zone consistent with plans?		N/A	
If bioretention systems are modelled in series, is there a low-flow bypass modelled in the downstream bioretention system/s? (Note: separate drainage systems are required if a low-flow bypass is modelled)	N/A		
Have K and C* been retained as default values? (Y/N)	Y		
BIORETENTION SWALE COMPONENT ONLY (CHECK TABLE C8)			
Has an extended detention depth of 0 m been used? (Y/N)		N/A	
Has the low flow bypass been calculated? The calculation should be provided by the applicant separately.			

TABLE D.10 BUFFER NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.7)

BUFFERS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C10)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Does the treatment node reflect the vegetated area receiving sheet flow only?			
Is the percentage of upstream area buffered consistent with catchment plans?			
Does the buffer area accurately reflect the percentage impervious area as shown on the development plans?			
Is the exfiltration rate set to zero?			
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)			

TABLE D.11 PROPRIETARY & CUSTOM PRODUCTS (INC GROSS POLLUTANT TRAPS) NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.8)

PROPRIETARY & CUSTOM PRODUCTS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C11)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Are the proposed pollutant reduction efficiencies independently verified using a method suited to local conditions (Section 4.8)?			
Does the data provided include performance results under dry weather flows (to account for potential pollutant leeching)? (Y/N).			
Is the assumed high-flow bypass rate consistent with manufacturer specifications? (Y/N)			
UNLESS "YES" HAS BEEN ANSWERED TO ALL THREE QUESTIONS ABOVE THE PROPOSED POLLUTANT REDUCTION RATES CANNOT BE RELIED UPON AS BEING REASONABLE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE UNIT'S PERFORMANCE.			
Is the storage volume modelled consistent with the proposed unit?			
Is the expected maintenance frequency a reasonable assumption?			
Is the storage volume large enough to contain all sediments and gross pollutants received by unit during inter-maintenance periods?			

TABLE D.12 SEDIMENT BASIN NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (SECTION 4.9)

SEDIMENT BASTINS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C12)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the surface area been calculated appropriately (Section 4.3.2)?			
Is the extended detention depth consistent with the development plans?			
Is the permanent pool volume consistent with the development plans?			
Is the exfiltration rate set to 0 mm/hr?			
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)			
Is the evaporative loss as % of PET reasonable?			
Has the equivalent pipe diameter been set appropriately? (Where appropriate refer to Section 4.3.3 for advice on accounting for user-defined stage–discharge relationship)?			
Is the overflow weir width consistent with the development plans?			
Is the notional detention time set to account for potential flow restriction?			
Are the number of CSTRs appropriate for the shape of the system?			
Have the K and C* values been retained as default values? (Y/N)			

N/A

TABLE D.13 INFILTRATION NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.10)

INFILTRATION (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C13)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Is the exfiltration rate justified?			
Has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1). If the secondary drainage link is not used, WQO's must be achieved prior to stormwater entering an infiltration system.			
Can the hydraulic conductivity of the in-situ soils be guaranteed even during earthworks?			
IF "NO" WAS ANSWERED TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS THIS NODE CANNOT BE USED.			
Is the pond surface area consistent with the plans?			
Is the extended detention depth consistent with the plans?			
Is the filter area consistent with the plans?			
Is the unlined filter media perimeter appropriate?			
Is the depth of infiltration media consistent with the plans?			
Is the exfiltration rate justified?			
Is the overflow weir width consistent with the plans?			
Is the evaporative loss as % of PET reasonable?			
Have the K and C* values been retained as default values?			

TABLE D.14 POROUS PAVEMENT NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.11)

POROUS PAVEMENTS (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C14)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Has the applicant answered "Y" to all questions in the reporting table?	N/A		

NB: Check all other parameters for the porous pavement using Table C9.

TABLE D.15 MEDIA FILTRATION NODE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (REFER TO SECTION 4.8.3)

MEDIA FILTRATION SYSTEM (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C15)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Is the extended detention depth consistent with plans?			
Is the surface area consistent with plans?			
Is the exfiltration rate set to zero?			
If an exfiltration rate has been used, has the secondary drainage link been used to return the exfiltrated flows to the model? (Section 4.1)			
Is the filter area consistent with plans?			
Is the filter depth consistent with plans?			
Is the filter media particle diameter consistent with manufacturer information?			
Is the saturated hydraulic conductivity consistent with manufacturer information?			
Is the depth below underdrain consistent with plans?			
Have the K and C* values been retained as default values or otherwise justified?			

N/A

TABLE D.16 OVERALL APPROVAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

DESIGN OBJECTIVES (CHECK REPORTING TABLE C16)	Y	N	COMMENTS/ISSUES TO FOLLOW UP
Have all water quality objectives been met?	Y		
Is the MUSIC model approved?			