Final Report

Riverstone West Precinct Flooding Assessment

59918177

Prepared for Department of Planning and Environment

25 February 2022





Contact Information

Cardno (NSW/ACT) Pty Ltd ABN 95 001 145 035

Level 9 - The Forum 203 Pacific Highway St Leonards NSW 2065 Australia

www.cardno.com Phone +61 2 9496 7700 Fax +61 2 9496 7748

Document Information

Prepared for	Department of Planning and Environment
Project Name	Riverstone West Precinct Flooding Assessment
File Reference	59918177_R001_Rev0_Rivers tone W Flooding Assessment.docx
Job Reference	59918177
Date	25 February 2022
Version Number	Rev 0

Author(s):

2. Jobanh

Venus Jofreh Water Engineer	Effective Date	25/02/2022
Approved By: Shefali		
Shefali Chakrabarty	Date Approved	25/02/2022

Practice Lead – Urban Water Management

Document History

Version	Effective Date	Description of Revision	Prepared by	Reviewed by
Rev A	12/02/2021	Draft Interim Report for Council review	VJ, MS	SC
Rev B	01/10/2021	Draft Report	VJ, YL	SC
Rev 0	25/02/2022	Final Report	SC	PP

© Cardno. Copy right in the whole and every part of this document belongs to Cardno 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 other than by agreement with Cardno.

This document is produced by Cardno solely for the benefit and use by the client in accordance with the terms of the engagement. Cardno does not and shall not assume any responsibility or liability whatsoever to any third party arising out of any use or reliance by any third party on the content of this document.

Glossary

	The probability of an example, a 5% AEP approximate convers	event occurr flood would h ion between	ing or being e have a 5% cha ARI and AEP	xceeded within a year. For ance of occurring in any year. is provided.	An
				•	
		AEP	ARI		
		63.2 %	1 year		
		39.3 %	2 year		
		18.1 %	5 year		
Probability (AEP)		10 %	10 year		
		5 %	20 year		
		2 %	50 year		
		1 %	100 year		
		0.5 %	200 year		
		0.2 %	500 year		
			-		

Australian Height Datum (AHD)	A standard national surface level datum approximately corresponding to mean sea level.
Average Recurrence Interval (ARI)	The long-term average period between occurrences equalling or exceeding a given value. For example, a 20 year ARI flood would occur on average once every 20 years.
Catchment	The area draining to a site. It always relates to a particular location and may include the catchments of tributary streams as well as the main stream.
Development	The erection of a building or the carrying out of work; or the use of land or of a building or work; or the subdivision of land.
Discharge	The rate of flow of water measured in terms of volume over time. It is to be distinguished from the speed or velocity of flow, which is a measure of how fast the water is moving rather than how much is moving.
Flood	Relatively high stream flow which overtops the natural or artificial banks in any part of a stream, river, estuary, lake or dam, and/or overland runoff before entering a watercourse and/or coastal inundation resulting from super elevated sea levels and/or waves overtopping coastline defences.
Floodplain	Area of land which is subject to inundation by floods up to the probable maximum flood event, i.e. flood prone land.
Flood planning area	The area of land below the flood planning level and thus subject to flood related development controls.
Flood planning levels (FPLs)	Flood levels selected for planning purposes, as determined in floodplain management studies and incorporated in floodplain management plans. Selection should be based on an understanding of the full range of flood behaviour and the associated flood risk. It should also take into account the social, economic and ecological consequences associated with floods of different severities. Different FPLs may be appropriate for different categories of land use and for different flood plains. The concept of FPLs supersedes the "Standard flood event" of the first edition of the Manual. As FPLs do not necessarily extend to the limits of flood prone land (as defined by the probable maximum flood), floodplain management plans may apply to flood prone land beyond the defined FPLs.

Geographical Information Systems (GIS)	A system of software and procedures designed to support the management, manipulation, analysis and display of spatially referenced data.
Hydraulics	The term given to the study of water flow in a river, channel or pipe, in particular, the evaluation of flow parameters such as stage and velocity.
Hydrograph	A graph that shows how the discharge changes with time at any particular location.
Hydrology	The term given to the study of the rainfall and runoff process as it relates to the derivation of hydrographs for given floods.
Probable maximum flood (PMF)	The PMF is the largest flood that could conceivably occur at a particular location, usually estimated from probable maximum precipitation, and where applicable, snow melt, coupled with the worst flood producing catchment conditions.
Risk	Chance of something happening that will have an impact. It is measured in terms of consequences and likelihood. For this study, it is the likelihood of consequences arising from the interaction of floods, communities and the environment.
Runoff	The amount of rainfall that actually ends up as stream or pipe flow, also known as rainfall excess.
Stormwater flooding	Inundation by local runoff. Stormwater flooding can be caused by local runoff exceeding the capacity of an urban stormwater drainage system or by the backwater effects of mainstream flooding causing the urban stormwater drainage system to overflow.
Topography	A surface which defines the ground level of a chosen area.

Abbreviations

AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
ARI	Average Recurrence Intervals
ARR	Australian Rainfall and Runoff
DCP	Development Control Plan
DPE	Department of Planning and Environment
FERP	Flood Emergency Response Plan
FMS	Floodplain Management Strategy
GIS	Geographic Information System
ha	Hectare
ILP	Indicative Layout Plan
km	Kilometres
km ²	Square kilometres
LGA	Local Government Area
Lidar	Light Detection and Ranging
m	Metre
m²	Square metre
m ³	Cubic Metre
mAHD	Metres to Australian Height Datum
mm	Millimetre
m/s	Metres per second
NSW	New South Wales
PMF	Probable Maximum Flood
SEPP	State Environment Planning Policy
TfNSW	Transport for New South Wales

Table of Contents

Gloss	sary iii		
Abbr	eviations		v
1	1 Introduction		1
	1.1	Background	1
	1.2	Purpose of the Study	1
	1.3	Scope of Work	1
2	Study	Area and Context	2
	2.1	Location	2
	2.2	Topography and Existing Drainage	3
	2.3	Land Use Zoning	3
	2.4	Existing Flood Behaviour	5
	2.5	Previous Studies	5
	2.6	Proposed Development	7
	2.7	Proposed Road Upgrades	7
3 Flooding Assessment		ing Assessment	10
	3.1	Modelling Approach	10
	3.2	Hydrology Modelling	12
	3.3	Hydraulic Modelling	15
4	Concl	usion	26
5	Refere	rences	27

Appendices

Appendix A	Site Survey
Appendix B	Flood Modelling Results

Tables

Table 3-1	Summary of Model Simulations and Scenarios	12
Table 3-2	Flow Comparison and Critical Duration	13
Table 3-3	Roughness Values for Different Roughness Zones	18
Table 3-4	Source of Inflow Hydrographs and Tailwater Level Hydrographs Adopted in each Flooding Scenario	20

Figures

Figure 2-1	Study Area – Riverstone West Precinct (Aerial Image Source: Nearmap)	2
Figure 2-2	Land Zoning for the Study Area (Source of Data: DPE Land Zoning GIS Layers 2018)	4

Cardno[®]

Figure 2-3	Hawkesbury River Flood Extents Under Different Flooding events and Scenarios (Source of Data: Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy (Worley Parsons, 2014))	6
Figure 2-4	Riverstone West Indicative Layout Plan (Source of Data: Riverstone West Development Cont Plan 2009)	rol 8
Figure 2-5	Proposed Garfield Road West and Bandon Road Alignment	9
Figure 3-1	Location of Inflows Applied into the hydraulic model for each Model Simulation	11
Figure 3-2	Comparison of Peak 1% AEP flows at Elizabeth Drive (South Creek) based on ARR1987 and ARR2019 Hydrology to FFA (Source: Wianamatta (South) Creek Catchment Flood Study Existing Conditions (2020))	I 12
Figure 3-3	Key Locations for Identifying Critical Duration	14
Figure 3-4	TUFLOW Model Extents	16
Figure 3-5	Adopted Topography at the Study Area and Surrounds	17
Figure 3-6	Existing Drainage Network Included in the TUFLOW Model	19
Figure 3-7	Terrain Difference Plot (Interim Scenario Less Existing Scenario)	22
Figure 3-8	Proposed Drainage Network and Terrain Difference Plot (Design Less Interim)	24

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Riverstone West precinct is planned to be a major employment area within the North West Growth Area and was zoned in August 2009 primarily for Business Park, general industrial and light industrial uses. Associated with the rezoning was a cut and fill strategy to raise land within the precinct to the 1% AEP flood level in order to achieve the minimum land height required for business and industrial development.

Since the rezoning of the precinct a number factors, internal and external to the precinct, have created the need to review the proposed development footprint and cut and fill strategy. These factors are:

- Proposed works by Transport for NSW (TfNSW) relating to Garfield Road West and Bandon Road. These upgrades are part of the TfNSW's North West Growth Centre Road Network Strategy (<u>https://roadswaterways.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/north-west-growth-centre-strategy/index.html</u>) and have the potential to alter flood behaviour within and in the vicinity of the precinct, primarily near Garfield Road West;
- > Amendment to the alignment of the southern end of the proposed "Spine Road" due to the proposed Garfield Road West works; and
- > A previously planned "cut" area on Lot 11 DP 816720, a site immediately west of the precinct, being no longer available for this purpose.

1.2 **Purpose of the Study**

The overarching purpose of this study is to investigate the flood behaviour impacts of the development footprint of the Riverstone West Precinct and the associated earthworks.

1.3 Scope of Work

The scope of work is as follows:

- 1. Undertake hydrological modelling considering the Australian Rainfall and Runoff Guidelines 1987 (ARR1987);
- 2. Undertake hydraulic modelling to establish the existing, interim and design condition flood behaviour;
- 3. Consider different flooding scenarios including local catchment flooding and also Hawkesbury-Nepean flooding scenarios based on Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (2019); and
- 4. Assess the impacts of the proposed development footprint on flood behaviour.

2 Study Area and Context

2.1 Location

The location of the Study Area is shown in **Figure 2-1**. The Precinct is located within the Blacktown City Council Local Government Area (LGA). It is bound by Bandon Rd to the north, Garfield Road West to the south, Riverstone Parade to the east and Eastern Creek to the west. The total Study Area is approximately 274ha and currently contains around 40ha of industrial land and the remainder is grazing paddocks. There is an existing Sydney Water Sewerage Treatment Plant and Transgrid Substation located within the Precinct.



Figure 2-1 Study Area – Riverstone West Precinct (Aerial Image Source: Nearmap)

2.2 Topography and Existing Drainage

The Study Area is located between the low grounds along Eastern Creek to the west and high ridges along Riverstone Parade to the east. Therefore, terrain levels vary extensively between 5 mAHD to the west and 40 mAHD to the east.

Detailed survey of the Study Area (undertaken by Land Partners, 2008) was provided to Cardno. The site ground survey along with the 2019 1m Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data was used to provide a detailed presentation of the topography of the site and surrounds.

The survey (Land Partners, 2008) also included some details of the drainage network within the Study Area and railway culverts including their alignment and invert levels at some locations. However, parts of the information such as size and invert levels of some culverts were missing. The missing information was requested and acquired from Transport for NSW (TfNSW).

The site survey is provided in Appendix A.

2.3 Land Use Zoning

The proposed land use zoning for the Study Area is shown in **Figure 2-2**. This figure has been generated by Cardno using the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) land zoning downloaded from Cardno's GIS database.

As can be observed, the Study Area is zoned to include:

- > Business Park;
- > General Industrial;
- > Infrastructure;
- > Private Recreation; and
- > Environmental Conservation.





Figure 2-2 Land Zoning for the Study Area (Source of Data: DPE Land Zoning GIS Layers 2018)

2.4 Existing Flood Behaviour

The Study Area is located adjacent to Eastern creek and is also 3km upstream from the confluence of Eastern Creek and South Creek. South Creek then connects further downstream to Hawkesbury River. The area is subject to flooding from Eastern Creek, backwater flooding from Hawkesbury River; and local overland flows.

A number of studies have investigated flood behaviour at the site and surrounds. Details of these studies are provided in the following sections.

Figure 2-3 shows the flood extents along Riverstone West Precinct for different flood events and flooding scenarios sourced from Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy (Worley Parsons, 2014).

2.5 **Previous Studies**

2.5.1 Proposed Redevelopment of Riverstone West Precinct Flood Impact Assessment (Worley Parsons, 2008)

This study found that it was possible for the Study Area to be raised so a total of 121 ha will be above the 1 in 100 year ARI flood level of 17.3 m AHD without causing any significant impact on adjoining properties. The study also showed that a cut and fill strategy could be implemented without causing significant flood impacts on adjoining properties in the adopted design 100 year ARI local catchment flood.

2.5.2 Peer review of the Proposed Redevelopment of Riverstone West Flood Impact Assessment (Cardno, 2008)

Cardno undertook a review of the Worley Parsons 2008 flood impact assessment to assess the adequacy and appropriateness of the assumptions, model parameters and findings of this study. The review also made recommendations regarding additional work required to address any inadequacies and mechanisms that could reduce impacts on adjoining areas in the local flooding regime if found necessary.

2.5.3 Riverstone West Precinct Flood Impact Assessment Report (Worley Parsons, 2013)

Worley Parsons undertook a further flood investigation aimed at determining an optimal fill layout that was compatible with the existing flood characteristics of the Precinct and that would not cause unacceptable flood impacts on adjoining properties. The investigations included an assessment of the existing flood behaviour along the section of Eastern Creek that adjoins the site, definition of the predicted post-development flood characteristics (i.e., with the proposed filling in place), and an assessment of the magnitude and extent of any impacts that the proposed filling may have on flooding.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine an optimal fill extent that meets the guidelines and requirements outlined in the State Environment Planning Policy (SEPP 2009) and Development Control Plan (DCP 2009). The report also served as an updated Flood Impact Assessment Report for the proposed development of the Riverstone West Precinct.

2.5.4 Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy (Worley Parsons, 2014)

The requirement for this study is described as follows:

Although the Riverstone West FIA (2013) addressed the majority of flood related requirements outlined in the SEPP (2009) and DCP (2009), the guideline documents also require the preparation of a Floodplain Management Strategy (FMS). The FMS as described in Appendix C of the DCP (2009) is required for most development applications that involved development of land within the Riverstone West Precinct. The specific purpose of the FMS as outlined in the DCP (2009) is to:

- Define existing flooding at the site and in the vicinity of the site in accordance with the NSW Floodplain Development Manual, 2005 procedures;
- Determine the flood impacts on account of the proposed development, and investigate mitigation options which will input to the FMS;
- Develop a strategy that demonstrates flood impacts at the site and adjoining the site are managed in accordance with the requirements of the SEPP (2009) and the development controls in Section 4.3 of the DCP (2009); and

Develop a Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) in consultation with the State Emergency Services (SES).





Figure 2-3 Haw kesbury River Flood Extents Under Different Flooding events and Scenarios (Source of Data: Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy (Worley Parsons, 2014))

2.5.5 Peer Review of the Riverstone West Floodplain Management Strategy (Cardno, 2014)

Cardno undertook a review of the Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy (2014) and the Riverstone West Precinct Flood Impact Assessment (2013) to identify any changes in the flood assessment as well as a review of the adequacy and appropriateness of the floodplain risk management study.

2.5.6 Eastern Creek Hydraulic Assessment (Catchment Simulation Solutions, 2014)

Catchment Simulation Solutions (CSS) undertook this hydraulic assessment study on behalf of Blacktown City Council as part of the Flood Planning Study for Eastern Creek and its tributaries contained within the Blacktown LGA. This study quantifies the existing flood behaviour across the Eastern Creek catchment for a range of design events. A XP-RAFTS hydrological model was used to define the design inflow hydrographs and a two-dimensional hydraulic model of Eastern Creek and its major tributaries was developed using the TUFLOW software. The model was verified by comparing simulated 1% AEP flood levels and discharges with 1% AEP flood levels and discharges documented in previous studies.

The study identified that flooding across the Eastern Creek catchment can occur as a result of major watercourses overtopping their banks as well as inundation from elevated Hawkesbury River water levels.

2.6 **Proposed Development**

According to the Riverstone West Precinct Development Control Plan (DCP, 2009):

"The vision for Riverstone West Precinct is to create an attractive employment precinct that provides for a diverse range of job opportunities to support the growing residential areas in Sydney's North West.

The Precinct will be characterised by a mix of industrial, light industrial and commercial uses that will be supported by accessible public transport, small scale retail and community facilities such as child care centres.

A pleasant and safe work environment is envisaged through the provision of pedestrian-friendly streets, good landscape design, parks and open spaces with access to riparian corridors, and cycle ways as well as encouraging high-quality built form based on ecologically sustainable design (ESD) principles.

Focal points around Riverstone and Vineyard Stations will be created by providing pedestrian-focused main streets with access to the stations. Small shops, cafes and restaurants will be encouraged to activate station areas and provide areas for social interaction.

The Precinct will incorporate a Spine Road that will improve the amenity of Riverstone Township by providing an alternative route for heavy vehicles to pass through. A crossing beneath the rail line (underpass) at Bandon Road will provide access to the Spine Road for vehicles travelling from the west.

Streets within the vicinity of Riverstone and Vineyard Stations will maximise pedestrian amenity and safety whilst providing for the requirements of large and heavy vehicles."

An Indicative Development Layout (ILP) for Riverstone West Precinct is shown in Figure 2-4.

2.7 Proposed Road Upgrades

Transport for NSW has proposed upgrades to Garfield Road West and Bandon Road. Details of these are provided in **Figure 2-5**. The proposed upgrades have been reviewed as part of this study and incorporated in the flooding assessment (See Section 3.1.2 for details).



Figure 2-4 Riverstone West Indicative Layout Plan (Source of Data: Riverstone West Development Control Plan 2009)



Figure 2-5 Proposed Garfield Road West and Bandon Road Alignment

3 Flooding Assessment

3.1 Modelling Approach

For this assessment flood modelling was undertaken to simulate the existing and future flood behaviour for the Study Area and surrounds. The hydraulic model for the Study Area and surrounds has been developed by Cardno.

Existing hydrology models and data were provided to Cardno for input into the hydraulic model. The following hydrology models and data inputs were used for the purpose of this flooding assessment:

- Eastern Creek XP-RAFTS model that was updated as part of the Eastern Creek Hydraulic Assessment (Catchment Simulation Solutions, 2014); and
- > Inflow and Tailwater level data from the Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (WMAwater, 2019).

3.1.1 Model Simulations

For this study, the following flooding simulations were considered and adopted based on the available information and the flooding behaviour of the catchment:

- Local Flooding: This simulation is critical for designing drainage network and also assessing the impacts of the proposed development. The inflows for this simulation are extracted from two different sources:
 - **Eastern Creek Local Flows:** This simulation applies the inflows from Eastern Creek and also the subcatchments to the east of the Study Area. The fine delineation of the sub-catchments provides the possibility to present the flowpaths traversing the Study Area. The inflows for this simulation are from two sources:
 - Inflows for the subcatchment at the site and surrounds are extracted from the XP-RAFTS hydrology model of Eastern Creek (Catchment Simulation Solutions, 2014). The XP-RAFTS model is based on the ARR1987 parameters; and
 - The upstream boundary inflows are extracted from TUFLOW hydraulic model of Eastern Creek (Catchment Simulation Solutions, 2014).
 - Hawkesbury Nepean Study Flows: This simulation considers local Eastern Creek and South Creek flooding through application of lump inflows into the model. The inflows for this scenario are adopted from the Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (2019) model data provided to Cardno by WMAwater. This scenario also considers Eastern Creek and South Creek flooding in isolation and without consideration of the backwater from Hawkesbury River.
- Hawkesbury Nepean Study Tailwater Condition: This simulation considers the backwater impacts from Hawkesbury River. This simulation is critical for assessing the impacts of the proposed development and also determining flood planning levels. The inflows and tailwater level hydrographs for this scenario are adopted from the Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (2019) data provided to Cardno by WMAwater.

Figure 3-1 shows the location of inflows applied into the hydraulic model for each simulation.



Figure 3-1 Location of Inflows Applied into the Hydraulic Model for each Model Simulation

3.1.2 Model Scenarios

To assess the impact of the proposed development of the Precinct, three scenarios can be considered for flood assessment:

- Existing Scenario: This scenario represents the existing conditions of the Study Area and surrounding areas and roads;
- Interim Scenario: This scenario represents the existing conditions with the proposed TfNSW Garfield Road West and Bandon Road upgrades included (Base Case); and
- Design Scenario: This scenario represents the TfNSW Garfield Road West and Bandon Road upgrades and the proposed Riverstone West Development footprint including the proposed fill pad and drainage network (NOTE: Compensatory cut not been assessed as part of this assessment).

Table 3-1 summarises the simulations and scenarios considered for undertaking the flood assessment as part of this study.

Table 3-1	Summary	of Model	Simulations	and Scenarios

Flood Simulation M Scenario	Local Inflow	Hawkesbury Nepean Inflow	Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater
Existing Scenario	X	X	X
Interim Scenario	X	X	X
Design Scenario	X	X	X

3.2 Hydrology Modelling

3.2.1 Overview

A hydrology model combines rainfall information with local catchment characteristics to estimate a series of runoff hydrographs at selected locations. These hydrographs are then incorporated into the hydraulic model to simulate the behaviour of the flood through creeks, channels and over the floodplain.

Cardno had initially undertaken this assessment based on the ARR2019 guidelines. However, following advice from Council, it was agreed to adopt the Eastern Creek Hydraulic Assessment (Catchment Simulation Solutions, 2014) hydrology which is based on ARR1987.

For the Wianamatta (South) Creek Catchment Flood Study (November 2020), Advisian had undertaken a comparison of flows from ARR2019 and ARR1987 at Elizabeth Drive (South Creek). The comparison showed that the ARR2019 flows were up to 20% lower as shown in **Figure 3-2**, so the ARR1987 guideline was considered to be more appropriate and was adopted.

Approach Adopted for Estimation of Design 1% AEP Flows		
Flood Frequency Analysis	ARR 1987	ARR 2019
E20 m2/o A	492 m ³ /s	381 m ³ /s
530 119/5	- 9%	- 29%

^ Value extracted from FFA curve provided as Appendix A49 – 'Review of ARR Design Inputs for NSW' (OEH, February 2019) prepared by WMA Water

Download link: https://data.arr-software.org/static/pdf/appendix.pdf

Figure 3-2 Comparison of Peak 1% AEP flows at Elizabeth Drive (South Creek) based on ARR1987 and ARR2019 Hydrology to FFA (Source: Wianamatta (South) Creek Catchment Flood Study Existing Conditions (2020))

Cardno undertook a sensitivity check for Eastern Creek to check the indicative 1% AEP peak flows in the Eastern Creek catchment based on transposition of a Flood Frequency Analysis (FFA) peak flow, ARR1987 peak flow and ARR2019 peak flow from Elizabeth Drive in South Creek. The calculations showed that

ARR2019 guidelines results in almost 20% reduction in flows in comparison to ARR1987 and confirmed that ARR1987 results are closer to the FFA.

3.2.2 Critical Duration

The XP-RAFTS model of Eastern Creek was run for the 1%, 5%, 20% AEP and PMF events for a range of durations including 1.5 hour, 2 hour and 9 hour.

The critical durations for the Study Area under the Local Inflows simulation was identified through comparison of flows under different durations and at three key locations within the Study Area. **Figure 3-3** shows the key locations where the flows have been compared. The results indicated that 2 hour can be selected as the critical duration as it generates higher local flows passing through the study site. Details of flows for the 1% AEP and 5% AEP and for different durations and also the critical durations are presented in **Table 3-2**.

Koylocation	1% AEP Flow			Adopted 1% AEP
Rey Location	1.5 Hour	2 Hour	9 Hour	Critical Duration
EAS0005100	44.7	49.2	29.7	
EAS0300090	19.7	18.9	8.4	2 Hour
EAS0003320	10.2	10.7	8.5	
Koylogation	5% AEP Flow			Adopted 5% AEP
Key Location	1.5 Hour	2 Hour	9 Hour	Critical Duration
EAS0005100	33.046	36.975	23.74	
EAS0300090	15.761	15.036	6.726	2 Hour
EAS0003320	7.064	7.424	6.768	

 Table 3-2
 Flow Comparison and Critical Duration



Figure 3-3 Key Locations for Identifying Critical Duration

3.3 Hydraulic Modelling

3.3.1 Existing Scenario Model Set-up

3.3.1.1 Model Extents

For the purpose of this assessment a 1D/2D hydraulic TUFLOW model was assembled by Cardno. **Figure 3-4** shows the extents of the hydraulic TUFLOW model adopted. The model extends from Schofields Road in the south to downstream of Windsor at the north (5km downstream of the Study Area). These model extents are considered sufficient to demonstrate any possible impacts of the proposed development on flooding on adjoining properties.

3.3.1.2 Model Topography

Model topography was adopted from the 2019 1m Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data downloaded from ELVIS (Elevation Information System) website (<u>https://elevation.fsdf.org.au/</u>).

As discussed in **Section 2.2** detailed survey of the Study Area (undertaken by Land Partners, 2008) was also included in the model to provide a detailed presentation of the terrain at the Study Area (**Appendix A**).

Based on the size of watercourses within the model extent, existing flowpaths and Study Area, a grid size of 2m x 2m was considered suitable and adopted for this study. The existing ground level terrain for the Study Area and surrounds adopted in the model is shown in **Figure 3-5**.



Figure 3-4 TUFLOW Model Extents



Figure 3-5 Adopted Topography at the Study Area and Surrounds

3.3.1.3 Hydraulic Roughness

Surface roughness was modelled in TUFLOW based on the roughness zones. Roughness zones for the model were determined using aerial photography, current land use zones, and site inspection carried out during the study. **Table 3-5** summarises the types of roughness zone and associating hydraulic roughness adopted in the model.

Roughness Zone	Manning's "n" Value
Light vegetation / Grass	0.035
Medium Vegetation	0.05
Dense Vegetation	0.1
Commercial / Industrial	0.1
Medium Residential	0.08
Low Residential	0.07
Railway	0.05
Roads	0.02

 Table 3-3
 Roughness Values for Different Roughness Zones

3.3.1.4 Existing Drainage Network

As discussed in **Section 2.2** the existing drainage network including railway culverts was modelled based on the site survey information, site inspection carried out during the study and also the information received from TfNSW. **Figure 3-6** shows the existing drainage network as included in the TUFLOW model.



Figure 3-6 Existing Drainage Network Included in the TUFLOW Model

3.3.1.5 Boundary Conditions

As discussed in **Section 3.1.1** different flooding simulations were considered in this study. **Table 3-4** shows the source of inflow and tailwater level boundary conditions adopted for each simulation.

Table 3-4 Source of Inflow Hydrographs and Tailw ater Level Hydrographs Adopted in each Flooding Scenario

Flooding Scenario	Source of Inflows	Type/Source of Tailwater Level
Eastern Creek Local Flows with Free Outfall Downstream Boundary	- XP-RAFTS model (ARR1987) for local catchment	Free Outfall
	AND	
	Upstream inflows hydrographs extracted from Council's TUFLOW Model (Refer to Section 2.5.6)	
Eastern Creek Local Flows with 20% AEP Hawkesbury- Nepean Tailwater Level	- XP-RAFTS model (ARR1987) for local catchment	20% AEP Hawkesbury- Nepean Tailwater Level
	AND	
	Upstream inflows hydrographs extracted from Council's TUFLOW Model	
Eastern Creek Local Flows with 1% AEP Hawkesbury- Nepean Tailwater Level	- XP-RAFTS model (ARR1987) for local catchment	1% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level
	AND	
	Upstream inflows hydrographs extracted from Council's TUFLOW Model	
Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Flows	RUBICON model inflows (provided by WMAwater)	Free Outfall
Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Tailwater Condition	Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (provided by WMAwater)	Hawkesbury-Nepean Regional Flood Study (provided by WMAwater)

Hawkesbury Nepean backwaters are quite large and will cause significant flooding within the Study Area even in the smaller events. In such situation any fill or cut within the study area will be a small feature in comparison to the backwater and will have negligible impact on flood behaviour. Therefore, the local flooding simulations have been modelled with free outfall downstream boundary so that the impacts of the development on flood behaviour can be investigated and not be overshadowed by the backwater impacts.

3.3.2 Existing Scenario Model Results

The TUFLOW model was run for the three simulations as per **Table 3-4** for the 1% and 20% AEP events. The results are presented in **Figures E1** to **E8 in Appendix B.**

3.3.2.1 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with Free Outfall Downstream Boundary

In this simulation the Study Area is mostly flood free in the 1% AEP event with the exception of the flowpaths traversing the area form the upstream catchments at the east and south of the Study Area. The 1% AEP flood levels along Eastern Creek vary from 12.3 mAHD at Garfield Road West to 7.4 mAHD at Bandon Road (**Figure E4**).

In the 20% AEP event, similarly the majority of the Study Area is flood free. Flood levels along Eastern Creek vary form 11.06 mAHD at Garfield Road West to 6.5 mAHD at Bandon Road (**Figure E1**).

3.3.2.2 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with 20% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level

This simulation was undertaken for the 1% AEP event. It was observed that the site is partially flooded due to the impacts of the 20% AEP tailwater level from the Hawkesbury_Nepean system. Flood levels vary from 12.5 mAHD at Garfield Road West to 11.1 mAHD at Bandon Road (**Figure E7**).

3.3.2.3 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with 1% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level

This simulation was undertaken for the 1% AEP event. It was observed that the study site is almost completely flooded due to the impacts of the 1% AEP tailwater level from Hawkesbury-Nepean river system. A constant flood level of 17.3 m AHD is observed at the site and along Eastern Creek (**Figure E8**).

3.3.2.4 Local Flooding – Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Flows

In this simulation the 1% AEP flood levels along Eastern Creek vary from 11.5 mAHD at Garfield Road West to 6.6 mAHD at Bandon Road (**Figure E6**). In the 20% AEP event flood levels range from 10.6 mAHD at Garfield Road West to 5.7 mAHD at Bandon Road (**Figure E3**).

The flood levels and flood extents are generally smaller in comparison to the local Eastern Creek Flows simulation. This is predominantly due to the different distribution and magnitude of hydrology inflows into the model. It can be concluded that between the two local flooding simulations (Eastern Creek Flows and Hawkesbury-Nepean Study flows), the Eastern Creek flows is more critical for the purpose of this study as it provides the definition and magnitude of flows traversing the Study Area which are required for developing the fill and cut strategy and also designing the drainage network.

3.3.2.5 Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Tailwater Condition

In this simulation the bathtub impact form the Hawkesbury-Nepean backwater results in a constant flood level within the Study Area. The entire Study Area is flooded in the 1% AEP event with flood level of 17.3 mAHD (**Figure E5**). Depth and extent of flooding in the 20% AEP event is significant along Eastern Creek and the constant flood level of 9.9m AHD is observed (**Figure E2**).

3.3.3 Interim Scenario Model Set-up

To represent the Interim Scenario, the Existing Scenario model was updated to include the proposed designs for Bandon Road and Garfield Road West upgrades as provided by TfNSW (refer **Section 2.7**). **Figure 3-7** shows the changes in terrain levels for the Interim Scenario in comparison to the Existing Scenario.

Garfield Road West and Bandon Road upgrades result in increases and decreases in the terrain levels along the proposed roads. Bandon Road upgrade also includes two compensatory cuts as shown in **Figure 3-7.** These are located outside the Study Area.



Figure 3-7 Terrain Difference Plot (Interim Scenario Less Existing Scenario)

3.3.4 Interim Scenario Model Results

The TUFLOW model was run for all the three flooding simulations discussed in Section 3.1.1 for the 20% AEP, 5% AEP, 1% AEP, 0.833% AEP, 0.5% AEP, 0.2% AEP and PMF events.

The differences between the Interim and Existing flood levels for the 20% AEP and 1% AEP events are presented in Figure I1 to Figure I6 in Appendix B.

It has been assumed that the hydraulic model with upgraded Bandon Road and Garfield Road West will form the Base Case for the purpose of Riverstone West Precinct assessment.

3.3.4.1 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with Free Outfall Downstream Boundary

The proposed Garfield Road West upgrade causes raised terrain levels on both sides of the confluence of Bells Creek and Eastern Creek (**Figure 3-6**). This results in reducing the width of the 1% AEP flood extent. Therefore the flood level increases of up to 50mm along the confluence are observed in the 1% AEP event (**Figure 14** and **Figure 16**). Localised flood level increases of up to 100mm are observed adjacent to Garfield Road West in the 1% AEP event (**Figure 14** and **Figure 14** and **Figure 16**).

Raising Garfield Road West levels adjacent to the Study Area results in increases in the 1% AEP flood levels and extents upstream of the site. It also results in decreases in flood levels and extents within and adjacent to the Riverstone West site (Figure I4 and Figure I6).

The compensatory cut as a part of Bandon Road design is marginally within the 1% AEP flood extent and results in up to 60mm decrease in flood levels in both the local flooding simulations (**Figure I4** and **Figure I6**).

In the 20% AEP event the proposed Garfield Road West and Bandon Road upgrade impacts on flooding are almost similar to the 1% AEP event (Figure I1 & Figure I3).

3.3.4.2 Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Tailwater Condition

The impacts of the proposed Garfield Road West and Bandon Road upgrades on 1% and 20% AEP flood levels in this simulation is negligible (**Figure 12** and **Figure 15**). This is predominantly due to the small scale of the proposed terrain changes in comparison to the large flood depths produced by the backwater from Hawkesbury-Nepean River.

3.3.5 Design Scenario Model Set-up

The Design Scenario model has been developed through application of the following data:

- Proposed fill pad: The fill pad is designed to raise the development area to 17.3 mAHD (which is the Hawkesbury 1% AEP flood level) to ensure that the development will not be flooded by the backwater from Hawkesbury River;
- Proposed Spine Road (provided by land owner / developer): The Spine Road design has been aligned with the fill pad design to ensure consistency in the layout and levels; and
- Proposed drainage network: The proposed drainage network is designed to replace the existing overland flowpaths within the Study Area and convey flows from the east of the fill pad to Eastern Creek thereby avoiding any water ponding upstream of the fill area.

Figure 3-8 shows the changes in the terrain in the Design Scenario compared to Interim and also the proposed drainage network.



Figure 3-8 Proposed Drainage Netw ork and Terrain Difference Plot (Design Less Interim)

3.3.6 Design Scenario Model Results

The Design Scenario model was run for the 20% AEP, 5% AEP, 1% AEP, 0.833% AEP, 0.5% AEP, 0.2% AEP and PMF events. The results for all the modelled events are provided in **Figures D1** to **Figure D35** in **Appendix B**.

3.3.6.1 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with Free Outfall Downstream Boundary

In the 20% AEP event the channel formalised upstream of the site redirect some of the upstream flows around the fill pad and into Eastern Creek. This results in the localised decreases in flood levels (up to 50 mm) along Riverstone Pde and the properties on the western side of Eastern Creek. Increases in flood levels are observed immediately adjacent to the proposed fill (**Figure D23**) but within the Study Area. A similar pattern is observed in the 5% AEP event (**Figure D26**)

The proposed fill pad is marginally within the 1% AEP local flood extent. This results in up to 50 mm increase in flood levels on properties along the western side of Eastern Creek and up to 500 mm within the Study Area. In this simulation, flood level decreases are observed upstream of the site and adjacent to Church Street, King Street and Princess Street (**Figure D29**). This is predominantly due to the provision of drainage networks and open channel proposed within the Study Area.

3.3.6.2 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with 20% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level

This simulation was undertaken for the 1% AEP event. It was observed that the proposed fill is partially within the flood extent and as a result increases in flood levels of up to 50 mm are observed on properties along the western side of Eastern Creek and within the Study Area (**Figure D30**).

3.3.6.3 Local Flooding – Eastern Creek Flows with 1% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level

This simulation was undertaken for the 1% AEP event. It was observed that the proposed fill does not affect the flood levels within the Study Area and along Eastern Creek. However increased flood levels are observed along Riverstone Pde. These increased flood levels are a result of backwater through the proposed channels and drainage pipes (**Figure D31**).

3.3.6.4 Local Flooding – Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Flows

In this simulation the 1% AEP flood levels increases of up to 300mm within the Study Area are observed. Flood level decreases of up to 50mm are also observed along Eastern Creek (**Figure D33**). In this simulation the impacts of the proposed development on 20% AEP event flood levels is negligible (**Figure D25**).

It should be noted that the observed increases are contained within the creek corridor and are not affecting any adjacent roads or properties.

3.3.6.5 Hawkesbury-Nepean Study Tailwater Condition

The impacts of the fill pad on 1% and 20% AEP event flood levels in this simulation is negligible (**Figure D24** and **Figure D32**). This is predominantly due to the small scale of the proposed terrain changes in comparison to the large flood depths produced by the backwater from Hawkesbury-Nepean River.

4 Conclusion

The Riverstone West Precinct was rezoned in August 2009 to allow industrial, light industrial and business park uses. Since the Precinct is subject to flooding from Eastern Creek, backwater flooding from Hawkesbury River, and local overland flows; it is proposed to fill the land to the 1% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater level of 17.3 mAHD. This flood assessment was undertaken to review the flood implications of this.

A TUFLOW hydraulic flood model was established for the existing, interim (with Bandon Rd and Garfield Rd upgrades) and developed conditions (with Bandon Rd and Garfield Rd upgrades, and the proposed fill pads), for the local Eastern Creek flows, Hawkesbury Nepean inflows and Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater level flood events.

The key finding of the assessment undertaken is that local flooding due to Eastern Creek flows is most impacted by the proposed fill. As can be observed from the flood mapping provided (**Appendix B**), the impacts are predominately observed in the 1% AEP Eastern Creek Flows with free outfall downstream boundary event and 1% AEP Eastern Creek Flows with 20% AEP Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Level event. Increases greater than 10mm are observed on adjoining properties. These increases will have to be mitigated to ensure that there are no impacts from the proposed fills pads.

There are increases also observed along Riverstone Pde, however these are predominantly stormwater drainage issues and can be resolved by drainage upgrades.

While increases and decreases of up to 10mm can be observed for most of the modelled events and scenarios assessed and are widespread for certain areas, these are considered to be within the modelling tolerances and can be considered as 'negligible/no impact'.

5 References

Department of Planning 2009, Riverstone West Precinct Development Control Plan.

Worley Parsons, 2008, Proposed Redevelopment of Riverstone West Precinct Flood Impact Assessment.

Cardno 2008, Peer review of the Proposed Redevelopment of Riverstone West Flood Impact Assessment.

Worley Parsons, 2013, Riverstone West precinct Flood Impact Assessment Report.

Worley Parsons, 2014, Riverstone West Precinct Floodplain Management Strategy.

Cardno, 2014, Peer Review of the Riverstone West Floodplain Management Strategy.

EMGA Mitchell McLennan, 2014, Riverstone West Precinct: Salinity and Groundwater Assessment and Management Plan.

JBS&G Australia Pty Ltd, 2018, Assessment of Groundwater Levels During Site Filling Works: 211 Riverstone Pde, Riverstone, Riverstone West Precinct.

Advisian 2020, Wianamatta (South) Creek Catchment Flood Study Existing Conditions.



SITE SURVEY



060701

- SPOT LEVELS SHOULD BE USED.
- BY A BOUNDARY SURVEY.



CLIENT

RIVERSTONE PARADE PTY LTD

PROJECT

PLAN OF SHEET SET LOCATIONS OVER RIVERSTONE WEST PRECINCT BEING LOT 211 IN DP 830505

NOTES

The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field

and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services.

LEGEN.	<u>D</u>		
Δ	BENCH MARK		
	TELEPHONE PIT		
Μ	WATER METER		
(\mathbb{C})	TREE D= DIAMETER TRUNK S= SPREAD DF CANDPY H= HEIGHT		
\square	WATER HYDRANT		
\bigcirc	STOP VALVE		
\circledast	SEWER MAINTENANCE HOLE		
✻	ELECT LIGHT POLE		
 0	POWER POLE (light)		
0	POWER POLE		
	GRATE		
#	GAS METER		
Å	GATE		
\mathbb{X}	MAN HOLE		
Ø	ТАР		
*	INSPECTION HOLE		
HEIST	CLOTHES HOIST		
	GULLY PIT		

Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation does not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.



Sydney OfficeLevel 2, 23-29 South Streett (61)Rydalmere NSW 2116f (61)PO Box 1144e sydrDundas NSW 2117w www	9685 2000 9685 2001 ley@landpartners.com.au v.landpartners.com.au	
HEIGHT DATUM AHD	LOCAL AUTHORITY BLACKTOWN COUNCIL	
HEIGHT ORIGIN PM 43386 RL 38.296	SCALE 1:6000 (A1)	
MERIDIAN N∕A	CONTOUR INTERVAL 1.0 Metre	
CO-ORD SYSTEM MGA	SURVEYORDATE OF SURVEYBS03/03/08	
CCAD FILE 71372-DE1	DRAWN DATE JMD 24/09/2013	
autocad file 73341	CHECKEDDATEGKO??/??/??	
ARCHIVE FILE 73341	APPROVED DATE GKO ??/??/??	
73341		

SHEET 1 OF 25 ©LandPartners 2013




RIVERSTONE PARADE PTY LTD

PROJECT

PLAN OF DETAILS & CONTOURS **OVER RIVERSTONE WEST** PRECINCT BEING LOT 211 IN DP 830505

NOTES

The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field

survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation

has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services.







Sydney Office t (61) 9685 2000 f (61) 9685 2001 Image: Figure			
HEIGHT DATUM	LOCAL AUTHORITY		
AHD	BLACKTOWN COUNCIL		
HEIGHT ORIGIN	SCALE		
PM 43386 RL 38.296	1:500 (A1)		
MERIDIAN	CONTOUR INTERVAL		
N/A	1.0 Metre		
CO-ORD SYSTEM	SURVEYOR DATE OF SURVEY		
MGA	BS 03/03/08		
CCAD FILE	DRAWN DATE		
71372-DE1	JMD 24/09/2013		
AUTOCAD FILE	CHECKED DATE		
73341	GKO ??/??/??		
ARCHIVE FILE	APPROVED DATE		
73341	GKO ??/??/??		
PLAN NUMBER			
73341			

SHEET 2 OF 25 ©LandPartners 2013



©LandPartners 2013

	RIVERSTONE PARADE PTY LTD
M.G.A. NURTH (ZUNE 56)	PROJECT PLAN OF DETAILS & CONTOURS OVER RIVERSTONE WEST PRECINCT BEING LOT 211 IN DP 830505
	NOTES The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services.
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	▲ BENCH MARK Image: Telephone pit M Water meter Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D= D= Diameter trunk S= Spread of Canopy H= Height Image: Tree D=
+ +	MAN HOLE Image: Clothes hoist Image: Clothes hoist Image: Clothes hoist
+ + + + + +	Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation does not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.
* * * *	LANDPARTNERS built environment consultants
15 + 7	Sydney Office Level 2, 23-29 South Street Rydalmere NSW 2116 PO Box 1144 Dundas NSW 2117t (61) 9685 2000 f (61) 9685 2001 e sydney@landpartners.com.auImage: Comparison of the sydney www.landpartners.com.auHEIGHT DATUM AHDLOCAL AUTHORITY BLACKTOWN COUNCIL
	HEIGHT ORIGINSCALEPM 43386 RL 38.2961:500 (A1)MERIDIANCONTOUR INTERVALN/A1.0 Metre
	CO-ORD SYSTEMSURVEYORDATE OF SURVEYMGABS03/03/08CCAD FILEDRAWNDATE71372-DE1JMD24/09/2013AUTOCAD FILECHECKEDDATE73341GKO22/22/22
	ARCHIVE FILEAPPROVEDDATE73341GKO??/??/??PLAN NUMBER
	73341 SHEET 8 OF 25 © LandPartners 2013

RIVERSTONE PARADE PTY LTD

PROJECT

PLAN OF DETAILS & CONTOURS OVER RIVERSTONE WEST PRECINCT BEING LOT 211 IN DP 830505

NOTES

The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field

survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation has been made hereon.

Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services.

LEGEN	<u>D</u>		
Δ	BENCH MARK		
	TELEPHONE PIT		
М	WATER METER		
(\mathbb{C})	TREE D= DIAMETER TRUNK S= SPREAD DF CANDPY H= HEIGHT		
\square	WATER HYDRANT		
	STEP VALVE		
\circledast	SEWER MAINTENANCE HOLE		
✻	ELECT LIGHT POLE		
 0	POWER POLE (light)		
0	POWER POLE		
	GRATE		
#	GAS METER		
~	GATE		
\mathbb{X}	MAN HOLE		
Ø	ТАР		
G R∂			

- ₩ INSPECTION HOLE CLOTHES HOIST
- _____ GULLY PIT

Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation does not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.

Sydney OfficeLevel 2, 23-29 South Streett (61)Rydalmere NSW 2116f (61)PO Box 1144e sydrDundas NSW 2117w www	9685 2000 9685 2001 ney@landpartners.com.au w.landpartners.com.au
HEIGHT DATUM	LOCAL AUTHORITY
AHD	BLACKTOWN COUNCIL
HEIGHT ORIGIN	SCALE
PM 43386 RL 38.296	1:500 (A1)
MERIDIAN	CONTOUR INTERVAL
N/A	1.0 Metre
CO-ORD SYSTEM	SURVEYOR DATE OF SURVEY
MGA	BS 03/03/08
CCAD FILE	DRAWN DATE
71372-DE1	JMD 24/09/2013
AUTOCAD FILE	CHECKED DATE
73341	GKO ??/??/??
ARCHIVE FILE	APPROVED DATE
73341	GKO ??/??/??
PLAN NUMBER	
733	341

SHEET 14 OF 25 ©LandPartners 2013

	CLIENT	
OF THE TOPOGRAPHY AND SHOULD ONLY E	RIVERSTC ≇ PTY	NE PARADE LTD
ONSHIP OF IMPROVEMENTS AND DETAIL CRITICAL SHOULD BE CONFIRMED	PROJECT	
ERVICES, INCLUDING FIBRE OPTIC 1100 PRIOR TO COMMENCING ADOPTED FROM S.C.I.M.S. ND DISTANCES.	PROJECT PLAN OF & CON & CON OVER RIVERS PRECING DOVER RIVERS PRECING LOT 211 IN NOTES The title boundaries shown hereon wer and have been determined by plan dim survey. Services shown hereon have been loca If not able to be so located, services ha relevant authorities where available and the plan. Where such records do not ex has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or c authority should be contacted for possil services and detailed locations of all se	F DETAILS STOURS STONE WEST CT BEING DD 830505 TO 830505 TO 830505 TO 830505 TO 830505
M.G.A. NORTH (ZONE 56)		
	LEGEND ▲ BENCH MARK ✓ TELEPHONE PIT ▲ TREE D= DIAMETER ✓ TREE D= DIAMETER ✓ TREE D= DIAMETER ✓ TREE D= DIAMETER ✓ STOP VALVE ✓ STOP VALVE ✓ SEWER MAINTENANCE ✓ POWER POLE (light) O POWER POLE (light) O POWER POLE (light) Ø GRATE ☑ GAS METER ☑ TAP ✓ INSPECTION HOLE ☑ CLOTHES HOIST ✓ GULLY PIT	TRUNK CANDPY HOLE
$\frac{1}{12}$	Symbols shown are indicative only. The not necessarily represent the real size of the size	e symbol size and orientation does or orientation of the feature.
	MERIDIAN	CONTOUR INTERVAL

N/A

CO-ORD SYSTEM

CCAD FILE 71372-DE1

AUTOCAD FILE 73341

ARCHIVE FILE 73341

PLAN NUMBER

73341

1.0 Metre

SURVEYOR BS

drawn JMD

CHECKED GKO

APPROVED

GKO

SHEET 15 OF 25 ©LandPartners 2013

DATE OF SURVEY

DATE ??/??/??

??/??/??

DATE 24/09/2013

DATE

	CLIENT
↓ + < < < <	PROJECT PI AN OF DETAILS
	& CONTOURS
	PRECINCT BEING
	LOT 211 IN DP 830505
	NOTES The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field
	survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation
	has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services
* 1	
* * * *	
* * * * * * ↓ / _ / _	
* * * * *	BEINCH MAKK TELEPHONE PIT WATER METER
	TREE D= DIAMETER TRUNK S= SPREAD DF CANDPY H= HEIGHT
	WATER HYDRANT
1200 RC	SEWER MAINTENANCE HOLE
	GRATE GAS METER
	GATE MAN HOLE
	☑ TAPℬ INSPECTION HOLE
	Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation doos
	not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.
	LANDPARTNERS built environment consultants
	BSI
	Sydney Office Level 2, 23-29 South Street t (61) 9685 2000 Rydalmere NSW 2116 f (61) 9685 2001 PO Box 1144 e sydney@landpartners.com.au
	Dundas NSW 2117 w www.landpartners.com.au FS 535063 HEIGHT DATUM LOCAL AUTHORITY
THE TOPOGRAPHY AND SHOULD ONLY BE	AHDBLACKTOWN COUNCILHEIGHT ORIGINSCALEPM 43386 RL 38.2961:1000 (A1)
DESIGN IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN,	MERIDIAN CONTOUR INTERVAL N/A 1.0 Metre
ICAL SHOULD BE CONFIRMED	CO-ORD SYSTEM SURVEYOR DATE OF SURVEY MGA BS 03/03/08 CCAD FILE DDAV/01 DATE
ES, INCLUDING FIBRE OPTIC	OCAD FILEDHAWNDATE71372-DE1JMD24/09/2013AUTOCAD FILECHECKEDDATE
O PRIOR TO COMMENCING	73341 GKO ??/??/?? ARCHIVE FILE APPROVED DATE
ED FROM S.C.I.M.S. ISTANCES.	/3341 GKO ??/??/?? PLAN NUMBER 70044
	/ 3341 SHEET 18 OF 25 © LandPartners 2013

	CLIENT	
	RIVERSTO PTY	DNE PARADE LTD
	PROJECT PLAN OI & COI OVER RIVERS PRECIN LOT 211 IN	F DETAILS NTOURS STONE WEST CT BEING I DP 830505
M.G.A. NORTH (ZONE 56)	NOTES The title boundaries shown hereon we and have been determined by plan dim survey. Services shown hereon have been loc: If not able to be so located, services ha relevant authorities where available an the plan. Where such records do not e has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or or authority should be contacted for possi services and detailed locations of all so	re not marked at the time of survey nensions only and not by field ated where possible by field survey. ave been plotted from the records of id have been noted accordingly on xist or are inadequate a notation construction on the site, the relevant ible location of further underground ervices.
	LEGEND ▲ BENCH MARK Image: Constraint of the second sec	TRUNK IF CANDPY E HOLE
	built e	IDPARTNERS nvironment consultants
	Sydney Office Level 2, 23-29 South Street t (61) Rydalmere NSW 2116 f (61) PO Box 1144 e sydu Dundas NSW 2117 w ww HEIGHT DATUM	9685 2000 9685 2001 ney@landpartners.com.au w.landpartners.com.au LOCAL AUTHORITY
RAPHY AND SHOULD ONLY BE TO BE UNDERTAKEN.	AHD HEIGHT ORIGIN	BLACKTOWN COUNCIL
OVEMENTS AND DETAIL	PM 43386 RL 38.296	1:1000 (A1) CONTOUR INTERVAL
_D BE CONFIRMED	CO-ORD SYSTEM	I.U MetreSURVEYORDATE OF SURVEYBS03/03/08
ING FIBRE OPTIC	CCAD FILE 71372-DE1	DRAWN DATE JMD 24/09/2013
O COMMENCING	AUTOCAD FILE 73341	CHECKED DATE GKO ??/??/??
S.C.I.M.S.	ARCHIVE FILE 73341	APPROVED DATE GKO ??/??/??
		3/1
	ן ו אר איז	041

SHEET 19 OF 25

©LandPartners 2013

· +

+ *

+

*

+

* *

W)

+

+ +

+ +

*

<u>NOTES</u>

EASTERN

* CONTOURS IF SHOWN ARE AN INDICATION OF THE TOPOGRAPHY AND SHOULD ONLY BE USED FOR PLANNING PURPOSES. IF DETAILED DESIGN IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN, SPOT LEVELS SHOULD BE USED.

JE SE

09

ìΟ

NENT

う 19

IBAR

- * DO NOT SCALE OFF THIS PLAN RELATIONSHIP OF IMPROVEMENTS AND DETAIL TO BOUNDARIES IS DIAGRAMMATIC AND IF CRITICAL SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY A BOUNDARY SURVEY.
- * THE POSITIONS OF ANY UNDERGROUND SERVICES, INCLUDING FIBRE OPTIC CABLE, HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED.
- * CONTACT "DIAL BEFORE YOU DIG" ON Ph: 1100 PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK ON SITE.
- * ORIGIN OF MGA COORDINATES PM43385 ADOPTED FROM S.C.I.M.S. ON 17/12/07. SURVEY BASED ON GROUND DISTANCES.

RIVERSTONE PARADE PTY LTD

PROJECT

PLAN OF DETAILS & CONTOURS OVER RIVERSTONE WEST PRECINCT BEING LOT 211 IN DP 830505

NOTES

The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field survey. Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation has been made hereon. Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground services and detailed locations of all services.

LEG	<u>END</u>			
	BE	NCH MARK		
		TER METER		
		F D= DIAMET	IER TRUNK	
ti)	S= SPREA H= HEIGH	D OF CANOPY	
	WA	TER HYDRANT		
	STE	IP VALVE		
) SEV	WER MAINTENA	NCE HOLE	
*	ELE	CT LIGHT PD	LE	
0	P۵۱	VER POLE (lig	ht)	
0	P۵۱	VER POLE		
	GRA	TE		
#	GAS	METER		
	□ GAT	E		
× ×	MAN	I HULE		
0	TAF)		
&	INS	PECTION HOLE	<u>-</u>	
		CLOTHES HOIST		
	L GUL	LY PIT		
Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation does not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.				
		built	environment consultants	

Sydney Office		BSIN	
Level 2, 23-29 South Street t (61)	9685 2000		
Rydalmere NSW 2116 f (61) 9685 2001			
PO Box 1144 e sydn	ey@landpartners.com	m.au /SO 9001:2008	
Dundas NSW 2117 w www	v.landpartners.com.a	u ^{FS 535063}	
EIGHT DATUM	LOCAL AUTHORIT	Y	
\HD	BLACKTOWN	N COUNCIL	
EIGHT ORIGIN	SCALE		
PM 43386 RL 38.296	1:1000 (A1)		
ERIDIAN CONTOUR INTERVAL		AL	
V∕ A	1.0 Metre		
O-ORD SYSTEM	SURVEYOR	DATE OF SURVEY	
IGA	BS	03/03/08	
CAD FILE	DRAWN	DATE	
1372-DE1	JMD	24/09/2013	
UTOCAD FILE	CHECKED	DATE	
/3341	GKO	??/??/??	
RCHIVE FILE	APPROVED	DATE	
/3341	GKO	??/??/??	
LAN NUMBER			
73341			

SHEET 22 OF 25 ©LandPartners 2013

	* * * * *	*
BP + + +	* * * *	* *
	* * *	* *
M.G.A AIS	* * * * * *	* * *
MURTH (ZUNE 56)	* * *	
	* *	*
	·	8
	æ .	
	*	*
	* *	*
	*	* *
E.		
THE		
		*
	↓ ↓	*
	R	*
	OB B	*
EASTERN		
		+ + +
NOTES		+ + +
* CONTOURS IF SHOWN ARE AN INDICATION OF THE TOPOGRAPHY AND SHOULD C USED FOR PLANNING PURPOSES. IF DETAILED DESIGN IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN, SPOT LEVELS SHOULD BE USED.	ONLY BE	
* DO NOT SCALE OFF THIS PLAN – RELATIONSHIP OF IMPROVEMENTS AND DETAIL TO BOUNDARIES IS DIAGRAMMATIC AND IF CRITICAL SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY A BOUNDARY SURVEY.		
 * THE POSITIONS OF ANY UNDERGROUND SERVICES, INCLUDING FIBRE OPTIC CABLE, HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. * CONTACT "DIAL BEFORE YOU DIG" ON Ph: 1100 PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK ON SITE. 		
* ORIGIN OF MGA COORDINATES PM43385 ADOPTED FROM S.C.I.M.S. ON 17/12/07. SURVEY BASED ON GROUND DISTANCES.		

*/ / * /	CLIENT
* + /*	
+ + + +	
* * *	PROJECT
*	PLAN OF DETAILS
• / /	
+ + /*	OVER RIVERSTONF WEST
+ + +	PRECINCT BFING
* * *	I OT 211 IN DP 830505
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	
* *	NOTES
* * * * *	The title boundaries shown hereon were not marked at the time of survey and have been determined by plan dimensions only and not by field
* * *	Services shown hereon have been located where possible by field survey. If not able to be so located, services have been plotted from the records of
	relevant authorities where available and have been noted accordingly on the plan. Where such records do not exist or are inadequate a notation has been made bereon
* * / */	Prior to any demolition, excavation or construction on the site, the relevant authority should be contacted for possible location of further underground
+///	services and detailed locations of all services.
+ / +//+/	
,375 CICL [*] 37 250 CICL * 25	
+ + + + + + / + / + /	LEGEND
	BENCH MARK
	WATER METER
/ +	TREE D= DIAMETER TRUNK S= SPREAD DF CANDPY
	WATER HYDRANT
	SEWER MAINTENANCE HULE
* * * * * ,	
///////////////////////////////////////	O POWER POLE
	GATE
	S INSPECTION HOLE
	CLOTHES HOIST
	GULLY PIT
	Symbols shown are indicative only. The symbol size and orientation does not necessarily represent the real size or orientation of the feature.
$+ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	
* * * * * *	
	built environment consultants
	Sydney Office
· < < < / /	Level 2, 23-29 South Street t (61) 9685 2000 Rydalmere NSW 2116 f (61) 9685 2001 PO Box 1144 e sydney@landnartners.com.au /SO 0001:0000
	Dundas NSW 2117 www.landpartners.com.au FS 535063
	HEIGHT DATUMLOCAL AUTHORITYAHDBLACKTOWN COUNCIL
* (]	HEIGHT ORIGIN SCALE PM 43386 RL 38.296 1:1000 (A1)
	MERIDIAN CONTOUR INTERVAL
	IN/A 1.0 Metre CO-ORD SYSTEM SURVEYOR DATE OF SURVEY
	MGA BS 03/03/08
	OCAD FILE DRAWN DATE 71372-DE1 JMD 24/09/2013
	AUTOCAD FILE CHECKED DATE 73341 GKO ??/??/??
	ARCHIVE FILEAPPROVEDDATE73341GKO22/22/22
	PLAN NUMBER
	73341
	SHEET 25 OF 25 © LandPartners 2013

APPENDIX

FLOOD MODELLING RESULTS

59918177 - 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

INDEX OF FIGURES Existing (Depth & WL) Local Flow Simulation - 20% AEP E1 E2 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 20% AEP E3 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 20% AEP Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP E4 E5 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 1% AEP Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 1% AEP E6 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 20% AEP HN TWL E7 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 1% AEP HN TWL E8 Interim Less Existing Local Flow Simulation - 20% AEP 11 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 20% AEP 12 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 20% AEP 13 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP 14 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 1% AEP 15 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 1% AEP 16 **Design (Depth & WL)** Local Flow Simulation - 20% AEP D1 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 20% AEP D2 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 20% AEP D3 Local Flow Simulation - 5% AEP D4 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 5% AEP D5 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 5% AEP D6 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP D7 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 20% AEP HN TWL D8 Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 1% AEP HN TWL D9 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 1% AEP D10 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 1% AEP D11 Local Flow Simulation - 0.833% AEP D12 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 0.833% AEP D13 Local Flow Simulation - 0.5% AEP D14 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 0.5% AEP D15 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 0.5% AEP D16 Local Flow Simulation - 0.2% AEP D17 D18 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 0.2% AEP Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 0.2% AEP D19 Local Flow Simulation - PMF D20 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - PMF D21 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - PMF D22 **Design Less Interim-Wate Level Difference** Local Flow Simulation - 20% AEP D23 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 20% AEP D24 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation - 20% AEP D25 Local Flow Simulation - 5% AFP D26

D27 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 5% AEP

- D28 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation 5% AEP
- D29 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP
- D29.1 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP-Model Extent with Aerial
- D29.2 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP-Model Extent without Aerial
- D30 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP with 20% AEP HN TWL Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 20% AEP HN TWL-Model
- D30.1 Extent with Aerial Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 20% AEP HN TWL-Model
- D30.2 Extent without Aerial
- D31 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP with 1% AEP HN TWL Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 1% AEP HN TWL-Model
- D31.1 Extent with Aerial Local Flow Simulation - 1% AEP with 1% AEP HN TWL-Model
- D31.2 Extent without Aerial
- D32 Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation 1% AEP Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 1% AEP-Model
- D32.1 Extent with Aerial Hawkesbury Neapean Tailwater Simulation - 1% AEP-Model
- D32.2 Extent without Aerial
- D33 Hawkesbury Neapean Inflow Simulation 1% AEP Design Less Existing
- D34 Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP
- D35 Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP

Existing Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Contours (0.1m) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50 FIGURE E1 1:17,000 Scale at A3 Cardno Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz

Existing Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	
	Doodo
	Roaus

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km

Existing Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	
	Deede
	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- I Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km

Existing Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ---- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50 FIGURE E4 1:17,000 Scale at A3

Cardno
 Approduced by National Water & Environment ()

Existing Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Roads	
🔲 Fill Pac	Extent
Riverst	one West Precinct Boundary
Study E	Extent
💋 Heritag	e Buildings Extent
NSW C	adastre
Flood Depth (I	m)
0.00 to	0.10
0.10 to	0.30
0.30 to	0.50
0.50 to	0.70
0.70 to	1.00
1.00 to	1.50
> 1.50	

FIGURE E5

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km

Existing Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

_	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50

0.5

1:17,000 Scale at A3

1 1 km

Existing - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 20% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Contours and Depth

> **177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment**

Logond

Lege	nu
	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
-	0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
Flood	Depth (m)
	0.00 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.30
	0.30 to 0.50
	0.50 to 0.70
	0.70 to 1.00
	1.00 to 1.50
	> 1.50

FIGURE E7 1:17,000 Scale at A3 0.5 C Cardno

Existing - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 1% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

_	Roade
	Nudus

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50

1:17,000 Scale at A3

1 km

Interim Less Existing- Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	· Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D)ry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet

FIGURE I1

1:17,000 Scale at A3

1 km





Interim Less Existing -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation

20% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Lege	ind
		Roads
		Fill Pad Extent
		Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
		Study Extent
		Heritage Buildings Extent
		NSW Cadastre
	Water	Level Difference (m)
		< -0.50
		-0.50 to -0.20
		-0.20 to -0.10
		-0.10 to -0.05
		-0.05 to -0.01
		-0.01 to 0
		0 to 0.01
		0.01 to 0.05
		0.05 to 0.10
		0.10 to 0.20
		0.20 to 0.50
		> 0.50
	Wet D	Pry Analysis
		Was Wet, Now Dry
		Was Dry, Now Wet
		FIGURE 12
		1:17.000 Scole at 12
0		0.5 1







Interim Less Existing -Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation

20% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Logona			
	Roads		
	Fill Pad Extent		
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary		
	Study Extent		
	Heritage Buildings Extent		
	NSW Cadastre		
Water I	Level Difference (m)		
	< -0.50		
	-0.50 to -0.20		
	-0.20 to -0.10		
	-0.10 to -0.05		
	-0.05 to -0.01		
	-0.01 to 0		
	0 to 0.01		
	0.01 to 0.05		
	0.05 to 0.10		
	0.10 to 0.20		
	0.20 to 0.50		
	> 0.50		
Wet Dr	y Analysis		
	Was Wet, Now Dry		
	Was Dry, Now Wet		
	FIGURE 13		

1:17,000 Scale at A3

0.5

C Cardno





Interim Less Existing- Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent **Riverstone West Precinct Boundary** Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Difference (m) < -0.50 -0.50 to -0.20 -0.20 to -0.10 -0.10 to -0.05 -0.05 to -0.01 -0.01 to 0 0 to 0.01 0.01 to 0.05 0.05 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.20 0.20 to 0.50 > 0.50 Wet Dry Analysis Was Wet, Now Dry Was Dry, Now Wet FIGURE I4 1:17,000 Scale at A3

Cardno
Produced by National Water & Environment ()





Interim Less Existing -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation

1% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D	Pry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet
	FIGURE 15
	1:17,000 Scale at A3
1	







Interim Less Existing -Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation

1% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Legena				
Roads				
Fill Pad Extent				
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary				
Study Extent				
Heritage Buildings Extent				
NSW Cadastre				
Water Level Difference (m)				
< -0.50				
-0.50 to -0.20				
-0.20 to -0.10				
-0.10 to -0.05				
-0.05 to -0.01				
-0.01 to 0				
0 to 0.01				
0.01 to 0.05				
0.05 to 0.10				
0.10 to 0.20				
0.20 to 0.50				
> 0.50				
Wet Dry Analysis				
Was Wet, Now Dry				
Was Dry, Now Wet				
FIGURE I6				
1:17,000 Scale at A3				







Design Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Contours (0.1m) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50 **FIGURE D1** 1:17,000 Scale at A3 Cardno Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	-				
			-		
-	-	-	к	oa	d

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- I Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

1 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

 Roade	
Itudus	

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Local Flow Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

•	
_	Doodo
	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50

FIGURE D5

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	
	Deede
_	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment Legend ---- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50







Design - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 20% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

 Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
- NSW Cadastre
- 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 1% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Deede
Roads

J	Fill	Pad	Extent
-			

- Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

•	
	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	— Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Ctudy Extent

Study Extent

💋 Heritage Buildings Extent

NSW Cadastre

- 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)

Flood Depth (m)

_	0.00	to	0.10
	0.40		0.00

0.10 to 0.30

	.00	w	0.00
_			

- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

ר 1 km







Design Local Flow Simulation 0.833% AEP Water Level **Contours and Depth**

> **177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment**



C Cardno





Design Hawkesbury- Nepean Tailwater Simulation 0.833% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

9	•	
	_	Roade
		Nuaus

-			
	Fill	Pad	Extent

- Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

I 1 km







Design Local Flow Simulation 0.5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Roads
Fill Pad Extent
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
Study Extent
/// Heritage Buildings Extent
NSW Cadastre
0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
Flood Depth (m)
0.00 to 0.10
0.10 to 0.30
0.30 to 0.50
0.50 to 0.70
0.70 to 1.00
1.00 to 1.50
> 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 0.5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	
	Deede
	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

ר 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 0.5% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

 Roads
Fill Pad Extent

- Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



- 1:17,000 Scale at A3
- 1 kn







Design Local Flow Simulation 0.2% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
-	0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
Flood	Depth (m)
	0.00 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.30
	0.30 to 0.50
	0.50 to 0.70
	0.70 to 1.00
	1.00 to 1.50
	> 1.50

FIGURE D17

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 0.2% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

 Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 0.2% AEP Water Level Contours and Depth

> **177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment**

Legend			
— F	Roads		
E F	Fill Pad Extent		
F F	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary		
— 5	Study Extent		
🖊 ł	Heritage Buildings Extent		
1	VSW Cadastre		
<u> </u>).1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)		
Flood D	epth (m)		
	0.00 to 0.10		
0	0.10 to 0.30		
0	0.30 to 0.50		
0	0.50 to 0.70		
0).70 to 1.00		
1	1.00 to 1.50		
>	> 1.50		



C Cardno





Design Local Flow Simulation PMF Water Level Contours and Depth

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment Legend ---- Roads Fill Pad Extent Riverstone West Precinct Boundary Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD) Flood Depth (m) 0.00 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.30 0.30 to 0.50 0.50 to 0.70 0.70 to 1.00 1.00 to 1.50 > 1.50

FIGURE D20 1:17,000 Scale at A3 0.5 1





Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation PMF Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

-	
_	Doode
	Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- I Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



1:17,000 Scale at A3

ר 1 km







Design Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation PMF Water Level Contours and Depth

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

 - Roads

- Fill Pad Extent
 - Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
- Study Extent
- I Heritage Buildings Extent
 - NSW Cadastre
 - 0.1m Water Level Contour (mAHD)
- Flood Depth (m)
- 0.00 to 0.10
- 0.10 to 0.30
- 0.30 to 0.50
- 0.50 to 0.70
- 0.70 to 1.00
- 1.00 to 1.50
- > 1.50



- 1:17,000 Scale at A3
- ר 1 km







Design Less Interim - Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

_	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D	Pry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet

FIGURE D23

1:17,000 Scale at A3







Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Difference

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

0	0.5	11
-	1:17,000 Scale at A3	1
	FIGURE D24	
	was Dry, Now Wet	
	Was Wet, Now Dry	
	Wet Dry Analysis	
	> 0.50	
	0.20 to 0.50	
	0.10 to 0.20	
	0.05 to 0.10	
	0.01 to 0.05	
	0 to 0.01	
	-0.01 to 0	
	-0.05 to -0.01	
	-0.10 to -0.05	
	-0.20 to -0.10	
	-0.50 to -0.20	
	< -0.50	
	Water Level Difference (m)	
	NSW Codestro	
	Study Extent	
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary	
	Fill Pad Extent	
	Roads	
	Legend	

Cardno





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation

20% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water I	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet Dr	y Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet

FIGURE D25

1:17,000 Scale at A3





Design Less Interim - Local Flow Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ---- Roads Fill Pad Extent **Riverstone West Precinct Boundary** Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Difference (m) < -0.50 -0.50 to -0.20 -0.20 to -0.10 -0.10 to -0.05 -0.05 to -0.01 -0.01 to 0 0 to 0.01 0.01 to 0.05 0.05 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.20 0.20 to 0.50 > 0.50 Wet Dry Analysis Was Wet, Now Dry Was Dry, Now Wet FIGURE D26 1:17,000 Scale at A3

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz

Cardno





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Difference

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Fill Pad Extent
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
Water Level Difference (m)
< -0.50
-0.50 to -0.20
-0.20 to -0.10
-0.10 to -0.05
-0.05 to -0.01
-0.01 to 0
0 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.05
0.05 to 0.10
0.10 to 0.20
0.20 to 0.50
> 0.50
Wet Dry Analysis
Was Wet, Now Dry
Was Dry, Now Wet
FIGURE D27
1:17 000 Scale at A3

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23| Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz

C Cardno





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation 5% AEP Water Level Difference

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Legent	
— R	oads
E Fi	ill Pad Extent
🔲 R	iverstone West Precinct Boundary
S	tudy Extent
💋 н	eritage Buildings Extent
N	SW Cadastre
Water Le	evel Difference (m)
<	-0.50
-0	0.50 to -0.20
-0).20 to -0.10
-0	0.10 to -0.05
-0	0.05 to -0.01
-0	0.01 to 0
0	to 0.01
0.	01 to 0.05
0.	05 to 0.10
0.	10 to 0.20
0.	20 to 0.50
>	0.50
Wet Dry	Analysis
W	/as Wet, Now Dry
W	/as Dry, Now Wet
	FIGURE D28

C Cardno

0.5

1:17,000 Scale at A3





Design Less Interim - Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> **177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment**

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent **Riverstone West Precinct Boundary** Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Difference (m) < -0.50 -0.50 to -0.20 -0.20 to -0.10 -0.10 to -0.05 -0.05 to -0.01 -0.01 to 0 0 to 0.01 0.01 to 0.05 0.05 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.20 0.20 to 0.50 > 0.50 Wet Dry Analysis Was Wet, Now Dry Was Dry, Now Wet FIGURE D29 1:17,000 Scale at A3

Cardno





Design Less Interim - Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend ----- Roads Fill Pad Extent **Riverstone West Precinct Boundary** Study Extent Heritage Buildings Extent **NSW** Cadastre Water Level Difference (m) < -0.50 -0.50 to -0.20 -0.20 to -0.10 -0.10 to -0.05 -0.05 to -0.01 -0.01 to 0 0 to 0.01 0.01 to 0.05 0.05 to 0.10 0.10 to 0.20 0.20 to 0.50 > 0.50 Wet Dry Analysis Was Wet, Now Dry Was Dry, Now Wet FIGURE D29.1 1:40,000 Scale at A3 2 km Cardno





Design Less Interim - Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

T	Legend
14	Roads
4	Fill Pad Extent
4A	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
4E	Study Extent
4	🗾 Heritage Buildings Extent
T	NSW Cadastre
/E	Water Level Difference (m)
A	< -0.50
TIT	-0.50 to -0.20
44	-0.20 to -0.10
444	-0.10 to -0.05
AD	-0.05 to -0.01
44-	-0.01 to 0
Xï	0 to 0.01
1	0.01 to 0.05
Ø	0.05 to 0.10
X	0.10 to 0.20
25	0.20 to 0.50
X	> 0.50
\geq	Wet Dry Analysis
2	Was Wet, Now Dry
2	Was Dry, Now Wet
20	
X	
112	
25	FIGURE D29.2
//	1:40,000 Scale at A3
ATT	
AD	1 1 0 1 2 km

Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz




Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 20% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

	riood Assessment
	Legend
	Roads
1	Fill Pad Extent
P	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
1	✓ Heritage Buildings Extent
10	NSW Cadastre
	Water Level Difference (m)
2	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
長	-0.20 to -0.10
•	-0.10 to -0.05
1	-0.05 to -0.01
1	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
1	0.01 to 0.05
2	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
0	0.20 to 0.50
X	> 0.50
	Wet Dry Analysis
3	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet
1	
1	
2	
N.	FIGURE D30
	1:17,000 Scale at A3
A	0 0.5 1 km
(he	
()	
- N	N Cardno
K	1
and a	Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23 Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: McG Zone 56
10164	Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 20% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

TT	
	Legend
15	Roads
9	Fill Pad Extent
4/4	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
AL.	Study Extent
Z	✓ Heritage Buildings Extent
The	NSW Cadastre
TE	Water Level Difference (m)
19/X	< -0.50
IH?	-0.50 to -0.20
11/	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
DAD	-0.05 to -0.01
H	-0.01 to 0
Litt	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
S.	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
5	> 0.50
	Wet Dry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
3	Was Dry, Now Wet
-	
TI	A COLORADO A
	FIGURE D30.1
2	1:40,000 Scale at A3
117	
DAC	0 1 2 km
	N
	() Cardno
力 把11	Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water)
	Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.ggz





Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 20% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

Planning, Industry & Environment

the	ricou Assessment
YIT	Legend
7// {	Roads
240	Fill Pad Extent
LEAA	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
JE4E	Study Extent
YE	Heritage Buildings Extent
THE	NSW Cadastre
37/E	Water Level Difference (m)
74 A	< -0.50
5-111111	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
SROAD	-0.05 to -0.01
1144	-0.01 to 0
th ATT	0 to 0.01
ALL!	0.01 to 0.05
0///	0.05 to 0.10
\sim	0.10 to 0.20
11X	0.20 to 0.50
VG	> 0.50
1152	Wet Dry Analysis
XA.	Was Wet, Now Dry
XD	Was Dry, Now Wet
S.P.	
OR	
11 S	
XX	FIGURE D30.2
An	1:40,000 Scale at A3
111187	0 1 2km
S ROAD	2.000
VIIB.	N Cardoo
NEW	
APPEL L	Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23[Project: 59918177
- 11 e	Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177 RiverstoneW FA CF Appendix.ooz





Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 1% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

Legend	
Roads	
Fill Pad Extent	
Riverstone West Precinct Boun	dary
Study Extent	
Heritage Buildings Extent	
NSW Cadastre	
Water Level Difference (m)	
< -0.50	
-0.50 to -0.20	
-0.20 to -0.10	
-0.10 to -0.05	
-0.05 to -0.01	
-0.01 to 0	
0 to 0.01	
0.01 to 0.05	
0.05 to 0.10	
0.10 to 0.20	
0.20 to 0.50	
> 0.50	
Wet Dry Analysis	
Was Wet, Now Dry	
Was Dry, Now Wet	
FIGURE DST	
1:17,000 Scale at A3	_
0 0.5	1 ki
0 0.5	1 ki
0 0.5	1 k
0 0.5	1 K
0 0.5	1 Kı





Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 1% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

14	Flood Assessment	
7	Legend	
-	— Roads	
1	Fill Pad Extent	
A	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary	
AN I	Study Extent	
The second	Heritage Buildings Extent	
1	NSW Cadastre	
A series of	Water Level Difference (m)	
	< -0.50	
No. of Contraction	-0.50 to -0.20	
	-0.20 to -0.10	
	-0.10 to -0.05	
	-0.05 to -0.01	
	-0.01 to 0	
	0 to 0.01	
	0.01 to 0.05	
	0.05 to 0.10	
	0.10 to 0.20	
	0.20 to 0.50	
	> 0.50	
	Wet Dry Analysis	
	Was Wet, Now Dry	
	Was Dry, Now Wet	
1		Ì
1		
1725	FIGURE D31.1	
FT	1:40,000 Scale at A3	
山戸	0 1 2 km	
and the second		
- Barris	Sec. 1	
and -	C Cardno	
1	1	

Date: 2022-2-23| Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Interim - 1%AEP Local Flooding with 1% AEP Hawkesbury Nepean Tailwater Water Level Difference Plot

> **177 Riverstone West** Flood Assessment

Th	
111	Legend
115	Roads
0	Fill Pad Extent
SA	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
44	Study Extent
72	💋 Heritage Buildings Extent
THE	NSW Cadastre
7/ 1	Water Level Difference (m)
4 JE	< -0.50
11111	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
4444	-0.10 to -0.05
ROAD	-0.05 to -0.01
144	-0.01 to 0
144	0 to 0.01
LE	0.01 to 0.05
HA.	0.05 to 0.10
$\leq \times$	0.10 to 0.20
11	0.20 to 0.50
S.S.	> 0.50
$\langle \rangle$	Wet Dry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
XI.	Was Dry, Now Wet
SP-	
2	
N S	
	FIGURE D31.2
3m	1:40,000 Scale at A3
ATT B	0 1 2km
ROAD	0 1 2111
	N (D Control
ALC: NO	Cocarano
7/111	Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-231 Project: 59918177
11.	Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177 RiverstoneW FA CF Appendix.gaz

唐子





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Legend
Roads
Fill Pad Extent
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
Study Extent
Heritage Buildings Extent
NSW Cadastre
Water Level Difference (m)
< -0.50
-0.50 to -0.20
-0.20 to -0.10
-0.10 to -0.05
-0.05 to -0.01
-0.01 to 0
0 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.05
0.05 to 0.10
0.10 to 0.20
0.20 to 0.50
> 0.50
Wet Dry Analysis
Was Wet, Now Dry
Was Dry, Now Wet
FIGURE D32
1:17.000 Scale at A3
0 0.5 1 k

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz

Cardno





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation **1% AEP Water Level Difference**

> **177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment**

l egend

Leye	inu
	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
1 1	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D	ry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet
	FIGURE D32.1
	1:40,000 Scale at A3

C Cardno

2 km

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23| Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Tailwater Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference **177 Riverstone West**

Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D	ry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet

FIGURE D32.2

1:40,000 Scale at A3

2 km

加限限

C Cardno

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23| Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Interim -Hawkesbury-Nepean Inflow Simulation

1% AEP Water Level Difference

177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Legena
Roads
Fill Pad Extent
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
Study Extent
Heritage Buildings Extent
NSW Cadastre
Water Level Difference (m)
< -0.50
-0.50 to -0.20
-0.20 to -0.10
-0.10 to -0.05
-0.05 to -0.01
-0.01 to 0
0 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.05
0.05 to 0.10
0.10 to 0.20
0.20 to 0.50
> 0.50
Wet Dry Analysis
Was Wet, Now Dry
Was Dry, Now Wet
FIGURE D33
1:17,000 Scale at A3



0.5

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Existing- Local Flow Simulation 20% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

Roads
Fill Pad Extent
Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
Study Extent
/// Heritage Buildings Extent
NSW Cadastre
Water Level Difference (m)
< -0.50
-0.50 to -0.20
-0.20 to -0.10
-0.10 to -0.05
-0.05 to -0.01
-0.01 to 0
0 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.05
0.05 to 0.10
0.10 to 0.20
0.20 to 0.50
> 0.50
Wet Dry Analysis
Was Wet, Now Dry
Was Dry, Now Wet
FIGURE D34

1:17,000 Scale at A3

l 1 km



Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz





Design Less Existing- Local Flow Simulation 1% AEP Water Level Difference Plot

> 177 Riverstone West Flood Assessment

Legend

	Roads
	Fill Pad Extent
	Riverstone West Precinct Boundary
	Study Extent
	Heritage Buildings Extent
	NSW Cadastre
Water	Level Difference (m)
	< -0.50
	-0.50 to -0.20
	-0.20 to -0.10
	-0.10 to -0.05
	-0.05 to -0.01
	-0.01 to 0
	0 to 0.01
	0.01 to 0.05
	0.05 to 0.10
	0.10 to 0.20
	0.20 to 0.50
	> 0.50
Wet D)ry Analysis
	Was Wet, Now Dry
	Was Dry, Now Wet

FIGURE D35

1:17,000 Scale at A3

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (We

Map Produced by National Water & Environment (Water) Date: 2022-2-23] Project: 59918177 Coordinate System: MGA Zone 56 Map: 177_RiverstoneW FA CF_Appendix.qgz