SUBMISSION ON SDC AND ICC DRAFT SUBDIVISION, LAND USE, AND DEVELOPMENT CODE OF PRACTICE 2023

SUBMITTER: DON MOIR

3.2.4.6 (p.28/29)

I wish to clarify the position of the respective Council's in regard to vesting of services situated on private land.

It has been the general policy of the SDC to take ownership of water, sewage and stormwater services, serving multiple properties, situated on private land and protected by appropriate easements. That has not been the case in regard to the ICC.

My view is that where these services serve multiple properties, are easily accessed such as within a right of way, and are protected by appropriate easement, they should be vested in Council and maintained just as any such service within the road would be maintained by Council.

The land owners in question, typically located on a private right of way, pay the same rates as those fronting directly onto a road and as such deserve the same level of service as their counterparts on the street.

3.2.4.7 (p.29)

The section requires physical connection of electricity and telecommunication services at the time of subdivision. Historically that has been SDC policy but reflects a significant change in ICC policy.

There have been few, if any, residential infill subdivisions within Invercargill where P and T were required as a condition of subdivision consent and this has resulted in no adverse effect that I am aware of and I strongly believe a similar policy should apply in respect to subdivisions within the Southland District.

I believe it should be sufficient to demonstrate the availability of these services upon subdivision but that the physical connection should be left until the time of building which is the point at which the service is required.

This leads to a broader issue in respect of the provision of services upon subdivision and my view is that in the case of infill subdivision it should be sufficient to only demonstrate the availability of services including, water, sewage, stormwater and vehicular access but not to construct these services until the time of building.

These services are not required until the time of building and there is a considerable gain in efficiency, cost saving and reduction in carbon footprint by installing these services at the time of building when they can, at the same time, be extended to the building they service.

Particularly in respect to the ICC there has been a very wasteful policy whereby water connections have ben constructed separately to sewage and stormwater connections often resulting in two separate trenches being excavated by two

separate contractors. A policy needs to be developed to cease this unsatisfactory practice.

3.2.5 (p.31) HEIGHT DATUM

I endorse the decision of SDC to adopt NZVD16 as its official height datum.

I strongly encourage ICC to adopt this datum also.

The decision to remain with Bluff Dunedin 1960 (+100m) is backward thinking and unsustainable in the long term.

The network of control marks that BD1960 is based on is by now heavily affected by local and regional land movement and is no longer maintained by Land Information NZ so that there are significant errors in mark heights.

NZVD16 is the official New Zealand wide datum and should be adopted by ICC.

I would have no issue with the addition of 100m to avoid negative heights in the situation where service records are below sea level.

32.10.5 (p.35) STORMWATER

I am concerned that this section does not sufficiently encourage the on site management of domestic stormwater.

It should, wherever possible, be Council policy to reduce the volume of its stormwater discharges to natural waterways.

Where soil type and ground water conditions are suitable, the use of on site soakage should be encouraged.

Where these conditions are less favourable, the use of retention devices should be encouraged.

A specific policy in this respect should be developed to reduce the serious impact that urban stormwater discharges are having on the natural waterways to which they discharge, both in terms of water volume and water quality.

3.2.20.2 (p.39) FIELD TESTS FOR ROAD BASECOURSE

The table appears to omit the use of the Benkleman Beam for testing the construction of the finished road surface prior to sealing which I am confident is not the intention.

5.3.3.4 (p.66) ROAD VERTICAL GRADE

A minimum vertical grade of 0.5% is specified however there are situations where no vertical grade is required.

I appreciate that road stormwater drainage may require the use of minimum grades but that should not apply to the road carriageway.

TABLE 5.4 (p.67) CARRIAGEWAY WIDTHS

I appreciate that in respect to the number of units served, the figures are indicative only, but the situation in respect to carriageway width for private right's of way needs to be clarified where more than 6 units are served.

Currently ICC standards would require the addition of footpath and street lighting which I consider unwarranted and the situation should be made clear.

5.3.8 (p.71) NO EXIT ROADS

I am concerned that this section discourages the use of cul de sac's in residential subdivisions.

I strongly believe residential amenity is enhanced through the use of cul de sac's rather than loop roads.

I am also concerned that loop roads encourage the construction of additional roading with higher initial construction cost, higher long term maintenance cost and higher carbon footprint.

5.3.12.1 (p.72) FOOTPATHS

I would prefer to see this section clarify the requirements for footpaths in respect of private right's of way where more than 6 units are served.

Currently ICC requires a footpath which I consider unnecessary.

ICC also currently require street lighting on such accessways which is particularly problematic, made more so by the refusal to allow such lighting to be connected to the City street lighting circuit.

I would like it clarified that street lighting on private accessways is at the discretion of the developer.

5.3.17.1 (p.75/76) paragraph (b)

The section imposes a minimum vertical gradient of 1:250 however there may be situations where no vertical grade is appropriate, especially where low impact design involves the discharge of stormwater runoff to the adjacent berm, where it is simply intended to soak away without accumulating.

5.3.17.2 (p.76)

The section requires the surfacing and edging of all shared urban accessways.

This is a marked change from existing policy with significant ramifications.

The majority of such accessways are rights of way servicing just two or three units and the requirement is well over the top in such a situation.

Similarly the requirement for a design in such cases is not warranted.

5.3.19 (p.80) FENCING

The section implies that fencing road boundaries will be the norm but there are many situations where fencing is not required and the section should reflect that more clearly.

5.3.20.7 (p. 84)

The section requires the reinforcing of mountable kerb and channel.

I am sure that is not the intention and it conflicts with the standard drawing.

5.4.2.4 (p. 86) paragraph b) BASECOURSE

It would be useful to clarify what “Local basecourse acceptable to Council” means.

5.4.2.4 (p.86)

The section requires a period of 12 – 24 months before the second coat seal can be completed.

I would like to suggest that a lesser period should be acceptable. Usually a summer season is sufficient.

6.3.4 (p.102) STORMWATER

In this section and others, ICC have retained a five year return period for stormwater design.

I question why this is the case and suggest that this should be increased to ten years.

6.3.8.9 (p. 111) SOAKAGE DEVICES

This section requires the assessment of infiltration rates to be carried out by a geo-professional and I disagree that is appropriate. I have had considerable experience in this field and my ability to make such assessments is well proven by my track record.

I seek the change in wording to “suitably qualified person”.

6.3.12 (p. 116)

The section imposes a minimum depth of 1.0m for stormwater connections and this may not always be possible or necessary.

7.3.13 (p. 138) ON SITE WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT

The section requires on site systems to comply with Council standards or otherwise AS/NZS 1547.

If Council had standards they would be in the code and so I suggest a simplification of the wording to: “On site domestic wastewater **management** systems shall be designed in accordance with AS/NZS 1547:2012 or its successor”.

7.5 (p.138)

AS/NZS 1547:2000 should be 2012.

The section requires the wastewater management system to be wholly contained within the allotment serviced.

This is a significant matter that has had undesirable consequences on several occasions.

I seek a change in this clause to allow for the management of domestic outside the serviced property where there is good reason to do so and where an appropriate easement is registered for that purpose.

The reference to RELAP should be removed and I recommend changing the wording requiring compliance with RELAP and pWLP to a requirement simply to meet the requirements of the Regional Authority.

Don Moir (sighted and verified)

7 June 2023